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NORTH HAVEN ZONING BOARD - $10 / 10 / 2023$
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Welcome, everybody, to the Tuesday, October 10th, 2023 Zoning Board of Appeals for the Village of North Haven meeting.

First order of business we have is, I need the Board to approve the June 13th, 2023 transcript.

MR. COX: (Raises hand).
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Motion by Mr.
Cox. Second?
MR. BROOKS: (Raises hand.)
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Mr. Brooks.
All in favor?
ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: All members in
favor. All right.
Doesn't look like we have any Correspondence today.

So we just have one application, and this application is ZBA \#422A Ronald and Samantha Panzier. Sorry if I pronounced that wrong. The property is located at 32 Coves End Lane, North Haven, New York. Suffolk County Tax Map No.
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901-6-2-68.1. The applicant proposes a swimming pool and associated patio 41 feet from the front property line. Section 163-18A of the Village Code requires the minimum distance from the street to be 70 feet in an $R-2$ district. The subject premises is bounded by Cove Road, Third Street, Coves End Lane, and Richardson. You can come right up to the table here, yup.

MS. NARVILAS: Oh, my. Okay. CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Yeah. MS. NARVILAS: Wow. CHAIRMAN POITRAS: If you can just --

MS. NARVILAS: Cozy.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: -- state your name, relationship to the application and address, I guess.

MS. NARVILAS: Of course.
Madeline Narvilas. I am the attorney for the applicant. I am at Whalen Filer, which is 532 Montauk Highway in Amangansett.
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I have a handout. Can $I$ hand that out now?

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: You can, yeah. MS. NARVILAS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: So, do you have one for every- --

MS. NARVILAS: Everyone.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: All right, so.
MS. NARVILAS: Everyone, yes. We took some photographs.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: So I'm gonna label this Exhibit 1, and it appears to be a packet of photos of the existing property as it is now. Is that correct?

MS. NARVILAS: Yes --
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: All right.
MS. NARVILAS: -- Mr. Chairman.
(Exhibit 1 was marked in evidence.)
MS. NARVILAS: Okay. So, good evening to the Board. Actually, I'll give you a moment to look at those photos.

So the Panziers live at 32 Coves End Lane, which, as you can see, it's interesting because it's a corner lot but
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it has two very significant challenges.
One of them is that it has three front yards. Coves End Lane, Third Street, and a street that gets referred to, it would seem, in the GPS and on our survey as "Cove Road". But when $I$ went to the property $I$ saw that the street sign says "Cove View Road".

So I am gonna refer to it as Cove View Road. I'm not sure why --

MR. BUTTS: They just changed them.

MS. NARVILAS: -- the discrepancy.
What is that?
MR. BUTTS: No, they changed names of them.

MS. NARVILAS: Oh, okay.
MR. BUTTS: Right.
MS. NARVILAS: What's the current name then?

MR. BUTTS: Cove Road.
MS. NARVILAS: Oh.
MR. BUTTS: They had two of them.
MS. NARVILAS: Okay. Cove Road.
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All right. Then wherever you see "Cove View" on your photos, that is incorrect. That should be "Cove Road".

So in addition to the three front yards -- and $I$ will just note that Third Street is actually not a through street, but it still does count as a street. So we have three front yards to this property. It's also nonconforming in terms of the size. Normally, an R-2. The minimum lot area is 40,000 square feet. Our lot is 27,499 square feet. So because of the three front yards and having a smaller lot than usual, when the Panziers decided they wanted to put an addition onto their house, they had some unique challenges.

And that's part of the reason that Peter DePasquale, who is our architect, came tonight, just in case the Board has any questions as to why the addition needed to be put where it is proposed to be put.

And, I mean, obviously, the fact
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that it is where it is, it meets all of the required setbacks. But because of that, the pool needs to be moved only about 12 feet, but that is 12 feet closer to Cove Road, and where at one time we could have said we were 53 feet away from that lot line. Now the proposed position would put us at 41 feet. Hence, we need the 29-foot variance. And, for the record, that Code section from which we need the variance is 163-18(a). So, again, if you have any questions architecturally or about the addition, Peter is here. I'm just gonna talk to you about why we are before the Board as far as the variance goes.

Moving the pool west actually
allowed for the saving of a very large tree, which is a Japanese maple. And I know that there was a recent change to your code that did have to do with applications for taking down large trees. And $I$ don't think we are quite to the size that that would have been required, but
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the applicant did want to retain that tree.

MR. MIDDLETON: The Japanese maple?

MS. NARVILAS: Yes.
MR. MIDDLETON: It's not native, so.

MR. BROOKS: And the picture -I'm sorry, this is one of the -- I don't know if you marked them, but the exhibits that were just submitted --

MS. NARVILAS: Yes.
MR. BROOKS: -- there's a picture of the existing pool --

MS. NARVILAS: Correct.
MR. BROOKS: -- location. Is the Japanese maple we're talking about visible on that?

MS. NARVILAS: Don't believe it is. Do you see it, Peter?
(Crosstalk)
MR. BROOKS: All right. Just checking. It's not near the existing pool. Okay.
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MR. DePASQUALE: The canopy of the maple touches -- passes over the coping of the existing pool.

MR. BROOKS: Okay.
MS. NARVILAS: So going through the variance standards, will the grant of the variance produce an undesirable change in the neighborhood or the community, the answer to that is no. There's already, obviously, a swimming pool in a very similar location at the lot between the house and what is the west lot line, so there's already a nonconformity.

And, very importantly, the applicant's property, as you can see with the photos, it takes no access from Cove Road. So it's not like it needs a variance onto a street that's being used by the applicant. And that section of the property is extremely heavily vegetated. In addition, there's also a stockade fence.

So the last three photos are where you're able to see a view of what there
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is, actually, on the other side of where the proposed pool is, is -- well, where it currently is and where we are hoping to be allowed to move it 12 feet in that direction.

