

This memo and accompanying documents are intended to address the questions raised and provide clarity as regards the site plan, lot coverage, setbacks, etc. for the 2 referenced properties as requested by the DRB in their Findings of June 1, 2015

### Overview to the Request for Clarity and Further Information:

1. The Board requested additional information to provide clarity as regards existing and proposed lot coverage on the 2 properties- **specifically within the 75' waterfront setback** and that information is provided below and in the attached documents.
2. The 75' setback (measured from the 100' elevation) is shown in **RED** on the attached site plans.
  - a. **Note that both houses are entirely within the 75' setback.**
  - b. **Given the required 25' setback off the road side, there is virtually no buildable area that is not within the 75' setback.**
3. **As regards lot coverage (building and impermeable area) within this setback- this is also shown on the attached plans.**
  - a. **451 Existing, there is 9.4% coverage within this 75' setback of the existing 16.5% coverage.**
    - i. **The entire existing buildings (1,347SF) at 7.5% and 1.9% of the roads are within the 75' setback.**
  - b. **465 Existing there is 1.6% coverage within the existing 75' setback of the existing 5.3% coverage.**
    - i. **In the existing lot there is no coverage within the 75' setback/**
  - c. **451 Proposed, there is 11.8% of the total 19.8% within this 75' setback.**
    - i. **The entire building at 7.5% and roads at 4.29% are within the setback**
  - d. **465 Proposed, there is 24.2% of the total 29.8% within this setback.**
    - i. **The entire building at 14.4% and roads 9.8% are within the setback.**
4. It should also be noted that "Lot Coverage" is not at issue on either property as both lots as proposed are well within the limits of the Zoning District.
  - a. As noted in the original approval of July 2014 for these lots there are restrictions only on the size of the structure on 451 Appletree Point and those are explained below and have been adhered to.
  - b. The setbacks were also clarified in that approval of 2014 and they also have been adhered to in these proposals.

### Engineered Site Plans and Lot Coverage Calculations:

1. Accuracy of the plans: these are engineered survey documents and are certified by the engineer.
  - a. At the time of submittal there were a few loose ends to address so the sheet was not stamped. A stamped drawing (Sheet #2) is now attached. More notes have been added as regards the survey, but the data, lot coverage numbers etc. are identical to what was submitted with the application.
2. There was some confusion as regards the **Existing Lot Coverage- Roads and Driveways.**
  - a. This seemed odd as there were no apparent driveways existing- they had grown over even though some gravel remains exposed. (The existing partially grown over

gravel drive is shown on the annotated drawing and was included in the submitted calculations.)

- b. However, the property line is actually in the middle of the roadway so that the existing road counts as lot coverage and that is what the **2,536 SF** of existing coverage was in reference to-part of the existing road and the remnant of the existing gravel drive.- as a single lot. **See Sheet #1.**
- c. This roadway coverage was allocated to each lot as part of the data shown for **Proposed Lot Coverage –Roads/Driveways, on Sheet #2.**

#### Site Area Limitations and Setbacks:

1. As narrow lots- between 80' and 120' in depth setbacks were an obvious issue to address.
2. These lots were submitted in 2014 for DRB review "seeking a variance....on setbacks".
  - a. DRB #14-1108VR and #14-1109VR.
  - b. Findings of Fact were issued on July 1, 2014. (These are attached).
3. This review established the setbacks for these lots- and these are what is shown on the engineering **Site & Utility Plan Sheet #2.**
  - a. Setback from the front yard property line was established as 25'.
  - b. Sideyard setbacks would be as per the zoning ordinance.
  - c. **Lake front setback** was established based on the existing camp as **17'**.
4. The only area limitation imposed was that the new **structure** at 451 could not exceed the existing structure.
  - a. The Findings of July 2014 noted an area of 1,215 SF. The survey noted that area of the house and boathouse as 1,347 SF and that is the area used for 451.
  - b. Note that there was no restriction on the size of the structure at 465 other than meeting the specified setbacks and RL-W overall lot coverage limit of 35%.
5. Note that **Structure** is defined in the zoning ordinance buildings and other constructions but **driveways and roadways are not structures.** (Zoning definition is attached.)
  - a. Lot coverage was not restricted on either lot other than the typical coverage of the **RL-W** District which is 35%. Both lots area well under that area at 19.8% and 29.8%.

#### Attachments:

---

##### Sheet #1: Boundary Line Adjustment

This is colored to show the exiting lot coverages and areas.

##### Sheet #2: Site and EPSC Plan

This is colored to show the proposed coverage areas.

Note that this is a stamped and signed document.

##### 14-1108VR Findings of Fact- 451 Appletree Point

##### 14-1109VR Findings of Fact- 465 Appletree Point

##### Article 13- Structure Definition.