

Summary of 2005-07 BP/SPR study

- In total for 2005 there could of been 14 SPR cases for new homes and additions out of 19 new home and 33 addition permits issued. (Only three of these I flagged as *potential* SPR problem cases.)
- In total for 2006 I count nine SPR cases for new homes and additions out of 14 new and 27 addition permits issued. (Only two of these I flagged as *potential* SPR problem cases.)
- In total for 2007 it looks as if 3 to 9 SPR Cases would have been needed in 2007 out of 17 new and 27 addition permits issued. (And the only new home case I graded blue, all the rest undetermined.)
- However, it is also conceivable that with a SPR process a number of these cases might not have occurred, and of those remaining -- particularly those five I flagged as problematic -- they could have been altered for the better.
- Ultimately, what this study suggests is that a Site Plan Review work load for the Planning Board would not have been an overwhelming task for the years 2005 to 2007.

[Note: Through May 18th of this year there have been 4 new SFD permits issued, 9 addition permits issued, and 3 demo/rebuilds permits issued, of which a cursory review of these BP applications suggests 3 to 4 SPR cases would have been needed so far this year. This looks in line with the above averages.]

- If all CCNS properties were automatically subject to SPR, in 2005 that would add 3 more to the total given above (one good, the other two undetermined); in 2006 that would add 3 more to the total given above (one good, the other two undetermined); in 2007 that would add 1 more to the total given above (undetermined as good or not). By "good" I mean that it would probably have been acceptable to a SPR board process.

revised May 22, 2008

2005-2007 BUILDING PERMIT/SPR study

The following is a studied review of building permit applications between 2005 to 2007 for new homes and additions. I undertook this to try and get a quantifiable handle on how many of these projects might have been subject to a Site Plan Review process, as is being considered for use by Wellfleet's Planning Board. In all this I've wanted to provide a solid informational overview that proves useful to the Planning Board's deliberation of SPR.

Caveat: The data contained here has been verified to the best of my ability, cross checking BP info, Map/Lot #'s, etc. to names and Wellfleet's assessors online data. I also went to look firsthand at some of these cases (and others) that I thought relevant or otherwise interesting to try and better understand the relation between the information collected here and a working SPR process.

Key Code: SPR flagging (indicated by blue " * ") is representative of Eastham's 3k "Site Coverage" formula (ESC) [Eastham's Site Coverage definition on page 9], relying on Wlft's assessed reviews of as built "Net Living Area," and is indicated as: {NLA 0000}. Some extra NLA figures are included here that did not cross the 3k trigger level, but are noted as a matter of fuller informational basis. All other dimensional info where given was taken from BP application files.

The NLA that Wellfleet uses is a sq.ft. figure that is comprised of the foundation as built or exterior dimensions at ground/or 1st floor level, plus the s.f. of any upper and/or lower finished living spaces. As such it is a very similar calculation to Eastham's Site Coverage formula, except that it does not encompass covered garages (detached or in-built), screened porch or covered deck. Where a NLA & a ESC figure is given, the ESC value usually involves inclusion of such a detached garage or other roofed accessory building on the property.

Along with the SPR flagging and s.f. NLA figure, I've included a "#" symbol in either black, red or blue. This "#" color coding is indicative of my own *assessment* about the kinds of good and not so good or questionable and challenging projects SPR could see; it is not meant to be taken literally as definitive of my *taste* in these instances (unless clearly stated so), but is offered solely as a reference point of considered opinion about how SPR might of ruled. If nothing else it is meant to stimulate looking into and thinking about these cases yourself.

Porch and deck dimensions were not included as part of any footprint sizing or SPR formulas herein, but are provided in the yearly BP list as informational.

Underline of new or add BP type indicates lots smaller than 20,000 s.f. and further info is detailed about this along each property case line.

Map/Lot numbers in green indicate properties in the CCNS.

2005 New Home permit summary details

In 2005, 19 new home BPs were issued, all of which are accounted for.

One of them was an Affordable Accessory Dwelling project.

Using Eastham's 3k "Site Coverage" formula, eight of these other 18 new home permits, plus one demo-rebuild (in the CCNS), would of been subject to SPR in 2005.

Of these nine I flagged 3 (red #) as candidates I consider indicative of potential SPR case problem cases, and that might have benefited from a SPR trigger/process.

The 7 (blue #) flagged new projects indicate projects that I loosely considered as fair to good examples, in an offhand way, of where SPR would of not had a problem with, even as they exceeded 3,000 s.f. of site coverage; and one of these only by 9 s.f. above 3k NLA/SC.