So there is going to be absolutely zero visual impact with this move. As it is now, the neighbors or even just somebody walking around can't see the existing pool from the street, and you wouldn't be able to see the proposed pool placement, either.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: If I could just interject here.

MS. NARVILAS: Of course.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Just because
it's -- 'cause I, from looking at this, I -- in my opinion, the elephant in the room here is kind of twofold.

So, one, moving the pool the direction you're -- you're increasing your degree of nonconformity. And when you have an existing pool that's there, generally this Board in the past has
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allowed -- you have a very unique property that has these three front yards here, right. So the Board has allowed some flexibility with that in the past.

However, we tend not to go along the lines of trying to increase any degree of nonconformity, right.

MS. NARVILAS: Of course.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: And especially, you are going closer to a road that is a habitat or a roadway where people who go by, that live, other houses are across the street there. So moving the pool, while it is screened, I -- doesn't appear from the pictures that -- and even going by it and viewing it visually myself, that you'd see much of a difference there. But you do carry a lot, obviously, with noise and other activities that pools tend to attract, right.

MS. NARVILAS: Sure.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: And I'll just give you the second point, then you can address both of the same time.
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MS. NARVILAS: Okay.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Just along the ideas of feasible alternatives, it seems like that with the removal of the existing structures that are there, you would have flexibility to keep it within the same general footprint, at least the same setback as this existing pool, or move it to the south side of the property on the inside of what appears to be a courtyard that you're trying to create, I guess, there.

So, and so it just seems like there are some alternatives that really could -- you almost could put it in that courtyard and -- not almost. You could put it there, I think, and not even have to get a variance. I think you'd meet setbacks as well as have, you know, no issues as far as being -- protruding closer to the streets or along those lines, so.
So if you want -- I mean, I'd love
to hear comments on that. But that's, to
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me, the hill of the climb here, right, so.
MS. NARVILAS: Right.
I'll respond to the first comment.
And I think I'll probably ask Peter to address the second one because $I$ think your second one has a lot more to do with due to the house addition and the way that's being proposed.

But as far as the neighbors who would be affected by the move, the closest neighbor is actually on the other side of Cove Road. There is no house sort of right over the lot line there. And the distance -- that house, which is on the other side of Cove Road, is actually set back.
So in terms of, I mean, I -- I
don't want to hazard a guess as to the distance between the neighbor and the pool, but I'll just say that $I$ was actually pleasantly surprised when $I$ went and looked at the property, because given that we have the incredibly heavy vegetation and that you've already got a

NORTH HAVEN ZONING BOARD - $10 / 10 / 2023$ distance, I mean, I understand that you have a little more of a distance now with the 53 feet as opposed to the 41 feet, but you do have 41 feet still, which is 60 percent of what would be -- almost 60 percent of what would be required to meet that setback, in terms of the distance between, you know, the pool, the edge of the property, crossing over the road -MR. BROOKS: I don't think -- I don't -- respectfully, I don't think the location of the neighbors is really that relevant.

The question is, it's a -- you
know, we didn't make the codes and we're not -- it's not for us, as a Board, to say whether they're smart or not smart. They're just the codes that it's our obligation to try to adhere to. And as the Chairman pointed out, there's a increase in the nonconformity. And so if the Code says it should be 50 feet -(Crosstalk)

MS. NARVILAS: 70 .
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MR. BROOKS: Then, you know, 40 percent nonconformity is a pretty substantial nonconformance. It's not a minor nonconformance. It's not, oh, it went from 95 percent conforming. I mean, 40 percent nonconforming as a result of this change.

It just seems that we probably need to hear more about the feasibility of the alternatives and, again, because we have to kind of look at it not just in the context of your one situation and say, "Oh, well" --

MS. NARVILAS: Of course.
MR. BROOKS: -- "this is kind of
swell." We have to look at it in the abstract of all of the applications that come before us and with a goal that we generally have to, you know, avoid granting variances, if there's a feasible alternative, pursuant to the standards that we are allowed to even consider.

So, you know, I think that's really the relevant issue, is -- and it

NORTH HAVEN ZONING BOARD - $10 / 10 / 2023$
might be that it's not as desirable for the owner in a different location, but that's also not always really an issue that we can give a lot of, you know --

MS. NARVILAS: No, I certainly appreciate what you're saying about the setting of precedent and the next 15 people would come before this Board. But I do think it is actually relevant in looking at the variance standards as far as the people that would be affected. MR. HATFIELD: I agree with Mark and Scott, that maybe no neighbors are affected, but $I$ do think that there's a feasible alternative. It's really that --

MS. NARVILAS: All right. Well, that, that, I'm going to -- sorry, I didn't meant to interrupt you.

MR. HATFIELD: That's fine. Just getting a consensus here that $I$ think it's really -- it seems to be a pretty clear feasible alternative.

MS. NARVILAS: All right. Well, I'm gonna ask our architect if he can come
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MR. BROOKS: And I do want to -- I mean, I do want to emphasize, because we have granted some variances before with setbacks, but it was, oh, they were -it's a 50-foot required setback, we gave them 48 feet. That's a minor variance. 40 percent variance is pretty material.

So, anyway, why don't you hop up here, say your name and address for the record.

MR. MIDDLETON: George, I had a question for you. With respect to the stockade fence, is that an issue? It looks like a six-foot fence, and it's in the front yard.

MR. BUTTS: I don't recall, I mean, a six-foot fence.

MR. MIDDLETON: Okay. Maybe, maybe my eyeball was off, but --

MR. BUTTS: Right.
MR. MIDDLETON: -- doesn't look
like a four-foot fence.
MR. BUTTS: Was that between --
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attached to the house?
MR. MIDDLETON: It looks like it's on the Cove side.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Yeah, on the west side of the property.

MR. MIDDLETON: Cove Road.
MS. NARVILAS: I have no idea when the stockade fence was --

MR. DePASQUALE: Neither do I.
MS. NARVILAS: -- put on the property.

