

TOWN OF SOUTHLINGTON
 ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
 TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 2011

Chairman Robert Salka called the Public Hearing and Regular meeting of the Southington Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m. in the Town Council Chambers with the following members in attendance:

Jeffrey Gworek, Patricia Potter and Bryan Wysong

Alternates: Matthew O'Keefe
 Juanita Champagne

Others: Rob Librandi, Zoning Enforcement Officer

Absent: Ronald Bohigian, Alternate
 Michael Milo, Alternate

The Chair seated Juanita Champagne for the vacant Vice Chairman seat. A quorum was determined.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was recited by everyone in attendance.

Ms. Potter explained to the audience the procedure to be followed in the presentation of an appeal advising that should their appeal be approved, they file it with the Town Clerk's Office before proceeding with the project.

ROBERT SALKA, Chairman, presiding:

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

A. APPEAL #5864A, application of Daniel Douchkov for a 2.9' side yard setback variance to 27.1' where 30' is required under Sections 7A-00 & 15-04 of the Zoning Regulations, 37 Ledge Road, property of Daniel T. & Evrova Douchkov in an R-80 zone.

MR. DOUCHOV: My name is Daniel Douchkov, 36 Ledge Road. We are planning on adding a building, demoing the existing garage structure and building a new garage with living space above.

We'd like to build 24 by 30 feet, the new structure. And, we need to use the setback to reduce the setback by 2' because there is the septic tank on the other side.

The distance between the new structure and the corner of the septic tank would be 15' when it is built. So, we need a little more to dig around for the foundation. Dangerously close if we move the building closer to the septic tank.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Anything else?

MR. DOUCHKOV: That's the only place we can use in the yard.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Questions of the applicant?

MR. WYSONG: I have none.

(No response)

THE CHAIR: Do you have a copy of a drawing or a rendition of what this new structure is going to look like? Is it going to be the same - I understand you are going to put a living space above it.

MR. DOUCHKOV: It will be the same level as the house, the existing structure. The garage is, it is in a hill. The garage is partially below level. So the new garage will be the same way and the second level, the living space, would be level with the existing house.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

MR. DOUCHKOV: So, it will be just another level above the --- you have a picture of the existing structure. Another level.

THE CHAIR: Okay. So it is no taller than the existing house right now.

MR. DOUCHKOV: Same height.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Is there anyone speaking in favor of this application?

(No response)

Is there anyone opposing this application?

(No response)

Hearing none, this application is closed.

B. APPEAL #5865A, application of The SKLE Holding Corp. for special exception approval to host the annual Oktoberfest to run in conjunction with the Apple Harvest Festival from September 30, 2011 through October 9 2011 under Sections 4-01.31A & 15-05 of the Zoning Regulations, 114 Main Street, property The SKLE Holding Corp. in a CB zone.

SPEAKER: My name is Cynthia Voorhees, 35 Windsor Way in Southington. I am here on behalf of the Elks Club to hold our annual Oktoberfest in conjunction with the Apple Harvest Festival.

It will be the same set up as in years past.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Any questions of the applicant?

MS. POTTER: The same stipulations as always?

MS. VOORHEES: Yes.

MR. GWOREK: Do we want to review those?

THE CHAIR: If you want to go through them, go ahead. Do you have copies of them?

MS. POTTER: Yes.

(1) The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the Town of Southington.

(2) The applicant shall conform to all health, safety and fire regulations.

(3) The applicant shall be responsible for policing the cleanup of private property during and after the festival.

(4) A certificate of liability insurance in the amount of at least \$2 million should be filed with the Town Manager's office prior to the start of the festival.

(5) All fire lanes must remain open at all times.

(6) The hours of operation shall be the same as the hours of the Apple Harvest Festival.

THE CHAIR: No problems with any of those?

MS. VOORHEES: No problems at all.

THE CHAIR: Same as last year.

MS. VOORHEES: Same.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Is there anyone speaking in favor of this application?

(No response)

Is there anyone opposing this application?

(No response)

Hearing none, this application is closed.

C. APPEAL #5866A, application of Vincent & Anna Iacobucci for an 8' side yard setback variance to 12' where 20' is required under Sections 7A-00, 11-09 & 15-04 of the Zoning Regulations, 53 Morningside Lane, property of Vincent & Anna Iacobucci in an R-20/25 zone.