Any flagged black (#) is meant to indicate undetermined. Some of these I felt probably need to be seen and considered in context of their area topography and/or neighborhood.

2005 Addition Permits summary details

In 2005 there were 33 BPs for additions, of which one addition & one add/rebuild clearly would of been subject to SPR. (I color coded/flagged these cases black for not knowing enough about it, except to note that it is or was a large spacious house to begin with.)

One addition in the CCNS breached the 3k Site Coverage threshold, which makes two cases on 20,000+ s.f. lots.

I can not say precisely how many others of these additions might have resulted in SPR from application of Eastham's Site Coverage formula for lots under 20k, except to note there were 10 such properties. Two were additions to Brownies cottages, which suggests they were already subject to Special Permit review. Of the other eight such cases, two might have been subject to a SPR under ESC formula for being additions more than 500 s.f., and one more is suspected as having been subject to a special permit process already.

In review I count eight new homes, one demo/rebuild, two additions, and one CCNS addition for twelve total triggered by a 3k Site Coverage formula on 20,000+ s.f. lots.

For lots under 20k, I consider that 2 (possibly 3) might have occurred.

In total, there could of been 15 SPR cases from 2005 Building permit applications for new homes and additions.

However, it is also conceivable that with a SPR process some of these cases might not have occurred, and - if any of these deemed problematic - might been altered for the better.

3 of the 5 park district homes would not of triggered SPR by NLA, but in any case I offered

color coding # symbols to encourage one's own further consideration of addition examples in this district. It is my opinion that *all* properties within the CCNS should be automatically subject to SPR for demo/rebuilds, any additions, and relocations.

2005 Building Permits info

map/lot#	b.p.	NLA s.f. & other dimensional info	*Site Plan Review
8 / 78.5	new*#	{NLA 4333} 2461/ftpt 1872/1st 1929/decking	
12 / 72.1	new*#	{NLA 3452} 1918/1st 1534/2nd 385/pch [ESC 4694] w/ 2-car gar./884 796/deck	
12 / 177	new	1500/1st 719/2nd 672/deck	
13 / 161.2	new	1518/1st 886/2nd	
14 / 41	new	{NLA 1735} 16,552 sf lot 1583/1st	
14 / 90	new	{NLA 1718} 1044/1st 558/2nd 240/deck	
23 / 166.3	new*#	1752/1st 815/2nd {NLA 2567} [ESC 3143] w/ 2-car gar. attach	
29 / 53	new	{NLA 1638} 1008/1st	
29 / 288.1	new	Accessory Dwelling 832/1 fl.	
29 / 156	new	{NLA 2797} # 1709/1st 1477/2nd	
29 / 258	new	1012/1st 812/2nd 132/deck	
29 / 467.2	new	{NLA 2968} # 1568/1st 222/farmers pch 266/deck	
29 / 46.1	new*#	1660 ft.pt. {NLA 2696} [ESC 3320] w/ inbuilt garage 624	
30 / 1.3	new*#	{NLA 3009}	
30 / 36	new	{NLA 2100} 1250/ft.pt	
36 / 17.2	new*#	{NLA 3848} 1848/1st 2000/2nd	
36 / 61	new*#	{NLA 4201} [see end note 05-1] 1368/1st 1840/2nd [ESC 4929] w/2 garage 728	
41 / 5	new*#	{NLA 3065} 1412/1st 1606/2nd	

41 / 148 demo/new 1443/1st 642/2nd 255/pch

41 / 161 new*# {NLA 3020} 19,166 *sf lot* 1510/1st x 2 204/deck

18 / 1 *#demo/new {NLA 3780} + garage = [ESC 4000+] 1890/1st 1890/2nd

28 / 232 add*#/rebuild {NLA 6220} [@ 95 Billingsgate Rd.] 4731 ft.pt. + 2nd story

4 / 13 add*# 396/1st {NLA 3020}

4 / 14 add 490/1st {NLA 2991} #

7 / 72 add 80/1st 352/sunrm 416/pch

8 / 29 studio 442/1st 162/loft {NLA 1124}

9 / 601 add 572/1st {NLA 1756} # 144/deck

9 / 641 add 180/1st {NLA 1560} #

12 / 122 add*# 130/2nd {NLA 3397} [note already a 3k home]

14 / 155.1 add 96/1st

15 / 87 add*? 583/2nd.fl. {NLA 2258} 7,841 *sf lot*

16 / 94 add 348/1st {NLA 1362}

19 / 58 add 608/1st [see end note 06-2]