MR. BROOKS: It's the height is the --

MS. NARVILAS: I understand that. No, it's the same thing in the Town of East Hampton where anything over four feet in a front yard does need a --

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Permit.
MS. NARVILAS: -- permit, so.
MR. DePASQUALE: Just one question before I talk.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: If you could, actually, just state for the --

MR. DePASQUALE: Sure.
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CHAIRMAN POITRAS: -- record, too, just your name and relationship to the application and address (inaudible). MR. DePASQUALE: My name is Pete DePasquale. I'm the architect for the project.

Just before I talk about the pool location, $I$ just wanted to be clear, is the -- is the 70 -foot setback the nonconformance or is it the pool in the front yard that's the nonconformance?

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Well, this, too, actually. One of the -- I was gonna bring that issue up --

MR. DePASQUALE: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: -- after we went through the statutes. But there actually should be a second -- an amendment, and then a revised turndown that would put in 163-10(8)(a) which would prevent, you know (inaudible) but would require a variance for a pool in a front or side yard.

MR. DePASQUALE: Right.
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CHAIRMAN POITRAS: So.
MS. NARVILAS: I was actually
surprised to not see that, and then I just, oh.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Yeah.
MS. NARVILAS: I thought that was --

MR. DePASQUALE: Right, because you --

MS. NARVILAS: -- subsumed.
MR. DePASQUALE: Right. You
couldn't have a pool in a front yard even if it was 70 , right?

MR. HATFIELD: Correct.
MS. NARVILAS: Not normally.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Not without a variance.

MR. DePASQUALE: Yeah, okay.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: So, yeah, there had been cases in this Village where that has occurred. Typically, like a waterfront property.

MR. DePASQUALE: Yes.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: That's where --
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you know, so it ends up being away from the water --

MR. DePASQUALE: Okay.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: -- in
substance. But there are some cases of that, but not -- this is unique. You have an existing -- with three front yards, you have a unique challenge with that.

MR. DePASQUALE: Yup.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: That you're gonna have it -- there's really only one small envelope here that would allow for not to have that variance be triggered.

MR. DePASQUALE: Yup. CHAIRMAN POITRAS: SO.

MR. DePASQUALE: As far as the location, when these clients came to us, they said from the very beginning that they wanted privacy and to preserve what they have on the lot. So you can see that our line of clearing has not changed. They also -- you know, they said, "We don't want to tear the house down," because they felt like that was not
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| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | using -- not being resourceful. So |
| 3 | they're trying to preserve as much as they |
| 4 | can. |
| 5 | The -- with the addition basic- -- |
| 6 | effectively having to go where it is on |
| 7 | the north side in terms of solar access, |
| 8 | not zoning, doesn't have to go there by |
| 9 | zoning, the pool has to be replaced |
| 10 | because of a conflict with that porch as |
| 11 | we've designed it. And their intent here |
| 12 | of moving it west is to maintain that |
| 13 | maple tree. So to take the pool down and |
| 14 | to rebuild it is gonna require, you know, |
| 15 | a cut and excavation. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN POITRAS: I'm sorry, if I |
| 17 | could just ask a question -- |
| 18 | MR. DePASQUALE: Sure. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN POITRAS: -- because the |
| 20 | location of this maple tree is unclear. |
| 21 | It looks to me, from the way the |
| 22 | survey that we're looking at, at least, |
| 23 | where the proposed pool is, you have a |
| 24 | proposed patio to the east, which is where |
| 25 | we're recommending that that pool move to, |
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which would then eliminate your maple tree anyway.

MR. DePASQUALE: No, no, so the --
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: So --
MR. DePASQUALE: Sure.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: So that's not clear that you have hardscape where you're saying that should be a maple tree.

MR. DePASQUALE: So, and $I$ can -should $I$ share this on Zoom if I'm gonna show you guys just a simple sketch?
(Crosstalk)
MR. MIDDLETON: Well, there's
nobody else on, so it doesn't really matter.

MR. BUTTS: You want me to share the screen, or?

MR. DePASQUALE: Whatever the group prefers, I'm happy to --

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Yeah, you can share it. That's fine. It'll be on the $T V$ and then it'll be on the record --

MR. DePASQUALE: Just give me one moment to join. Oh, actually, you know, I
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was having Wi-Fi issues, so maybe I'll just show you real quick, but --

MR. BUTTS: Yeah. That's okay.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: If you can,
so --
MR. BUTTS: You're looking for
this?
MR. DePASQUALE: Oh, you have the survey?

MR. BUTTS: Trying to.
MR. DePASQUALE: Okay. Yeah, that should do it. There it is.

MR. BUTTS: There it is.
MR. DePASQUALE: So the tree is right here. The canopy goes to here. And the patio, you know, is not gonna have any excavation or over-excavation associated with it. It's at grade. The idea is if we rebuilt the pool to this extent, that we're gonna have to have a greater cut and we're gonna have to cut half the roots of the tree. So, truly, their desire was to save that tere. And if it's not allowable, you know, they wanted to ask if
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they felt like it was worth preserving that tree. And because, you know -- yeah.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Can you just, while you're up there, can you -- what are the dimensions of the -- dimensions of the proposed pa- -- I'm sorry, not the -- the existing kidney-shaped pool? How wide is that? How long is that? Because it seems similar in size to the proposed pool, which is $18 \times 36$.

MR. DePASQUALE: That's right.
It's not far off. So it's basically, you know, matching the pool in terms of its dimension and length and width. So if you just squared it off --
(Crosstalk)

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Yeah, that's what's not making sense then. Why not keep it in that spot where you're not gonna be cutting any roots back?

MR. DePASQUALE: There's a covered roofed porch here which comes out to this line, so.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Well, there's a
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proposed covered, roofed porch there, right, so.

MR. DePASQUALE: Yeah, yeah.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: It's, it's --
so that's why we're saying as far as alternatives, like, maybe this is -- this is a question of desire and not -- if you had the same size pool and you put it in the same spot, you just change the shape from kidney to rectangular.

