

April 4/22

On March 23 we, along with several other property owners on Sandpiper Drive attended the ARCOM meeting to hear the new owners proposal for substantial changes to the house that had been requested, and to raise our objections.

Before the proposal was even heard one giddy ARCOM member who clearly stated she was a good friend of the applicant, told the assembled, 'she was supportive of their application as is', several other members nodded their agreement.

We personally had four objections or issues that we wanted to discuss. Items 1/and 2/ are directly related and should be read in that manner.

1/Arcom were asked to signal their approval for a variance to the property. We ask the Town Council to reject an unnecessary new window on the east side roof line of the house which would directly overlook our home and living areas. The applicants wish to add two bedrooms and two bathrooms to the formerly uninhabitable space which was an art studio above the garage. There are presently two windows at the front of the house facing Sandpiper which they could use for this purpose and by doing so they would not infringe on our quality of life. It should not be acceptable to give a variance to a property without considering the fact that this new window directly overlooks one of our main bedrooms and bathroom when they already have windows that could be used for their purposes of converting an uninhabitable space into two new bedrooms and bathrooms.

2/ While Arcom were told that the applicants were willing to call the home exactly what it has been since built in 1988 a one story split level home as opposed to a two story home, the addition of two bedrooms and bathrooms on the upper level of the garage essentially makes this a two story home for future development on the street. All of the letters of objection that you have received from concerned owners on Sandpiper have indicated that Sandpiper is a one story home street , as has been confirmed several times by previous Arcom and Town Council decisions, it should remain as such. Acceptance of this will forever change the nature of the street and sadly will destroy one of the last remaining streets filled with light and width. Please do not remove the history of the north end forever.

3/ The Applicants' Landscapers would not explain the landscaping they proposed on the East side of the house after having destroyed the hedge which sits entirely on our property . Our side is healthy and looked after.

How can ARCOM accept something that sits on another owners property?

4/ In ARCOM's exuberance to accept this proposal with a rubber stamp, they would not even agree to keep the two large air conditioning units which have sat on the western side of the house since 1988 and move them to the East Side so close to our home. With some serious objection from us following ARCOM's vote of approval, they reluctantly agreed to ask the owners to leave the units where they are presently located.

We are not asking for very much and support the look of the renovated house, but to be totally dismissed by ARCOM is just insulting.

We ask the Town Council to take a good honest look at the issues raised and opine.