19 / 128 add {NLA 1734}

19 / 142 add 74/1st

21 / 126 studio {NLA 1188}

23 / 42 add 320/2nd.fl

23 / 109 add 224/1st

23 / 209.1 add 800/2nd.fl {NLA 1550}

29 / 69 add 252/1st

29 / 75 add 144/2nd.fl {NLA 2016} 13,505 *sf lot*

29 / 91 add*? 764/1st {NLA 1564} 13,068 *sf lot*

29 / 112 add 105/1st {NLA 1090} 14,810 *sf lot*

29 / 158 add 904/1st 350/2nd {NLA 2292} 500/deck

29 / 205 add 225/1st {NLA 2136} 14,375 *sf lot*

29 / 263 add 286/1st {NLA 2066}

29 / 455 add 115/1st 140/2nd

29 / 482 add 740/1st {NLA 2789}

30 / 10	add	{NLA 832}	252/snrm
35 / 161	<u>add</u>	170/1st	{NLA 1233} 8,712 <i>sf lot</i>
35 / 167	<u>add</u>	324/1st	{NLA 975} 11,326 <i>sf lot</i>
36 / 18.14	add	352/1st	
36 / 190 A	<u>add</u>	301/1st	[Brownies - special permit?]
36 / 190	<u>add</u>	280/1st	[Brownies - special permit?]
40 / 66	<u>add*?</u>	473/2nd (to 1082 existing)	{NLA 2410} 8,276 <i>sf lot</i>
46 / 13	add	276/1st	{NLA 2522} 20,038 <i>sf lot</i>

2006 New & Addition summary details

In 2006, 14 new home BPs were issued (all of which are accounted for), and there were 27 BPs for additions.

Using Eastham's 3k Site Coverage trigger nine known cases would of been subject to SPR, 4 new homes, 2 park properties additions, and 3 in town additions.

Of these nine, two new homes were red flagged, and the 2 park additions I graded blue, all the rest neutral or undetermined.

In total I count nine that would of been subject to SPR. (Plus one more park case if all CCNS properties were automatically subject to SPR.)

2006 Building Permits info

<u>map/lot#</u>	<u>b.p.</u>	<u>size s.f. & other dimensional info</u>	<u>*Site Plan Review</u>
8 / 67	new*#	1176/ft.pt + 2nd fl. {NLA 3339}	
8 / 78.3	new	1950/1st 476/2nd 205/pch {NLA 2,550}	
8 / 294	new	1216/1st 740/2nd {NLA 1776}	
14 / 139	new	1310/1st 1230/2nd {NLA 2626} 9,583 <i>sf lot</i>	
22 / 27	new	1232/1st 1232/2nd {NLA 2464} 488/deck	
29/129.1	new	{NLA 1750}	
29 / 143	new*#	{NLA 3200} 1280/1st & finished basement 640/2nd 360/pch	
29 / 226	new	{NLA 2497}	

30 / 23.3	new	1350/1st	1350/2nd	{NLA 2776}	
36 / 107	new	720/1st	600/2nd	{NLA 1368}	
36 / 274	new*#	1100/ft.pt (2 story) [ESC 3004] w/2-car gar. at. [see end note 06-1]			
41 / 9	new*#	1280/1st	1280/2nd	{NLA 2560}	[ESC 3136] w/2-car garage attach
41 / 35	new	1400/1st	564/2nd	104/pch	{NLA 1950}
41 / 50	new	1260/1st	740/2nd		{NLA 1854}
6 / 10 ccns		demo/rebuild 704/1st 374/2nd [tiny lot, split Truro/Wlft line; ZBA case?]			

8 / 64	add	384/1st	{NLA 1646}		160/pch
8 / 149	add	396/1st	{NLA 2223}		
12 / 101	add	480/2nd	{NLA 1640}		
12 / 210	add	520/1.5 stories {NLA 2400} 210/pch [nice porch add on to existing box front]			
13 / 88	add	190/2nd	168/pch	{NLA 1792}	7841 sf lot
13 / 194	add	440/1st wing {NLA 2918}			
14 / 125	add	210/1st	{NLA 1639}		
16 / 3	add	135/1st	{NLA 1899}		
16 / 81	add	640/1st	{NLA 2080}		192/pch
18 / 4	add*#	596/1st	{NLA 3179}		275/pch
18 / 6	studio*#	520	{NLA 3157}		
19 / 58	add*#	608/1st	{NLA 3252}		[see end note 06-2]
20 / 145	add	224/1st	224/2nd	{NLA 1438}	6,098 sf lot
21 / 61	add		448/2nd	{NLA 1536}	14,810 sf lot
23 / 183	add	96/1st			
23 / 193	studio	384 = [ESC 1488] {NLA 1488}			
24 / 158	add	750/1st	645/2nd	{NLA 2060}	11,326 sf lot
28 / 18.1	add	226/1st	38/2nd	{NLA 2700}	
28 / 165	add*SP?		576/2nd	{NLA 1172}	7,841 sf lot
29 / 40	add	182/1st	{NLA 1610}		
29 / 308	add	457/1st	{NLA 2070}		
29 / 335.1	add	847/1st	{NLA 2474}		