MR. DePASQUALE: Right.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: I mean, I don't
think you're cutting any roots of this tree that seems to be an issue, right. I mean, you're in the same spot, so why would you be cutting any roots at that point, right.

MR. DePASQUALE: We'd be building the pool against the building.

MR. BROOKS: You could just -- I mean, not that $I ' m$ the architect --

MR. DePASQUALE: Yeah.
MR. BROOKS: -- but one could
consider just reducing the area of the
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proposed enclosed porch by three feet, and then all of a sudden you're not touching it at all. I mean, I'm not --

MR. HATFIELD: If it just slides to the -- if it just slides to the edge of the proposed patio, what's closer to the -- east, then you're not gonna be -you're not gonna be increasing the nonconformity.

MR. DePASQUALE: That's right. We would just need to --

MR. HATFIELD: It would line up with your proposed porch, right, if that's architecturally --

MR. DePASQUALE: That's right.
Just in order to build that pool, we would have to take down the tree, and that's just --

MR. BROOKS: So the tree, what was confusing me is the -- I thought the green was the area of vegetation, but there's no green in there. So the tree is in the white area?

MR. DePASQUALE: The tree is right
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CHAIRMAN POITRAS: So just for the record --
(Crosstalk)
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: When you say "right here," the record is not clear on that --

MR. DePASQUALE: Sure.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: -- because you're pointing to a screen that nobody can see.

MR. DePASQUALE: Sure thing.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: So, so the architect is pointing to the center of what we could call the courtyard where it has, $I$ guess, a dry well, it looks like "DW" in the center, which I guess is where the tree is, too?

MR. HATFIELD: It's proposed.
MR. DePASQUALE: It's clearly, I think, in order to take this the next step, if there's even a next step to discuss, would be to doc- -- have the surveyor document the extents of that tree
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so that we can be accurate about it, and we could -- yeah, so that's -- if I can get access to the Wi-Fi, $I$ can show you where the tree is in terms of photography, but we don't have it on the survey.

MS. NARVILAS: Can I just ask the Board, if there was an alternative of, let's say, being able to keep the tree and the pool moving -- the proposed pool being about five feet east of where it is being proposed to be now, if we could cut that distance down by, like, half and still keep that tree, is that something that the Board would feel more comfortable with?

MR. HATFIELD: It'd be nice not to reduce -- not to increase the nonconformity at all.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: I mean, generally, in this situation, that would be where this Board has, in the past, looked to try to not increase -- not necessarily say, "No, don't build a new pool" --

MS. NARVILAS: Sure.
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CHAIRMAN POITRAS: -- but, but try
to, you know, eliminate that option to have to increase that nonconformity, right, so.

MS. NARVILAS: If --
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: So whether
that's maybe a narrower pool or, you know, maybe a slightly shorter pool, if you need, you know, or a pool that's possibly even a different shape that allows you to set it at a different angle or something along those lines, or -- you know, those would all be, I think --

MR. MIDDLETON: And the fact that it extends past the principal structure is an issue, right? I mean, that's --

MR. HATFIELD: We'd be giving a variance for that, too.

MR. MIDDLETON: Right. That's --
MR. HATFIELD: But that's, that's kind of -- the variance is grandfathered in, in a way, with the existing pool.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Right.
MR. HATFIELD: They're essentially
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squaring off a kidney-shaped pool.
MR. MIDDLETON: If you left it in the same area --

MR. HATFIELD: Yes. Then that would be agreeable.

MR. MIDDLETON: Which, pointed out, they're increasing the degree of nonconformity in two respects.

MR. HATFIELD: Yes, adding another variance to --

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: And in terms of precedent, that's -- that's the issue, where you have something that's fairly unique that exists, that if we granted a variance to allow for the new pool and -but it was within basically the setbacks of the existing, that would be unique to you, right. It would not necessarily be precedent-setting at that point because the pool already exists.

MR. HATFIELD: You've got three front yards, existing pool, and you're just squaring it off, then it's --

MR. BROOKS: I mean, I'm not -- we
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don't usually kinda tell the applicant what we -- like, "Oh, hey, but a five feet would be" -- or eight feet, it's -- I mean, it's generally our thing to review the application as submitted, explain what our issues are with it, and then it's up to the applicant to decide how they want to respond to that.

> But, I mean, I think, it sounds like there are feasible alternatives that might not give the applicant everything they want. But there are feasible alternatives to have a pool that doesn't increase the nonconformity.

MS. NARVILAS: That's the other reason -- sorry. The other reason I'm asking, though, is because even though, you know, we're not asking you to say, "Do this," or, "Do that."

If we end up being faced with a
possibility of having to take this tree down in order to have an addition at all approximately the size that it's being proposed, and obviously wanting to keep a
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pool, I guess, you know, just getting some sense of whether there's any possibility of some kind of a compromise if we really want to save that tree.

MR. BROOKS: I don't think we're suggesting at all you take down the tree. I think that it's up to the homeowner to decide what their priorities are. But I think what we're talking about is avoiding increased nonconformity with applicable zoning. It's not on us to tell you to -MR. HATFIELD: The applicant's gotta balance architecture, living space, tree and pool, right, I mean.

