

MARK & VALERIE JACOBS  
11 Compo Parkway  
Westport, Connecticut 06880

October 28, 2024

**Westport Zoning Board of Appeals** ([zba@westportct.gov](mailto:zba@westportct.gov))

**Re: 4 Compo Parkway**

Dear Members of the Westport Zoning Board of Appeals:

Please uphold the decision of the Planning and Zoning Commission and Staff to deny a Zoning Compliance Certificate to the owner of 4 Compo Parkway.

As the Commission and Staff have pointed out, the construction and operation of a chipping green in the setback is not a permitted use. In fact, the Town has always been quite strict about setback rules, in some cases going so far as to require homeowners to remove swing sets.

And this situation is far worse than installing a child's playset, since a chipping green poses a risk to people offsite. In fact, golf balls from 4 Compo Parkway have already landed in a neighbor's yard. Luckily, they did not hit the owner—or her children or her pets—but the fact remains that this is a dangerous use and one prohibited in a setback. We simply cannot have two sets of rules: one for those who have the means to install an expensive (but illegal and dangerous) chipping green and then ask the ZBA to bend the rules to let them keep it—and a second set of rules for those who act like good citizens and neighbors and follow the rules. It is especially unfair to neighbors on Compo Parkway and Yankee Hill who are now at risk of being hit by stray golf balls.

There are, in addition, other grounds to deny the homeowner's request, including the fact that, in constructing the chipping green:

- the contractor regraded areas that are within five (5) feet of the property line, which is also contrary to the Westport Zoning Regulations (Sec. 32-8.3.2);
- the contractor appears to have disrupted, filled, compacted, and/or regraded more than 850 sq. ft., but never obtained the necessary engineering/drainage study or the Excavation and Fill Permit required by the Westport Zoning Regulations (Sec. 32-8.1 et al); and
- the contractor compactd the soil and installed a rubber membrane for the artificial turf, both of which impede drainage. (If the contractor also used "crumb rubber" artificial turf, that would present an additional violation since that product is banned in Westport.)

These additional violations are especially problematic because this site already has significant drainage issues, and these changes mean that the chipping green is likely to push water onto other people's property and/or the street.

In closing, we note that the application itself was misleading. The homeowner and his attorney refer to this project as a "putting green." But even a quick glance at the survey reveals that it is not a putting green, but rather, a chipping green. Nor does this project involve the mere installation of artificial turf in a setback. Instead, this was the wholesale regrading of a site and the installation of multiple underground cups, flags, tee boxes, rubber membranes, and artificial turf. (Query whether that misleading characterization should, in and of itself, provide grounds for denial of the appeal.)

In any event, we urge you to uphold the P&Z's and Staff's decision and deny the appeal.

Sincerely,

/s/ Mark & Valerie Jacobs