MR. IACOBUCCI: Hi. My name is Vincent Iacobucci, 53 Morningside Lane in Southington.

And, what I am here for is I have a porch in the back of my house. It's been there around 30 years. And, it's time that I have to do something, so I am trying to enclose it.

It's the same location, the same size. Not moving it because of the structure of the house. So, that is what I am trying to do. Nothing else.

Enclose it.

MS. POTTER: Does the um --- does it have a roof over the porch now? Are you changing your roof line?

MR. IACOBUCCI: Yes, it's going to have a roof, yes.

MS. POTTER: It doesn't have one now, though.

MR. IACOBUCCI: Well, it doesn't have --- it has it right now. What's happening is we've been doing it. We waited for the response on the application and it was taking time. I said, there is nothing changing, so let's continue.

But when they said Stop! I stopped. But it's kind of late now. The roof is there.

THE CHAIR: So, basically, is it completed now?

MR. IACOBUCCI: No. It's not really completed inside. But it is outside it is.

THE CHAIR: When I drove by, the outside looked completed.

MR. IACOBUCCI: Yes, yes.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Do you have any questions of the applicant?

MR. O'KEEFE: When you say you had a porch there for 20 or 30 years, did the existing porch have a foundation?

MR. IACOBUCCI: The exiting porch, yah. It's been there --- it's 12 by 16 foot.

MR. O'KEEFE: Did it have a foundation underneath it or ---

MR. IACOBUCCI: It's a slab of cement.

MR. O'KEEFE: Was there anything on top of the slab of cement in the past or was it just a -

MR. IACOBUCCI: Well, the porch. The porch is about, you can go under it. It's about 5' under, open.

MR. O'KEEFE: Right. So it didn't have walls prior to this?

MR. IACOBUCCI: No, no.

MR. O'KEEFE: More like a patio?

MR. IACOBUCCI: Yes. Though we kind of get to a time that says you go up and down. You use the porch more but let's enclose it. That's the idea of it.

MR. WYSONG: Has the building department looked at the structure if the porch?

MR. IACOBUCCI: I don't know if they ever came over. It's been a while that we started it up. I don't know if the building --- we applied for the inspection, right? The permit. Well, we didn't get what time. He says let's inspect it. So, we are waiting now.

THE CHAIR: But you did get a building permit?

MR. IACOBUCCI: Well, yes. We applied for it. I didn't get the permit. It was denied.

MR. LIBRANDI: They didn't receive a building permit because they have to apply for a zoning permit, first.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Well, that's what I'm asking.

MR. LIBRANDI: He kind of skipped a step not knowing possibly that he had to go to the zoning board to get a zoning permit.

THE CHAIR: So, the town hasn't approved it.

MR. LIBRANDI: No.

MR. IACOBUCCI: No. Nobody has been there to my knowledge.

MR. LIBRANDI: That was also --- staff has also done some research on it in the Assessor's Office and um, there was a wood deck where it is located right now in the 1980's there is one located.

Past that, there is no record.

THE CHAIR: There was a permit to put a deck on it back in -

MR. LIBRANDI: There was, it was assessed with a deck. In terms of zoning permits, we haven't seen anything.

THE CHAIR: Okay.

MS. POTTER: I'm sorry. I didn't understand that. It had --- he did take out a permit in 1981?

THE CHAIR: Well, he must have taken out a permit, otherwise it wouldn't be on tax records because that's the only way really it gets on the tax records. They look at the --- and then they add it to the tax.

It had a permit when he put the slab and obviously the wooden deck on it.

MS. POTTER: Okay.

THE CHAIR: I'm assuming that.

MR. IACOBUCCI: Now, since I've been doing some work, I don't know if anybody ever came around from the town to look at this place.

THE CHAIR: Well, they probably wouldn't because as he said, you know, there is a sequence. You needed a variance. Once you get the variance then you would get the approval from us and then you apply for the permit and then they will follow up on it. I have a feeling they don't necessarily; the building department doesn't know you started it. They don't know it is even there.

So, that is why they probably haven't been out to inspect it, yet.

MR. IACOBUCCI: That's why I did some work there not knowing. It has been here but I was trying to do something until I got the permit but the permit was never given to us. It was denied. And, then I stopped. But some of the work is done there.