MS. NARVILAS: Sure.
MR. HATFIELD: That's -- gotta
figure out what's most important for them and (inaudible). 'Cause the addition's not built yet and, you know, I assume -- I don't know how many square feet it is. I mean, it looks modest, you know, but --

> MR. DePASQUALE: It's, it's
modest, $I$ think -- it's maximizing the floor area. Because it's a smaller site,

| 1 | NORTH HAVEN ZONING BOARD - 10/10/2023 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | it's a smaller floor area. But, yeah, |
| 3 | that's -- |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN POITRAS: How large is |
| 5 | this maple tree? |
| 6 | MR. DePASQUALE: The canopy - |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Approximately. |
| 8 | MR. DePASQUALE: The -- so I'm |
| 9 | gonna say is approximately, this dimension |
| 10 | here. |
| 11 | MR. BROOKS: So it's a nice tree. |
| 12 | MR. DePASQUALE: (Inaudible) in |
| 13 | the order of 25 feet. |
| 14 | MR. BROOKS: It just doesn't seem |
| 15 | like there's any reason you would need to |
| 16 | take it down and you could still have a |
| 17 | pool and an addition. |
| 18 | MR. HATFIELD: I think it's -- |
| 19 | MR. BROOKS: It's not for me to |
| 20 | say that. That's just my impression |
| 21 | looking at it. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Did the |
| 23 | contractor specifically say they would |
| 24 | have to take the pool -- take the tree |
| 25 | down if they kept the pool in the same |
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place that the existing pool is in?
MR. DePASQUALE: No. But I think
that we could -- I think, if we're gonna rebuild the pool -- you know, if you keep the existing pool, the alternatives are to redesign the addition. Or, if you're rebuilding the pool in the same spot, even -- you know, you have to extend your excavation beyond the extent of the pool. And the tree has grown to the pool at this point, so you would have to shear that off.

MR. BROOKS: The canopy has grown, but the roots -- I mean, the base of the tree is --

MR. DePASQUALE: They always align.

MR. HATFIELD: I'm looking at this picture of the -- the one picture of the pool. I think it's in your interest, if you want to go down this road, to get it documented on a survey --

MR. DePASQUALE: Yeah.
MR. HATFIELD: -- where it is,

NORTH HAVEN ZONING BOARD - $10 / 10 / 2023$
because I don't -- in this picture of the pool, I don't see a Japanese maple. I see a canopy with leaves that look like a Japanese maple.

MR. DePASQUALE: Yup.
MR. HATFIELD: And if I'm comparing that location to the existing pool, I can't -- I don't really see --

MR. DePASQUALE: Yeah. I think if that --

MR. HATFIELD: That doesn't appear that close to me.

MR. DePASQUALE: Well, I think you're right. I think we need to document that. I think it would make sense for us to, if we're gonna keep going, to provide something from a tree person and provide something from a contractor --

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: And a pool company.

MR. DePASQUALE: -- to speak to all of those points.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Yeah, just to say -- exactly, so.
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MS. NARVILAS: And then a revised survey.

MR. DePASQUALE: Yes.
MR. MIDDLETON: George has to give you the turndown anyway (inaudible) variance.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Right. We're gonna have to keep this open no matter what because --

MS. NARVILAS: Oh, no problem.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: But - -

MR. BROOKS: It seems like, I
don't know, my rough non-architect justice on this, that one can fit a rectangular pool pretty much in the dimensions of the existing pool.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Yeah.
MR. DePASQUALE: If that were the case, you know, we'll present the options to our owner and come back to you guys.

But, so if this goes to here and this extends there, does that not -- does that not increase the amount of nonconformance?
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CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Not -- no,
because you would still meet your setback to the south.

MR. HATFIELD: 20 foot.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: So, so that would not -- I guess, technically, it would increase your nonconformance, but you're not going to be violating the setback there.

MS. NARVILAS: We'd still the variance for the pool in the front yard.

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: The degree of nonconformity is the issue of going closer -- further west.
(Crosstalk)
MR. BROOKS: The point that is closest to the west would be the same. CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Right.

MR. DePASQUALE: Yeah.
MS. NARVILAS: Well, let's see what they tell us.

MR. DePASQUALE: Yeah.
MS. NARVILAS: All right. So we will come back before you with more
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MR. BROOKS: That would be great.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Yeah. And, like I said, I think photos and, if you want, you know, contractor letters and, you know, that would be -- that would be helpful to at least --

MS. NARVILAS: Sure.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: If they say definitively that it's -- you know, that this would kill the tree, then, you know, you see what other alternatives might be available at that point, right, so.

And I guess the question, the extension of that would be then, how far does it have to -- would you have to have that easterly edge of the pool around -(Crosstalk)

CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Yeah, change the shape of the pool, make it narrow, right. There's a lot of options for that, but I think you need --

MS. NARVILAS: Go from kidney bean to string bean.
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CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Right.
So start to answer those questions first and $I$ think it might build itself at that point, right.

MR. DePASQUALE: Sure.
MS. NARVILAS: Okay.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Like, you can see what would fit in there and what might work. And, you know, perhaps there's another shape, right, like if you want to have the same area, maybe it becomes narrow but maybe it's L-shaped. You put a part of the $L$ up towards the house or something along those lines, that would wrap around and give you some -- a little more swimming area. But I'll leave that to you. You're the architect, so.

MR. DePASQUALE: Okay.
MR. BROOKS: Okay.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: At this point, is there anything else you'd like to add, or?

MS. NARVILAS: No.
MR. DePASQUALE: No. It's very
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 helpful.MS. NARVILAS: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: All right. In that case, we will leave this application open.

And the next -- the only other item is, our next meeting will be on Tuesday, November 14th, 2023.

And we just need a motion from the Board to adjourn.

MR. D'ANGELO: (Raises hand).
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Motion by, I'm sorry, Mr. D'Angelo.

MR. COX: (Raises hand).
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: And then second by Mr. Cox.