34 / 1	add*#		816/2nd {NLA 3856}
34 / 8	add	288/1st	{NLA 2309}
35 / 140	add*#	648/1st	995/2nd {NLA 3094}
35 / 186	add/rebuild	{NLA 1800}	1353/1st 1306/2nd
36 / 39	<u>add</u>	120/1st	{NLA 1550} 14,810 sf lot
36 / 190B	<u>add</u>	224/1st	[Brownies]
42 / 104	<u>add</u>	416/1st	{NLA 2912} 16,988 sf lot

2007 New & Addition summary details

In 2007, 17 new BPs were issued, all of which are accounted for. Of these 17, one would of been subject to a 3k ESC SPR formula, which I graded blue (from the architectural plans).

There were 27 BPs for additions, of which I considered two cases for SPR, and six others might have been, of which two of these may have been a ZBA cases. Where updated Assessors data isn't available, I provide the NLA prior to and est. of the addition sizes given on the BPs (which are the dimensional figures below).

Two CCNS properties had additions, one of which could have been a 3k+ SC SPR case.

Overall it looks as if 3 up to 9 SPR cases would have been needed in 2007.

2007 Building Permits info

map/lot#	b.p.	size s.f. & other dimensional info	*Site Plan Review
8 / 45	new	768/1st 550/2nd 120/pch	
8 / 95	new	1216/1st 764/2nd	
8 / 189.4	new	1828/1st 1154/2nd {est. NLA 2982}	216/pch
8 / 249	new	1238/1st 625/2nd 168/pch	
20 / 115	new	816/basement + 1st 780/2nd 9,583 s.f. lot	[see end note 07-1]
23 / 196	new*#	2007/1st 1370/2nd 576/garage = [ESC 3953]	372/pch
23 / 87.6	new	768/1st 786/2nd	
29 / 368	new	1098/1st (1397/ft.pt - basement)	

30 / 23.2	new	852/1st	582/2nd		
36 / 56	new	920/1st			
36 / 275	new	1316/1st	816/2nd	576/2car gar.#	168/pch =ESC 2876 [see EN06-1]
40 / 70	new	1220/1st	1200/2nd		
41 / 12	new	936/1st	378/2nd	60/pch	342/acs.bld.
41 / 74	new	852/1st	852/2nd	144/pch	
41 / 122	new	1406/1st	496/2nd		
41 / 156	new	1216/1st	962/2nd		
42 / 105	new	1216/1st	808/2nd		
41 / 95	studio	504	[ESC 2772]		

6 / 1	add	160/1st	160/2nd	[prior nla 2106]	= {est. NLA 2426}
7 / 41	add	525/1st		[prior nla 800]	
8 / 279	add	504 1st		[prior nla 1434]	
9 / 611	add/rebuild*?	2000/ft.pt	1500/2nd	[prior nla 2088]	{est NLA 3500}
12 / 92	add	504/1st		[prior nla 1456]	
12 / 154	add	102/1st	197/2nd	[prior nla 1596]	
13 / 85	add	36/1st		[prior nla 1508]	14,810 sf lot
13 / 99	add/rebuild*?	1104/ft.pt		[prior nla 2654]	
13 / 161.1	add	512/1st		[prior nla 1680]	
13 / 187	add	28/1st		[prior nla 2016]	
14 / 117	add	144/1st		[prior nla 1920]	
15 / 31	add	224/1st		[prior nla 1663]	14,375 sf lot
15 / 96	add & acs. bld.	189 + 237	acs.bld	[prior nla 1614]	
16 / 28	add	278/1st	168/2nd	[prior nla 1584]	
19 / 61	add*#	1440/1st	1360/2nd	[prior nla 2524]	{NLA 5,396} [end note 07-2]
20 / 50	add*SP?	480/1st		[prior nla 1591]	9,583 sf lot
23 / 215	add	324/1st		[prior nla 1849]	

