MACKEY BUTTS & WHALEN LLP

September 17, 2024

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Ellen L. Baker Robert R. Butts Robert B. Dietz Richard R. DuVall Ian S. MacDonald Joshua E. Mackey Cara A. Whalen

Christina A. Mazzarella Alexander D. Salvato

Emily Abrahams Tyrone Brown Richard J. Olson R. Keith Salisbury

Hon. Albert M. Rosenblatt

Reply to:

- 3208 Franklin Avenue
 Millbrook, NY 12545
 P 845.677.6700
 F 845.677.2202
- ☐ 319 Mill Street Poughkeepsie, NY 12601 P 845.452.4000 F 845.454.4966
- 81 Main Street
 P.O. Box 308
 Sharon, CT 06069
 P 860.364.6232
 F 860.364.6429

Via Email: landuse@salisburyct.us
Dr. Michael Klemens
Chairman – P&Z Commission
Town of Salisbury
PO Box 548
27 Main Street
Salisbury, CT 06068

Re.: Wake Robin Inn – 104-106 Sharon Road, Lakeville CT (Special Permit Application #2024-0257)

Dear Dr. Klemens and members of the Planning and Zoning Commission:

We represent ARADEV LLC, the applicant in the Special Permit application referenced above.

The purpose of this correspondence is to respond to the September 13, 2024 correspondence from Perley Grimes, Jr., Esq on behalf of his clients, Mr. and Mrs. William Cruger.

The subject of Mr. Grimes' correspondence is focused upon the existing non-conforming nature of 104-106 Sharon Road. The cases cited by Mr. Grimes addressed situations where residential property owners applied for *variances* to allow modification to properties which, if granted, would increase the non-conformity of those lots. For the following reasons, Mr. Grimes' arguments are moot and inapplicable to the application before the Commission.

First, the application is for Special Permit under Section 213.5 of the Town of Salisbury Zoning Regulations, not a variance. In considering applications for Special Permits, the Commission has broad discretion is deciding whether an application meets the required standards. "In applying the law to the facts of a particular case, the board is endowed with a liberal discretion, and its action is subject to review by the courts only to determine whether it was unreasonable, arbitrary or illegal." *Santarsiero v. Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Monroe, 165 Conn. App.* 761 (2016).

It is assumed that the Commission has determined the instant application fits within the criteria of Section 213.5 and will require certain conditions for approval that will mitigate any actual or perceived expansion of non-

www.mbwlawyers.com

conformity. The discussion of variances as suggested by Mr. Grimes is inapplicable.

Second, it is acknowledged that Section 503 places limits on the modifications that may be made to non-conforming buildings. Pursuant to Section 503.2, no non-conforming building or structure may be modified "in any way that increases the area or space, including vertical enlargement, of that portion of the building or structure that is non-conforming." The non-conforming portion of the building at issue is the height. Accordingly, the design of the extension has been reworked to comply with the Zoning Regulations for the maximum building height for a principal building (Section 309.2). Under this Section, the building height may be a maximum of 35' measured from the average grade plane to the mid-point of the roof if a gable, gambrel, or hip.

As per the current grading plan, the average grade plane of the principal building is 841.3. The average grade plane was developed by taking the grade elevation every 5'-0" around the perimeter. The roofs of the addition have been modified to be gambrel roofs. Height is measured from the average grade plane to the mid-point of these roofs (between eave and peak). The height of the addition is therefore 28' and the height of the mechanical/elevator overrun is 31.48'.

Given that the new design calls for heights within 35' there is clearly no expansion of non-conformity. Plans for the new design were submitted under separate cover on September 16, 2024 and added to the public record today.

Sincerely,

MACKEY BUTTS & WHALEN, LLP

Joshua E. Mackey

cc. ARADEV LLC