

IN RESPONSE TO LETTER FROM WILLIAM HARLOW
TO WHATELY PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS
REGARDING TRUDEAU APPLICATION FOR PERMIT

FLAG LOT:

1. The bylaws allow, in certain circumstances, access other than through the "pole."
2. Not applicable.
3. We understand abutter's involvement is restricted to public hearing.

SPECIAL PERMIT FOR DRIVEWAY

1. False statement. We disagree that the dust condition on the driveway is anywhere near the extreme that Mr. Harlow depicts. While all gravel driveways raise dust, Mr. Harlow continues to use his patio aside the driveways for lounging, entertaining and drying clothes. Most times we drive cautiously, sometimes even placing one side of the car on the grass rather than the driveway, out of courtesy. This gravel driveway existed prior to his purchase.
2. No culverts exist and no stone walls have ever been destroyed.
3. Mr. Harlow, being the 3rd owner, is the first to complain of undermining of the stonewall and these other issues of which he complains. After his purchase, Mr. Harlow removed what had been mature Rhododendrons and other established growth along the wall. We believe those plantings had both a stabilizing and water absorption function, and such removal has greatly contributed to the issues of which he complains. We believe there are tomato plants there now. Also, he, being a roofer, should appreciate which way water flows. When doing all his re-landscaping, he could have certainly placed

appropriate drainage culverts had he chosen to. Mr. Harlow was aware when he purchased his property of the juxtaposition of the driveways, and we don't believe an added home changes that.

4. We're not sure we understand Mr. Harlow's point, but the plans show a 20 foot side yard setback.

5. We would like clarification from the Planning Board on this issue. The bylaws, as written, are confusing to us.

6. Plans will continue to be submitted as the Planning Board requests.

7. To be submitted for Planning Board review if amended application is allowed. Apparently by this question Mr. Harlow doesn't object to such an amendment.

8. As yet to be obtained, depending on Planning Board decision.

ASTERISK ITEMS

1st asterisk: If permit is granted, any special conditions should apply only to the proposed easement/common driveway. We see nothing in the bylaws allowing for special conditions to be applied to the remainder of our existing driveway. No damage to his property has been caused by any past action on our part.

2nd asterisk: Gravel driveways are normal and customary in rural communities. Our understanding of the Highway Department regulations is that only the first eight feet of a driveway be paved. Our gravel driveway predates Mr. Harlow's purchase.

3rd asterisk: The "newly created properties" would be our Lots 1 & 2. We don't understand how "visually separating" these properties would benefit Mr. Harlow. Mr. Harlow has always had, and still has, the option of creating a "visual separation" on his own property.