MR. WYSONG: Point of information. The town requires some pretty stringent foundation requirements if my experience is accurate.

MR. LIBRANDI: In terms of footings?

MR. WYSONG: Forty-two inch foundation holes, inspection before concrete is poured, et cetera.

MR. LIBRANDI: You know, this is probably going to be something that after the fact its build, the building department is going to have to go out and review it. If they have an issue with it, they have the authority to --- you know, if it is unsafe, they have the authority to remove it.

THE CHAIR: It doesn't meet the regulations.

But the question that we have is, do we approve a variance to put something there --- that happens to be there --- but do we have approve the variance and then the building department is the one that's got to do ---

MR. LIBRANDI: Yes, they deal with specifications. We are just dealing on the hardship and the dimensions of the structure.

THE CHAIR: Right.

MR. O'KEEFE: Or, but I think then the question becomes is it a hardship because the structure is there if it is reasonably likely that the structure would have to be removed anyway even if we did grant a variance and then checked it and the hardship that we may have used may not have been a hardship.

MS. POTTER: But it's already there.

MR. O'KEEFE: But if the building department says it has to be torn down because of the foundation.

MS. POTTER: No, I understand that. But the deck, the --- he's not going --- it is not changing the floor plan of anything. That's what it was. It was 12 by 12 by 16.

MR. IACOBUCCI: Right. And, I cannot change, not even a couple of inches. I can't because it would not comply with the entrance to the porch, the windows. Nothing. I can't change anything. I have to keep close to the way it was and that's it.

MR. WYSONG: I would think our responsibility as a Zoning Board of Appeals would be to pretend the structure isn't there. For the purposes of -

MR. O'KEEFE: Or not consider the structure being there for purposes -

MR. WYSONG: _- our hearing the appeal. It's as though the structure doesn't exist.

THE CHAIR: Well, I guess the question would be whether it's a structure or not, there is something back there. There was a porch put on. Was there a variance granted at that time? Or was it pre-existing?

You know, I guess the real question is, if it has already been there, was there a variance granted or was there a variance requested in order to put the slab on, put the porch on. He wouldn't need one.

MR. O'KEEFE: Under the definitions, Section 2.02 for building. It says: Any structure having a roof and intended for shelter, housing or enclosure of persons or animals.

So, as he described the patio, it doesn't qualify as a building. It may not even be a structure. So, it is really a question of are we going to allow a structure where not structure existed.

MR. LIBRANDI: We don't require zoning permits for patio slabs.

And, in terms of the deck, we haven't found anything in terms of a zoning permit or a variance for that in the past. But then again, it has been there for --- ever since our record from the Assessor's card --- the 1980's.

MR. O'KEEFE: Although it may qualify under the definition of structure which says: Anything constructed or erected which requires location on the ground or attachment to something and having a location on the ground, including foundation and signs in any zone, walls and fences except those less than 4' and located ---- so it would be considered --- the patio, presumably, would be considered a structure.

THE CHAIR: Which means they would have to come to us for a variance for that initial -

MR. O'KEEFE: Correct.

THE CHAIR: --- structure or patio that was there.

MR. O'KEEFE: Right.

THE CHAIR: That wasn't done at that time.

And, yet a permit was issued. It must have been issued because it is on the tax rolls.

MR. LIBRANDI: I would think so.

THE CHAIR: Well, I guess when you look at the house. The patio is going to be 12' from the property line, correct?

MR. GWOREK: The house is nonconforming, as well.

THE CHAIR: The house isn't conforming, either. So, that's why, it must have been pre-zoning, prior to, so it is pre-existing. I guess that is what I was getting at.

Okay? Any other questions of the applicant?

(No response)

So, we have something that's nonconforming already. And, what he is doing is he's taking one more step further and putting an enclosed structure on a nonconforming ----

MR. O'KEEFE: It sounds like he is basically increasing a nonconforming use but only in a vertical sense.

THE CHAIR: Correct. It doesn't look like he's changing the line.

MR. LIBRANDI: It is just he is adding the living space.

MR. IACOBUCCI: I cannot run as fast as I used to in the bad weather.

THE CHAIR: None of us can!

(Chuckles)

Thank you.

Is there anyone speaking in favor of this application?