End Notes

05-1: This is a large new house {ESC 4929} on Barker Street in an older established neighborhood off of Old Wharf Rd that I've been to see first hand. Described by assessment as a 2 story home, which it is on the upper slope of the lot and south side front face, yet on the back north side where the lot slopes down, it presents a huge long face and mass of 3 stories high. They also clear cut away just about all the pine trees and vegetation on the north & west side of the lot so its imposing size is all the more apparent to the abutting north side neighbors. As one of these neighbors was unloading her groceries I enquired what she thought about this new house. Quite unsurprisingly, she and all the others around her are greatly dismayed by it, and notes it is occupied by one person. In my estimation this is a perfect case of where a SPR process would of been of great benefit and fulfilled it purpose. *see 05-1 photos*

06-1: I red flagged this Franklin Lane house as a case study of something SPR might miss which perhaps should be considered of relevant importance to its purpose. This case study house is a very bland 2 story box structure with 2 car garage attachment on a 30,056 s.f. street corner lot.

Using Eastham's Site Coverage formula to include the attached two car garage space (very slightly offset from the home's front & back lines), indicates that this home would have been subject to SPR, for its assessed SC figure of 3004. Had this case proceeded to SPR it has numerous faults I feel could of benefited from SPR.

The garage attachment has a vast expanse of roof slope reaching almost to the 2nd story ridge line itself, all to accommodate a small back facing 2nd story loft area. In combination with the undistinguished back face of the house proper, this additional length and breadth of rear face is pretty overwhelming, all of which is highly visible to the neighborhood. Secondly, the adjoining street corner side face of this 2 story house has no windows in it, and so presents another large and imposing blank wall to the neighborhood. Lastly, way too much of pre-existing trees and/or other vegetation was removed from the lot so that this house and its faults are all the more glaringly exposed and imposed on the neighbors.

In consideration of this home's faults and how SPR with a ESC 3,000 s.f. trigger might miss such an unfortunate project had it come in 5 s.f. less, one thing I've noticed (while driving around looking at many of these recent cases under review) is that two car garages are in vogue and they are a problem. They tend to be so by increasing the size and mass of homes, particularly as attachments, and/or as a below grade level in built which can tend to mean that an excess portion of the home has three stories of real exposure.

Because of this fact I would like to suggest that any 2,000 s.f. ESC project that *involves a two car garage* be subject to SPR to allow for scrutiny of size, mass, and exposure anomalies as I've perceived them to be an elemental problem. Ones that could be missed at the 3k threshold. *see 06-1 photos and extra garage set*

06-2: I gave this project an undetermined black grading -- this house is listed in BP applications for a 608 s.f. addition in 2005 as well as another of the same s.f. in 2006. The first addition appears as if it wouldn't have triggered SPR, while the second would have with a NLA of 3252. Overall, it is not an objectionable project, except perhaps for how one of the additions is a floating wing on pylons extension above the down sloping lot. Several other houses are situated below this Powers Lane property on Mill Creek. I drove up it to try and get a sense of how this floating wing extension might appear to those homes below it, and

although I couldn't see it well thru the up-sloping pine woods from Mill Creek and houses situated therein, there was one home that might have found this wing looming over their backyard. *see 6-2 photos*

07-1: Map 20/Lot 115 on Summit Ave with a 9,583 s.f. lot is another interesting case. In one regard it is a new quality built small house (34' x 24') with an approximate 2400 SC, that manages to sit (barely so) within the 25' set back requirements. This Highland Street neighborhood is by and large comprised of relatively small lots with small 1 story houses of long standing. Although this case met by-right permitting it otherwise presents a close looming 3 story rear wall face to an abutting 1 story house and back yard/deck area sloped just below on Clarke Ave. The Clarke Ave. home owners are not thrilled with this small yet towering development so close and above them. This new Summit Ave. house is for sale, and claims a "Waterview," but from what I could determine only from the top floor and not greatly so. I wonder if SPR might be of some of benefit to this sort of small lot/small homes neighborhood area. Perhaps for such in town areas, as this area is an example of, an overlay district for SPR might be appropriate? *see 07-1 photos*

07-2: I gave this Powers Lane project a blue grading even though the additions amounted to 2872 s.f. of additional NLA to what was 2524 of prior NLA for a new NLA of 5,396. It is an A-frame type home, of which the addition was a similar type wing attachment separated by an open deck. As large as it might seem by NLA, it is not an overly imposing structure in its existing context/location as best as I could tell. *see 07-2 photos*

The photographs noted above are primarily for my own reference, although I will leave a CD with them on it with Mary Rodgers. Better yet that one goes to look at these cases yourself.

revised May 22, 2008