All in favor?
ALL BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN POITRAS: Thank you.
(End of Provided Recording)
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| $2023[7]-1: 13,3: 4,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 16,7: 22,8: 15, \\ & \text { 10:22, 14:8, 23:5, } \end{aligned}$ | architect [7] - 7:20, |  | checking [1] - 9:24 clear [4]-17:22, 20:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3: 8,42: 9,44: 3, \\ & 44: 22,45: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 10:22, 14:8, 23:5, $33: 23,35: 17,36: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:25, 20:6, 27:22, } \\ & 29: 15,38: 14,41: 18 \end{aligned}$ | built [1] - 34:20 <br> business [1] - 3: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { clear }[4]-17: 22,20: 9, \\ & 24: 8,29: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 25 [1] - $35: 13$ | addition's [1] - 34:19 | architecturally [2] -8:14, 28:15 |  | clearing [1] - 22:22 <br> clearly [1] - 29:21 |
| 27,499 [1] - 7:13 | address [5] - 4:20,12:25, 14:6, 18:11, |  | BUTTS ${ }_{[13]}-6: 12$ |  |
| 29-foot [1] - 8:10 |  | architecture ${ }_{[1]}$ -34:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 16,6: 19,6: 22, \\ & 6: 24,18: 18,18: 22, \\ & \text { 18:25, 24:17, 25:4, } \\ & 25: 7,25: 11,25: 14 \end{aligned}$ | clients [1]-22:18 <br> climb [1] - 14:2 <br> close [1] - 37:13 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 22,28: 24,32: 4, \\ & 34: 25,35: 2,41: 12, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 22,28: 7,39: 15 \\ & \text { closest [2] - 14:11, } \\ & 39: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 32_{[2]}-3: 24,5: 23 \\ & 335_{[1]}-1: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { affected }[3]-14: 11, \\ 17: 12,17: 15 \end{gathered}$ |  | C |  |
| 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Agata }[3]-1: 24,45: 2, \\ & 45: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { associated }[2]-4: 3, \\ & 25: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { canopy }[5]-10: 2, \\ 25: 16,35: 6,36: 14, \end{gathered}$$37: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Code }[3]-4: 5,8: 11, \\ & 15: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 40 [3] - | agreeable [1] - 32:6 | assume [1] - 34:20 <br> attached [1]-19:2 |  |  |
| 18:9 |  | attorney [1] - 4:2 | $\text { carry }[1]-12: 19$ | code [1] - 8:22 <br> codes [2]-15:16, |
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| 5 | 2:2, 12:4 | aye [2]-3:15, 42:19 | certainly [1] - 17:6 <br> certify ${ }^{[1]}$ - 45:2 | $1: 12$ |
| 5[1] - 43:5 | (1)-3111 | B | certify [1] - 45:2 <br> chairman [1] - 5:18 | community [1] - 10:9 |
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| 532 [1] - 4:24 |  |  | 5:6, 5:9, 5:12, 5:1 | conflict ${ }_{[1]}$ - 23:10 |
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| issues [3]-13:21 | look [6] - 3:18, 5:22,16:12, 16:17, 18:23, | minor [2] - 16:5, 18:8 <br> modest [2] - 34:22, | 5:20, 6:14, 6:18, | New [2] - 1:10, 3:25 <br> new [2] - 30:23, 32:16 |
| 25:2, 33:7 |  |  | $6: 20,6: 23,6: 25,9: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { new }[2]-30: 23,32: 16 \\ & \text { next }[5]-17: 8,29: 22 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 30:1 |  | moment [1]-5.22 | $9: 13,9: 16,9: 20,$ | $29: 23,42: 7,42: 8$ |
| it'll [2]-24:22, 24:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { looked }[2]-14: 23, \\ & 30: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { moment }[2]-5: 22, \\ & 24: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 1:16, 12: |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Montauk }[1]-4: 24 \\ & \text { most }[1]-34: 18 \\ & \text { motion }[3]-3: 10, \\ & 42: 10,42: 13 \end{aligned}$move [5] - 11:5, 11:8, | $25,16: 15,17: 6$ | nobody [2] - 24:15, |
| itself [1] - 41:4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 35:21, 36:19 |  | :20, | noise [1] - 12:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Japanese [5] - 8:20, } \\ & \text { 9:4, 9:18, 37:3, } 37: 5 \\ & \text { join }[1]-24: 25 \end{aligned}$ | love [1]-13:24 | move [5] - 11:5, 11:8, 13:9, 14:11, 23:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 16,30: 7,30: 2 \\ & 1: 6,33: 16,34: 1 \end{aligned}$ | non-architect [1] - 38:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { June }[1]-3: 7 \\ & \text { justice }[1]-38: 14 \end{aligned}$ | M | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 21,12: 14,23: 12, \\ & 30: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 24,41: 7,41: 24, \\ & 42: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 20:12, 38:25, 39:8 |
|  | madeline $_{[1]}-4: 22$ |  |  | nonconforming [2] - |
| K |  | MR [128] - 3:9, 3:12, |  | , |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { keep }[8]-13: 7,26: 20, \\ & 30: 9,30: 14,33: 25, \\ & 36: 5,37: 17,38: 9 \\ & \text { kept }[1]-35: 25 \\ & \text { kidney }[4]-26: 8, \\ & 27: 11,32: 2,40: 24 \\ & \text { kidney-shaped }[2]- \\ & 26: 8,32: 2 \\ & \text { kill }[1]-40: 12 \\ & \text { kind }[5]-11: 20,16: 12, \\ & 16: 16,31: 22,34: 4 \\ & \text { kinda }[1]-33: 2 \end{aligned}$ | maple [11]-8:20, 9:5, | -22, $0: 24,0.4,9.7$ |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 18,10: 3,23: 13, \\ & 23: 20,24: 2,24: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 9,9: 14,9: 17,9: 23, \\ & 10: 2,10: 5,15: 11, \end{aligned}$ | Name [1] - 44:2 <br> name [5] - 4:19, 6:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:22, 16:3, 28:10, } \\ & 30: 18,31: 4,32: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 35: 5,37: 3,37: 5 \\ \text { Mark [2] - } 2: 4,17: 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:2, 16:16, 17:13, } \\ & \text { 17:20, 18:3, 18:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { name }[5]-4: 19,6: 21, \\ 18: 11,20: 3,20: 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { normally }[2]-7: 11 \text {, } \\ & 21: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | marked [2] -5:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 18,18: 20,18: 22, \\ & 18: 23,18: 25,19: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { nes [1] - } 6: 1$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:11 } \\ & \text { matching }[1]-26: 14 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | NORTH ${ }_{[1]}-1: 6$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:23, 18:25, 19:3, } \\ & \text { 19:7, 19:10, 19:13, } \end{aligned}$ | 41:13 $\text { narrower [1] - } 31$ |  |
|  | matching [1]-26:14 <br> material [1] - 18:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:21, 19:25, 20:5, } \\ & 20: 16,20: 25,21: 9, \end{aligned}$ | NARVILAS [53] - 4:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { North }[4]-3: 5,3: 24, \\ & 44: 2,45: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { matter [2]-24:16, } \\ & 38: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  | 4:14, 4:17, 4:21, 5:5, |  |
|  |  | 21:12, 21:15, 21:19, |  | Notary [1] - 44:24 note [1] - 7:6 |
|  | $\underset{34: 24}{\operatorname{maximizing}}[1] \text { - }$ | 21:24, 22:4, 22:10, 22:15, 22:17, 23:18, 24:4, 24:6, 24:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 20,6: 14,6: 18, \\ & 6: 20,6: 23,6: 25,9: 6, \\ & 9: 13,9: 16,9: 20, \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | November [1] - 42:9 |
|  | mean [19]-7:25, |  |  | NOW [1] - 44:4 |


