

in the driveway. On lot two and lot three the driveways would be one of the turnarounds for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Lonsberry asked if the proposed driveway would be on the property line.

Mr. Venezia stated that it would be off the property line by about a foot. The reason the driveway is being proposed where it is because they did not want it on the other side of the barn because of the leach field.

Mr. Lonsberry stated that at that point it no longer becomes a sixty foot right of way.

Mr. Venezia stated that they could make the right of way larger and just include the barn in the right of way.

Mr. Lonsberry stated that he has a concern with the proximity of the barn to the proposed driveway and asked if the barn could be torn down to maintain the 60 foot right of way.

Ms. Bateman stated that it is a nice barn and wouldn't want to tear it down.

Mr. Amato stated that he agrees with Mr. Lonsberry. He has a concern with the whole idea of the subdivision. Allowing this sets a precedent for a lot of other properties to be split up in this way. He does not like that idea. There is a reason we have regulations for a certain amount of road frontage.

Mr. Venezia stated that they do have enough room to put a town road in and subdivide it into multiple lots. This would allow someone who has a large piece of property and wants to stay in the area and with the house and land values the way they are this would allow her to stay in one spot.

Mr. Amato stated that she probably has all good intentions but it does open up the possibility for a lot of other properties to do the same thing.

Mr. Bishop explained that when a variance is not needed a subdivision application only goes to the Planning Board.

Mr. Venezia stated that the whole purpose of this proposal is for Kelly to be able to stay on this property and downsize down the road.

Ms. Bateman stated that they have met every recommendation that the Planning Board recommended.

Mr. Lonsberry asked if there were any comments from the public.

Nathan Stahl stated that he lives adjacent to this parcel. He expressed his concern with the subdivision of three lots. He feels this is more than what is needed. He is happy to hear that the driveway is being considered on the south side. He has kids that play and they just put in a pool that borders the north

side. He would like the neighborhood to maintain the country feel. He feels the properties in that area are very unique from an aesthetic point of view and he would like this maintained.

Mr. Goodwin stated that this property has a beautiful lake view.

Ms. Bateman stated that is why she would like to stay here.

Mr. Goodwin asked if the barn could be moved.

Ms. Bateman stated that she loves the barn and would not want to tear it down.

Mr. Amato stated that he has a concern with the whole concept of this application. He had a concern of the possibility that the two parcels could be subdivided again in the future.

Mr. Venezia stated that they could put a deed restriction that they could not be subdivided again.

Mr. Bishop stated that he agrees with Mr. Amato. They are trying to create a subdivision by getting a variance. Subdivisions are up to the Planning Board and not the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Coriddi stated that he does not have a problem with the proposal as long as the driveway was away from the edge of the property. He would also like to see a deed restriction that states that the lots can't be subdivided again into smaller lots.

Hearing no other comments from the public, Mr. Lonsberry closed the public hearing.

After discussing the application and reviewing the questions on the back of the application the following motion [attached hereto] was made: Mr. Amato made a motion to deny the application. Mr. Lonsberry seconded the motion. Roll call was read with Amato, Goodwin, Lonsberry & Bishop voting AYE and Coriddi voting NAY.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Application #23-135, George West, owner of property at 4476 State Rt 247, requests an area variance to build a residential additions and garage. Proposed additions and garage do not meet the front yard setback.

Richard Krapf, Architect was present and presented the application to the board.

Mr. Lonsberry stated that the board did not have a problem with the setback on the south side but would like to see the addition on the house moved back further from the road. There was a question that if the house moved back further would it impact the proposed leach field.

Mr. Krapf stated that the day after the last meeting he emailed the engineer to see if moving the addition back would impact the leach field. The response was that the maximum length for the absorption lines receiving gravity distribution is 60 feet which the lines are currently at. There is no potential for lengthening and narrowing the absorption field. Currently they are at 20 foot separation for the rear bump out at the southwest corner to the raised system and 10.6 feet separation from west property line to the raised system. The addition could be moved back 0.6 feet. This is the one option but it is pretty much stuck where it is now. If the rear bump out at the southwest corner was removed, which is the bedroom the addition could be moved back approximately 5 feet. However in doing so that room becomes unusable in size. So he would have to add space to the south which makes that variance worse.

Mr. Amato stated that they could move the addition more toward the north and have the layout change.

Mr. Krapf stated that in terms of laying out rooms in a house you can't just put things wherever. He only has a certain number of options. The structural walls have to stay where they are. There is practical design issues that need to be addressed.

Mr. West asked what the negative impact was with the additions when the existing house sets so close to the road.

Mr. Amato stated that in his opinion the existing house is very close to the road but it is fairly small. Now with the additions you are looking to almost double the size of the home fairly close to the road.

Mr. West explained that most of the homes in that area are only about 20 feet from the road.

Mr. Lonsberry stated that could be but zoning is now different and they have to go by the zoning ordinance today.

Mr. Lonsberry asked if the apartment was going to have its own external entrance.

Mr. Krapf stated yes it is in the plan for it to have its own entrance.

Mr. Lonsberry asked if the people that live in the apartment would have to walk all the way around the house to get into their apartment.

Mr. Krapf stated that the garage is not met for the people in the apartment but yes they will have to walk around the house from the driveway.

Mr. Lonsberry asked if the garage could be moved north and put the apartment on the north side.

Mr. Krapf stated that that is something that is up to his client.

Mr. West stated that with all the changes he has made since he came in front of the board that is not where he wanted the apartment in the first place. He guess he will have to go and look at everything again and see what he can do.

Mr. Lonsberry explained that since the public hearing has been closed the board will need to make a decision on the application next month. He asked the applicant if they would be able to take a look at the proposed and make any changes for them to look at next month.

Both Mr. Krapf and Mr. West agreed that they will try to make changes and bring it back next month.

Mr. Amato made a motion to table the application until November 16, 2023. Mr. Bishop seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Mr. Bishop made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:48PM. Mr. Amato seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Victor Lonsberry, Vice Chairman

Sue Yarger, Secretary