1. **Request to increase the building coverage 379 sq ft over allowable due to our unusually small lot size for the neighborhood**

The lot size for 20 E Maple Street is unusually small. It is one of the smallest single family lot sizes in New Canaan according to the surveyors at RKW. The lot size is 0.175 acre (7,621 sq ft). Due to this very small lot size, the allowable building coverage is only 1,896 sq ft. The planned renovation would increase our home’s coverage to a modest 2,275 sq ft which includes 250 sq ft for front and rear porch entries. Our proposed increase in coverage is still less than the 2,388 sq ft that the Town had approved for the previous owners of our house in 2001, but which the previous owners never carried out. No outward expansion of our home has occurred during our ownership or that of the previous owner.

As you can see from **Photo #1** and the **Google Maps Satellite Image**, our house is the small green one among larger houses in the neighborhood. The proposed increase in coverage is modest but will bring the house more in character with its neighborhood without injuring or adversely affecting the enjoyment of our neighbors’ properties.

**Photo #1**
2. Request to increase the maximum side yard height to 21 feet at mid roof

In addition to its unusually small overall lot size, our lot does not meet the B Residence Zone minimum front yard width of 75 feet. Our home also does not sit centered within our building setback lines. We believe this is because the property lines were drawn and the land subdivided after our house was built in 1910. Because the lot’s frontage is undersized, any increase in the building height is nonconforming, no matter what we do. This is unique to our property.

The existing second story is only partially usable as it exists. We are only hoping to get three reasonable sized bedrooms upstairs and this raises the roof as shown on our plans. We have kept the ridge of the roof running front to back to help keep the eaves down. The house’s interior ceiling heights are all standard heights and the total building height requirement is not a problem. It is only the building height on both sides of the house that cannot meet the requirement because the lot’s frontage is undersized.
3. Request to raise the rear single story roof on the pre-existing nonconforming corner of our home

As mentioned above, our home does not sit centered within our building setback lines because the property lines were drawn and the land subdivided after our house was built in 1910. Because of this, the back northeastern corner of our house is outside the setback line and is nonconforming. Our proposed renovation would increase this nonconformity by raising the first floor roof a little over 1 foot. This would allow us to make the interior ceiling height of this section of the house to be all one height, greatly increasing the interior functionality of the house without making any exterior change to the house that impacts our neighbors at all. Please refer to the architectural drawing of the north exterior elevation of the house.

**Drawing:** Raise first floor roof a little over 1 foot on pre-existing nonconforming corner of the house.
4. Full Support from our neighbors

We have sought neighboring support early on and remain confident in the community support to maintain the home as an owner-occupied single family home. All of our adjacent neighbors have sent in letters of support:

- David & Pamela Shea at 24 E Maple St (Easterly neighbor)
- Mike & Caley Sayre at 19 E Maple St (Southerly neighbor)
- Karen Fiorito at 17 E Maple St (Southerly neighbor)
- Anthony Tomas, resident at 9 E Maple St and owner of 11, 16 & 18 E Maple St (Westerly neighbors)

We respectfully request that the Board grant us this variance because of the lot’s unique small size and because of how the pre-existing house is situated within the confines of the building setback lines. These conditions are not common to the other properties in our neighborhood and we feel that this creates a particular hardship for us, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience. If granted, the variance will not injure or adversely affect the character and enjoyment of nearby properties as demonstrated by the letters from our neighbors.