|  | photos [6] - 5:14, 5:22, 7:3, 10:17, | $36: 2,36: 5,36: 6,$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 9 \\ & \text { result }[1]-16: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { obligation }[1]-15: 20 \\ \text { obviously }[4]-7: 25, \\ \text { 10:11, 12:19, 33:25 } \\ \text { occurred }[1]-21: 22 \end{gathered}$ | 10:24, 40:5 <br> picture $[5]-9: 9,9: 14$, <br> 36:20, 37:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 21,37: 3,37: 9 \\ & 37: 20,38: 16,38: 17, \\ & 39: 12,40: 18,40: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { questions }[3]-7: 22, \\ & 8: 14,41: 3 \\ & \text { quick }[1]-25: 3 \\ & \text { quite }[1]-8: 24 \end{aligned}$ | review [1] - 33:5 <br> revised [2]-20:20 |
| October [4]-1:13, $3: 3,44: 3,45: 5$ | place [1]-36:2 <br> placement ${ }_{[1]}$ - 11:13 <br> pleasantly [1]-14:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { porch }[5]-23: 10, \\ & 26: 23,27: 2,28: 2, \\ & 28: 14 \end{aligned}$ |  | $2: 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { one [16] - 3:20, 5:7, } \\ & \text { 6:3, 8:6, 9:10, 11:21, } \\ & \text { 14:6, 14:7, 16:13, } \\ & \text { 19:21, 20:14, 22:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { point }[8]-12: 24 \text {, } \\ & 27: 18,32: 20,36: 12, \\ & 39: 17,40: 14,41: 5 \\ & 41: 21 \end{aligned}$ | ```position [1] - 8:8 possibility [2] - 33:22, 34:3 possibly [1] - 31:10 precedent [3]-17:8,``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { R-2 }[2]-4: 7,7: 11 \\ & \text { raises }[4]-3: 9,3: 12, \\ & 42: 12,42: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Road }[10]-1: 10,4: 8, \\ & 6: 11,6: 22,6: 25,8: 6, \\ & 10: 18,14: 13,14: 16, \\ & 19: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $15$ | pointed [2]-15:21, 32:7 <br> pointing [2]-29:11, | precedent [3] - 17:8, 32:13, 32:20 | READS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 44:4 real [1] - 25:3 really [10] - 13:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Road" }[3]-6: 7,6: 9, \\ & 7: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| open [2] - 38:9, 42:6 opinion [1] - 11:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pointing [2] - 29:11, } \\ & 29: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { precedent-setting }{ }_{[1]} \\ & -32: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { really [10] - 13:15, } \\ & 15: 13,16: 25,17: 4, \end{aligned}$ | roadway [1] - 12:12 <br> Ronald [1] - 3:21 |
| opposed [1] - 15: | points [1] - 37:23 <br> Poitras [1] - 2:4 | prefers [1] - 24:20 <br> premises [1] - 4:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 16,17: 22,22: 12 \\ & 24: 15,34: 4,37: 9 \end{aligned}$ | roofed [2] - 26:23, |
| ion [1] - 31:3 |  |  |  |  |
| options [2] - 38:20 | POITRAS [73] - 3:2,$3: 10,3: 13,3: 16,$ | premises [1] - 4:8 <br> prepared $[1]$ - 45:6 | REASON [1] - 44:4 reason [4]-7:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { room }[1]-11: 20 \\ & \text { roots }[5]-25: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| $40: 22$ order |  | present [1] - 38:20 preserve $[2]-22: 20$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { reason }[4]-7: 19, \\ 33: 17,35: 15 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| order [5] - 3:6, 28:17, 29:22, 33:23, 35:13 | 4:13, 4:15, 4:18, 5:4, | preserve [2]-22:2 | 33:17, 35:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 21,27: 14,27: 17, \\ & 36: 15 \\ & \text { rough }[1]-38: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { over-excavation } \\ & 25: 18 \\ & \text { owner }[2]-17: 3 \text {, } \\ & 38: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:14, 11:17, 12:10, } \\ & \text { 12:23, 13:3, 19:5, } \end{aligned}$ | ```preserving [1] - 26:2 pretty [4]-16:3, 17:22, 18:9, 38:16``` | rebuilding [1] - 36:8 |  |
|  | 19:19, 19.23, 20 |  |  |  |
|  | 21:6, 21:17, 21:20, | prevent $[1]$ - 20:22 <br> principal [1]-31:16 | recent [1] - 8:21 <br> recommending ${ }_{[1]}$ - 23:25 | Sag [1] - 1:10 <br> Samantha [1] - 3:22 <br> save [2] - 25:24, $34: 5$ |
|  | $21: 25,22: 5,22: 11$, $22: 16,23: 16,23: 19$, | priorities [1] - 34:9 <br> privacy ${ }_{[1]}$ - 22:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 25 \\ & \text { record }[7]-8: 11, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { p.m [1] }-1: 14 \\ & \text { packet }[1]-5: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 5,24: 7,24: 21, \\ & 25: 5,26: 4,26: 18 \end{aligned}$ | problem [1] - 38:11 <br> proceedings [1]-1:23 | $\begin{gathered} \text { record }[7]-8: 11, \\ 18: 12,20: 2,24: 23, \\ 29: 4,29: 7,45: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { saving }_{[1]}-8: 19 \\ & \text { saw }[1]-6: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| Panzier [1]-3:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 25,27: 5,27: 13, \\ & 29: 3,29: 6,29: 10, \end{aligned}$ | Proceedings [2] - $45: 3,45: 8$ | Recorded [1] - 1:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Scott }[3]-2: 5,2: 10, \\ & 17: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Panziers [2] - 5:23, } \\ & 