
MEMORANDUM

To: FILE

From: Jean Fraser

Subject: Application ID: 2013-228

Date: 12/6/2013

Comments Submitted by: Marge Schmuckal/Zoning on 12/6/2013

Marge's original review comment on 10/18/13 stated that the height requirement appeared to be met, but that the narrative had mentioned average grades, She wanted to see the methodology for the average grade. Based on the email from Ryan Senatore and the Average Grades Diagram dated 12.04.13, the methodology has been shown and the heights for the three story and four story buildings from the average grade is below the 45' maximum hieght requirement.

MEMORANDUM

To: FILE
From: Jean Fraser
Subject: Application ID: 2013-228
Date: 12/4/2013

Comments Submitted by: Marge Schmuckal/Zoning on 12/4/2013

There seem to be two outstanding zoning issues that Marge needed addressed. The first relates to the bumpout on the rear of the building at 128 North Street. It appears that this "bumpout " is a bulkhead which encroaches into the 20' rear yard setback. Section 14-425 allows a "basement bulkhead" whose area does not exceed 50 square feet and which does not project more than 6' from the principal structure to encroach into any required yard setback. The section also stipulates that the bulkhead may not be more than 24 inches in height. If the bulkhead at 128 North Street meets this criteria, then the proposed lot line meets zoning.

The second issue is the utility closet which encroaches into the 20 rear yard setback. Section 14-139(a)(4)(b) states that the rear setback for "principal and attached accessory structures with ground coverage greater than one hundred (100) square feet" is 20 feet. When the accessory structure is attached to the principal structure, it is part of the principal structure and therefore the ground coverage includes the footprint of the principal structure and the attached accessory structure. Since the footprint of both together is over 100 square feet, the utility closet needs to meet the 20' rear setback. At this point it does not. - Ann Machado

MEMORANDUM

To: FILE
From: Jean Fraser
Subject: Application ID: 2013-228
Date: 12/11/2013

Comments Submitted by: Marge Schmuckal/Zoning on 10/18/2013

This project is for 29 new dwelling units and 34 parking spaces. Two existing buildings will be demolished to make way for this project. The East Cove property is currently a legal single family. 79 Walnut Street is a legal four family. The front of this large property is along Walnut Street. The minimum street requirement of 70' is being met. The initial review indicates that the minimum setback are being met. However, I would like clarification concerning the front setback for unit #1. Is the averaging method being used? Or is the applicant depending upon another part of the Ordinance for the front setback along Walnut Street to be less than 10'. I would also like a better zoning analysis done for the newly configured lot of 128 North Street. The rear setback may be nonconforming by the rear bump out. A bit more information on that lot would be required (remaining lot size - show old lot lines compared to the new etc.).

The height requirement appears to be met. However, the narrative mentioned average grades. I did not see the methodology for the average grades. The average grade was not indicated on the building elevations. Please explain the details a little bit more.

I just wanted to be sure on the plans that the "yellow" outline is the edge of the building outline for setback purposes, and not the "black" line. Please confirm.

Marge Schmuckal
Zoning Administrator