(No response)

Is there anyone opposing this application?

(No response)

Hearing none, this application is closed.

D. APPEAL #5867A, application of Bill Downes for a 99' front yard setback variance to 50.1' where 60' is required under Section 7A-00 & 15-04 of the Zoning Regulations, 55 Burning Tree Drive, property of William F. & Shelley A. Downes in an R-80 zone.

MR. SUSCO: Good evening. My name is John Susco and I live at 9 Ledge Road in Southington. And, I am here tonight representing Bill and Shelley Downes.

They're seeking a 9.9' front yard variance. The hardship in our case is that the property was rezoned back in the 90's. And, even with the variance for the proposed structure, you can see by the drawings, we will still be behind the front of the existing house.

MR. LIBRANDI: Mr. Chairman, if I could just add that staff as reviewed the plans with the contractor and we are in favor of it.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Any questions of the applicant?

(No response)

No questions?

Thank you.

Is there anyone speaking in favor of this application?

(No response)

Is there anyone opposing this application?

(No response)

Hearing none, this application is closed.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

A. APPEAL 5862A, application of John & Wendy Fusari for a 6' front yard variance to 26' where 32' exists and 40' is required under Sections 7A-00 & 15-04 of the Zoning Regulations, 16 Whitlock Avenue, property of John M. & Wendy G. Fusari, in an R-20/25 zone.

MR.FUSARI: Good evening, I am John Fusari. This is my wife, Wendy.

MS. FUSARI: Wendy Fusari, 16 Whitlock.

MR. FUSARI: As we stated at the last meeting, we are looking to go out 6' from the front of the house to improve space on the first floor and flow on the first floor, only.

As requested from the last meeting, you wanted to see the roof line of the structure.

The hardships we had talked about before. Obviously, going out the back, we have the sewer pipe. Marrying the roofs was an issue. That's why we decided --- the house is pre-existing, nonconforming as it is. So this was really our only alternative as far as improving the living space.

MR.LIBRANDI: Mr. Chairman, if I could add the letter from the neighbors as an exhibit.

THE CHAIR: Go ahead. Do you want to read it into the record?

MR. LIBRANDI: "To Whom It May Concern: I am aware that my neighbors John & Wendy Fusari are seeking a variance for the purpose of existing 6' out (sic) across the front of the house on the first floor only.

I do not oppose the granting of such.

Sincerely, Terry Stone, 18 Whitlock Avenue."

THE CHAIR: Okay. Questions of the applicant?

(Pause)

MR. O'KEEFE: More of a concern perhaps than of a question. More than half the house is already nonconforming. And, it looks like it is being increased even more both to the front and to the side.

THE CHAIR: Um-hum.

(Pause)

In what sense is it nonconforming? Because of the --- okay.

MR. O'KEEFE: It looks like this is ---

THE CHAIR: Where it is 32 where 40 was required, now they're going to 26. Okay?

MR. O'KEEFE: Right. And, it looks like an area on the side if you are coming forward and you don't make the side.

MS. FUSARI: We are not going out on the side, unless I am misunderstanding you.

MR. O'KEEFE: If the house is nonconforming on the side and you are going out on the front, then you are also --- encroaching on the side. You know, that's the side. It's the same piece as both the side and the front.

(Undertone comments)

THE CHAIR: The side, are you talking, Matt, are you talking the side where the fireplace, where the chimney is?

MR. O'KEEFE: It looks to me that your buildable square was in here. (Indicating) And, that the house comes out on the side and in the front. So, if you're coming out on the front, as to this piece.

MR. WYSONG: The house is nonconforming as it is. Both on the front and the side.

MR. O'KEEFE: Correct.

So, the nonconformity increases on both the front and on the side.

MS. CHAMPAGNE: Just by virtue of the front being extended. Yah.

MR. O'KEEFE: Correct.

THE CHAIR: The new roof line, does it --- it doesn't --- when I look at the side view, you're putting new windows on the front which are bay windows which are going to stick out. Are you planning on moving the steps forward?

I'm looking at the side elevation. The drawing here.

MR. FUSARI: Yah.

THE CHAIR: So you're moving the steps out further?

MR. FUSARI: Correct.

THE CHAIR: Okay.

So, the steps are actually going, they will be another 4 or 5 feet out forward.