7: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:3, 29:6, 29:10, } \\ & \text { 29:14, 30:19, 31:2, } \\ & 31: 7,31: 24,32: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:3, 45:8 } \\ & \text { produce }[1]-10: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Recording [2] - 1:23, } \\ & 42: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { screen }[2]-24: 18, \\ & 29: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { part [2] }-7: 19,41: 14$ |  | project [1] - 20:7 <br> pronounced [1] - 3:23 | ctangular |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{ses}[1]-10: 3 \\ & \mathbf{t}[4]-11: 25,12: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 20,37: 24,38: 8, \\ & 38: 12,38: 18,39: 2, \end{aligned}$ |  | lesign [1] - 36 | screened [1] - 12:15 |
| 30:21, 31:16 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 4,5: 15,6: 8,7: 10 \\ & 10: 16,10: 21,12: 2, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 24,14: 6,14: 7, \\ & 20: 19,42: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { patio [4] - } 4: 3,23: 24, \\ 25: 17,28: 7 \end{gathered}$ | 40:4, 40:10, 40:20,41:2, 41:8, 41:21, |  | reducing [1]-27:25 <br> refer [1] - 6:10 |  |
| people [3]-12:12, |  | 19:6, 19:12, 21:23 | ferred [1] - 6:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { section }[3]-4: 4,8: 11, \\ & 10: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $17: 9,17: 12$ <br> percent [6]-15:6, | 42:4, 42:13, 42:16, 42:20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { proposed }[17]-7: 23, \\ 8: 8,11: 3,11: 12, \end{gathered}$ | relationship [2] - 4:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { see }[17]-5: 24,7: 2, \\ & 9: 21,10: 16,10: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| $15: 7,16: 3,16: 6,$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { pool }[63]-4: 3,8: 4 \\ 8: 18,9: 15,9: 25, \end{gathered}$ | $14: 9,23: 23,23: 24$ | relevant [3]-15:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:10, 11:12, 12:18, } \\ & \text { 21:4, 22:21, 29:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 16:7, 18:9 <br> perhaps [1] - 41:10 | 10:4, 10:11, 11:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 7,26: 10,27: 2, \\ & 28: 2,28: 7,28: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { removal }_{[1]}-13: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 4,22: 21,29: 12, \\ & 37: 3,37: 9,39: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| permit [2]-19:19, | 11:12, 11:21, | 29:20, 30:10, 30:12, | laced [1] - 23 | 37:3, 37:9, 39:21,$40: 13,41: 9$ |
| 19:20 17:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:24, 12:14, 13:9, } \\ & \text { 14:21, 15:9, 20:8, } \end{aligned}$ | 33:25 <br> proposes [1] - 4:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { require [2]-20:23, } \\ & 23: 14 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| person |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seem }[2]-6: 6,35: 14 \\ & \text { sense }[3]-26: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
| Pete [1]-20:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:11, 20:23, 21:13, } \\ & \text { 23:9, 23:13, 23:23, } \end{aligned}$ | proposes [1] - 4:2 protruding [1] - 13:21 | $23: 14$ | $34: 3,37: 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Peter }[4]-7: 20,8: 15, \\ & 9: 21,14: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $23: 25,25: 20,26: 8 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { provide }[2]-37: 17 \text {, } \\ & 37: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 25,15: 7,18: 7 \\ & 45: 6 \end{aligned}$ | set [2]-14:16, 31:12 <br> setback [6] - 13:9, |
| PG [1] - 44:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:10, 26:14, 27:9, } \\ & \text { 27:20, 28:17, 30:10, } \end{aligned}$ | Provided [1] - 42:21 <br> Public [1] - 44:24 | requires [1]-4:5 <br> resourceful ${ }_{[1]}$ - 23:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:8, 18:7, 20:10, } \\ & 39: 3,39: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| photographs [1] - 5:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 24,31: 8,31: 9, \\ & 31: 10,31: 23,32: 2, \end{aligned}$ | Public [1] - 44:24 pursuant [1] - 16:22 | respect [1] - 18:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { setbacks }[4]-8: 3, \\ & 13: 20,18: 6,32: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| Photographs [1] 43:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 16,32: 21,32: 23, \\ & 33: 14,34: 2,34: 15, \\ & 35: 17,35: 24,35: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { put }[10]-7: 16,7: 23, \\ & 7: 24,8: 9,13: 16, \\ & 13: 18,19: 11,20: 21, \\ & 27: 9,41: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { respectfully [1] - } \\ & \begin{array}{l} 15: 12 \\ \text { respects }[1]-32: 9 \\ \text { respond }[2]-14: 4, \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 20,18: 6,32: 17 \\ & \text { setting }[2]-17: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
| photography [1] - 30:5 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 20 \\ & \text { shape }[4]-27: 10, \end{aligned}$ |



