

A letter of comments concerning petition CUP 2631 and petition 12080

This list is submitted by James Carrano of 1729 Oakview drive.

Dear Zoning and Land Regulation Committee,

I am writing to express my concern and opposition to the rezoning and conditional use for a detached dwelling of the lots at 1722 Oakview Drive, Stoughton, my neighborhood. As a long-time residents (43 years) we have a vested interest in maintaining the character, safety and property values of community. The following points are the key reasons for opposition.

1. Riverfront Zoning: Referring to the map portion of the notice, ALL of the waterfront lots are zoned SFR 1. Changing one to TFR-08 would set a precedent for further multi-family developments, potentially changing the look and feel of our community and thus should be avoided.
2. Neighborhood Flavor: We have lived at 1729 Oakview Dr. for 43 years and during this time the neighborhood flavor has been stable and comfortable with little traffic. Allowing multi-family structures will open the neighborhood to rentals and “bed and breakfast” type occupancy, completely the opposite of the previous decades.
3. Traffic and Parking Concerns: The cul-de-sac does not have any area for parking vehicles off the road surface. In my opinion without a certified survey to study, there does not seem to be enough area on the proposed lot to add a driveway or parking area thus forcing vehicles to be parked on the road surface.
4. Impact on Property Values: The presence of an accessory dwelling and potentially a duplex structure in the future will adversely affect the property values of surrounding single-family homes. Many of the neighbors have invested significant resources in maintaining our homes and properties. Shifting the housing mix could lead to a decrease in property values for the neighborhood.
5. Title: An accessory dwelling unit seems like a vague title. The term “dwelling unit” implies habitation with fresh water, electricity, HVAC equipment and sewer connection. In essence, a separate residence and address. This is not in compliance with TFR-08 which states a single structure for two family occupancy. Allowing an accessory dwelling would also set another precedent for multiple structures along other riverfront lots.
6. Future Owners: Once and if these proposals are allowed, any future owners will be able to reinterpret the guidelines and change the structures. What a current owner promises may not bind future owners.
7. Community Consensus: Many of the neighbors share these concerns and there is a strong community sentiment against these proposals. These changes will have a negative impact on our community.

Thank you for considering these concerns,

Sincerely submitted,

James A Carrano (and Virginia M Carrano)

Copy: Pleasant Springs Plan