MS.FUSARI: They are going sideways.

THE CHAIR: I'm sorry.

MS. FUSARI: They might be coming sideways which -

THE CHAIR: Well, either way, they still have to stick out --- you've still got to have legally --- right.

So, even though the house is only --- the house is going to be 26', you're going to have to add another 4 or 5 feet for the stairs going down. So you're really moving the house quite a bit forward.

(Pause)

So you are taking a nonconforming house and you're making it more nonconforming which is typically the reverse of what we would like to see. We like to see nonconforming become more conforming.

Okay. Do we have any other questions of the applicant?

(No response)

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone speaking in favor of this application?

(No response)

Is there anyone opposing this application?

(No response)

Hearing none, this application is closed.

B. APPEAL 5863A, application of Joseph Geladino for a 13' front yard setback variance to 27' where 40' is required under Sections 7A-00 & 15-04 of the Zoning Regulations, 101 Matthews Street, property of Joseph Geladino, in an R-12 zone.

MR. GELADINO: Joseph Geladino, 23 Cory Lane, Bristol, CT. I addressed all of your concerns at the last meeting.

My engineers met with Robert and I believe Mary was there to go over any questions you had. I believe they're worked out and now we are looking for your approval.

That's it.

THE CHAIR: Rob, can you just review what transpired with the applicant?

MR. LIBRANDI: Well, the applicant and his engineer came in and we talked about from the previous plan where the deck was placed in the back of the house which they would require a front and a rear setback as I remember.

What they did is they removed the deck and placed it on the side of the property and they pushed the structure back further which is making it --- which would require less of a variance from the front yard.

This is an existing, um --- lot that has --- that is restricting in space. So, it's an odd shaped lot. He has worked with staff. You know, this seems like it is --- I don't want to see reasonable, but you know, he has worked with us and we have tried to correct the variance.

THE CHAIR: Wasn't one of the other questions about access, the road access? Was that one of the questions?

MR. LIBRANDI: There was a question and I was told that we should only focus on the structure itself. The engineer has spoken with the property owners and uh, next door, that came in last hearing, and they did specify that the driveway would also allow access to their rear yard in some way.

But again, that is irrelevant to what is in front of us right now.

THE CHAIR: So, we are down to a 7.7' variance.

MR. LIBRANDI: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Questions?

MR. WYSONG: None here.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

Is there anyone speaking in favor of this application?

(No response)

Is there anyone opposing this application?

(No response)

Hearing none, this application is closed.

7:30 pm.

REGULAR MEETING

Approval of Minutes - Regular Meeting of July 12, 2011

Mr. O'Keefe so moved a motion to approve the Minutes of the July 12th meeting. Ms. Potter seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. APPEAL #5864A, application of Daniel Douchkov for a 2.9' side yard setback variance to 27/1' where 30' is required under Sections 7A-00 & 15-04 of the Zoning Regulations, 37 Ledge Road, property of Daniel T. & Evrova Douchkov in an R-80 zone.

Ms. Potter made a motion to approve Appeal 5864A. Two point nine is kind of minimal as what he's asking for.

Mr. O'Keefe added the lot is irregularly shaped and the buildable footprint is quite small and as I look at the proposed improvements, they get about 95 percent of the improvement, if not more, into the buildable square. It looks like a reasonable attempt to build within the buildable square.

Mr. O'Keefe seconded.

(Motion passed 5 to 0 on a roll call vote.)

B. APPEAL #5865A, application of The SKLE Holding Corp. for special exception approval to host the annual Oktoberfest to run in conjunction with the Apple Harvest Festival from September 30, 2011 through October 9 2011 under Sections 4-01.31A & 15-05 of the Zoning Regulations, 114 Main Street, property The SKLE Holding Corp. in a CB zone.

Ms. Potter made a motion to approve Appeal 5865A with the stipulations as read during the public hearing. Mr. Wysong seconded.

Stipulations:

(1) The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the Town of Southington.

(2) The applicant shall conform to all health, safety and fire regulations.

(3) The applicant shall be responsible for policing the cleanup of private property during and after the festival.

(4) A certificate of liability insurance in the amount of at least \$2 million should be filed with the Town Manager's office prior to the start of the festival.

(5) All fire lanes must remain open at all times.

