Board Members Present: Jonathan Stevens (Vice Chair), Brad Rabinowitz, Michael Long, Israel Smith, Missa Aloisi

Staff members present: Ken Lerner

File: ZP15-0797AP
Location: 164 North Willard
Zone: RL Ward: 3
Date appeal accepted: February 13, 2015
Appellant/Owner: Nicole Killoran, Esq./Luke Purvis
Request: Appeal of Code Enforcement Officer’s January 29, 2015 “Unsubstantiated Complaint” determination that parking, along the southern boundary of Property, has been expanded.

For clarification, decision issued to Appellant on January 29, 2015 only pertains to the Property at 164 North Willard. The “easement” referred to frequently in documents is located on part of the adjacent property at 158 North Willard Street. Thus, the expansion of parking referred to in the Appellant’s decision refers to a strip of land, approximately 2’ (w) x 60’ (l) on the south side of the driveway and north of the easement on the adjacent property (see attached drawing).

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

Sections 2.7.11, 12.2.2, and 5.3.2 of the Comprehensive Development Ordinance (CDO); appeal indicates Appellant will argue 24 V.S.A. § 4454 (a).

RELIEF REQUESTED BY APPELLANT:

That the board reverse Code Enforcement Office’s decision and find that the parking area constitutes an unenforceable violation pursuant to 24 V.S.A. § 4454 (a).

GROUNDS FOR RELIEF BY APPELLANT:

Appellant provided documents of Property history and parking use arguing 15 years statute of limitations for enforcement.

APPELLANT’S SUBMITTALS:

• February 27, 2015 Summary of Appeal
• January 29, 2015 Decision – Exhibit 1
• 2000 Property Lines – Exhibit 2
• Statement of Historical Usage for 164 North Willard St. – Exhibit 3
• 1988 Ortho Photo – Exhibit 4

CITY’s SUBMITTALS:
• Appeal
• January 29, 2015 Decision
• February 4, 2015 Decision
• Affidavits submitted by Property Owner Cleary (158 North Willard St)
• Affidavits submitted by Property Owner Purvis (164 North Willard St)
• Aerial Photos of Property (164 North Willard St)
• Drawing of the two Properties indicating approximate location of easement
• Photos dated September, October, November and January.
• Complaint

Background:
A written complaint was submitted to the Code Enforcement Office on June 30, 2014; “North and south sides of driveway in rear has new parking constructed March 2013, parking on lawn ongoing especially since April/May 2014 (also visible from Dan’s Ct.).”

Code Enforcement Office staff followed up with numerous meetings and correspondence with the parties. A number of site visits and monitoring were conducted at the Property, as well as, research of City records, review of aerial photos and supporting documentation from Appellant and neighbor. Between September 10, 2014 and January 2015 Code Enforcement staff did not observe any parking south of driveway at 164 North Willard.

In response to the complaint the previous owner of 164 North Willard, Hector LeClair, wrote that he purchased the Property in 1966. He stated two of the three dwelling units of Property were rentals while the third acted as an office (see attached affidavit – although there are no permits on record for an office use at 164 North Willard). According to the affidavit, parking was never assigned (still isn’t), tenants, clients, and Mr. LeClair (who lived in Essex) parked wherever there was a space available.

There are no City records on file indicating location or number of parking spaces at 164 North Willard.

In 1983 Mr. LeClair, as supported by testimony, obtained easement rights from “property to the south” (158 North Willard) to be used for “ingress and egress and for all other lawful purposes”. LeClair indicated that parking had occurred within the easement for a period of 15+ years, until 2013.

Since Appellant’s purchase of 164 North Willard in 2013, he states there has been parking within the easement.
This contention is refuted by neighbor Cleary, who purchased 158 North Willard in 2012. Mr. Cleary denies Appellant's statements and states that "... between July, 2012 and April of 2014, a period of approximately 19 months, or ONE year and 7 months, the easement was never used for parking vehicles. In addition, I [as owner of 158 North Willard] never gave consent for cars to be parked on this [easement] area". See attached drawing indicating approximate location of easement.

A review of City records revealed no zoning permits were on file for Property.

Evidence Presented:
The Board examined the materials submitted in support of this request.

I. Minutes
The meeting minutes will be distributed separately upon review and approval by the Development Review Board.

II. Motion by Israel Smith: In the matter of ZP15-0797AP, 164 North Willard, I move we uphold the determination of no violation by the Code Enforcement Office per the following findings, and highly recommend that the owner of 164 North Willard submit a parking plan with lot coverage as it appears an expansion of parking has occurred on the north side of the driveway:

III. Findings
DETERMINATION:
Based on the research conducted, information provided, including but not limited to statements by the owner of 158 North Willard and on-site observations by Code Enforcement it was determined that the violation complaint was unfounded as parking in the area at issue had ceased. Further, as the parking had ceased for a period in excess of 60 days, Appellant lost any potential claim to reestablishment or the 15 year statute of limitation. See CDO Sec. 5.3.2 below. This determination was issued on January 29, 2015 and is the subject of the appeal. Note that this determination only addresses parking south of the driveway.

CDO Sec. 5.3.2. "Bianchi" controlled uses, structures, and lots.
Although not subject to enforcement action pursuant to Article 2, uses, structures, and lots which are deemed to be controlled by the Bianchi decision, and the subsequent enactment of 24 VSA Sec. 4454, shall be considered violations that are not considered legal to any extent and shall in no event be granted the consideration or allowances of nonconforming structures, uses, and lots. Thus, no change, alteration, enlargement, and reestablishment after discontinuance for more than sixty (60) days or reconstruction after an occurrence or event which destroys at least 50% of the structure in the judgment of the city’s building inspector shall be permitted, except to a conforming use, structure, or lot.

Second: Missa Aliosi
Vote: 5-0-0
Vote: motion carried

Dated at Burlington, Vermont, this 2\(r\) day of April, 2015.
Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan Stevens, Development Review Board Vice Chair

Please note that an interested person may appeal a decision of the Development Review Board to the Vermont Superior Court, Environmental Division. (Comprehensive Development Ordinance Article 12, Section 12.2.3 Appeals of Development Review Board Decisions: An interested person may appeal a decision of the Development Review Board to the Vermont Environmental Court within 30 days of the date of the written decision as follows:

(a) Notice of Appeal: The appeal shall be taken in such a manner as the Supreme Court or the environmental court may by rule provide for appeals from state agencies governed by Sections 801 through 816 of Title 3, Vermont Status Annotated. Notice of the appeal shall be sent by mail to every interested person appearing and having been heard at the hearing before the DRB, and, if any one or more of those persons are not then parties to the appeal, upon motion they shall be granted leave by the court to intervene.)