(6) The hours of operation shall be the same as the hours of the Apple Harvest Festival.

Mr. O'Keefe commented regarding Stipulation #5, he would recommend changing the word "should" to "must". Should does imply it is optional. The Chair said it should be changed universally. That is a good catch.

(Motion passed 5 to 0 on a roll call vote.)

C. APPEAL #5866A, application of Vincent & Anna Iacobucci for an 8' side yard setback variance to 12' where 20' is required under Sections 7A-00, 11-09 & 15-04 of the Zoning Regulations, 53 Morningside Lane, property of Vincent & Anna Iacobucci in an R-20/25 zone.

Ms. Potter made a motion to approve Appeal 5866A. Ms. Champagne seconded.

Ms. Champagne observed it is reasonable.

Ms. Potter said it is reasonable. The structure was there since 1980. The house is already nonconforming. It's on that 12' line.

Mr. Wysong agreed the house is there. The extension to the house is in the same variance from the property line.

(Motion passed 5 to 0 on a roll call vote.)

D. APPEAL #5867A, application of Bill Downes for a 99' front yard setback variance to 50.1' where 60' is required under Section 7A-00 & 15-04 of the Zoning Regulations, 55 Burning Tree Drive, property of William F. & Shelley A. Downes in an R-80 zone.

Ms. Potter made a motion to approve Appeal #5867A. Ms. Champagne seconded.

Ms. Potter said she didn't see any problem with it.

Mr. O'Keefe said if the zone had a 40' line when the house was built and it was conforming when it was built and had they built that at that time, they wouldn't have needed a variance. And, if the only thing is the moving of the front setback line and it's virtually behind it, I think it would fit the definition of a hardship.

Ms. Champagne agreed.

(Motion passed 5 to 0 on a roll call vote.)

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

A. APPEAL 5862A, application of John & Wendy Fusari for a 6' front yard variance to 26' where 32' exists and 40' is required under Sections 7A-00 & 15-04 of the Zoning Regulations, 16 Whitlock Avenue, property of John M. & Wendy G. Fusari, in an R-20/25 zone.

Ms. Potter made a motion to approve #5862. A lot of good points were brought up with the front changing and then the steps going out. I think it's too big. Ms. Champagne seconded.

Ms. Champagne said it does seem extreme, but I think what they're doing to the house will be a betterment to the neighborhood and to their living.

Mr. O'Keefe stated that he didn't see a legal hardship. We have a house that's more than 50 percent nonconforming and you are increasing the nonconformity. There just doesn't seem to be any rhyme or reason that makes it exceptionally difficult or unusually hard other than the fact that they want a larger house. From that perspective, it would be troublesome to support it.

Mr. Gworek said you are already nonconforming. You are adding 6 more feet but you're already nonconforming. I know you like to go back towards conforming, but it is already nonconforming. It does add a

lot to that house and it may not be an unusual hardship or a hardship at all but it's already nonconforming.

Ms. Potter said she felt it was better for the neighborhood. It is an upgrade.

(Motion passed 4 to 1 with Chairman Salka opposed)

B. APPEAL 5863A, application of Joseph Geladino for a 13' front yard setback variance to 27' where 40' is required under Sections 7A-00 & 15-04 of the Zoning Regulations, 101 Matthews Street, property of Joseph Geladino, in an R-12 zone.

Ms. Potter made a motion to approve 5863A. Ms. Champagne seconded.

Mr. Wysong said he felt they did a nice job in listening to our concerns from the last meeting. They met with the building department. I brought the old drawing for reference and it looks like the movement of the deck to the side allowed them to become more nearly conforming by 5' while maintain the setback on the rear yard. I think it was a good compromise for a very difficult lot.

The Chair said he had satisfied the requirements that we had asked for.

Mr. O'Keefe noted it is an unusually shaped lot. The street that presumably is the front is a paper street. I do think he addressed our comments.

(Motion passed 5 to 0 on a roll call vote.)

MISCELLANEOUS / OLD BUSINESS/ NEW BUSINESS

The next meeting is September 13, 2111 and we are back on our twice a month schedule.

ADJOURNMENT - Ms. Potter made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by Ms. Champagne. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned t 7:40 o'clock, p.m.)

Robert Salka, Chairman
Zoning Board of Appeals

