



# Town of Griswold



28 Main Street  
Griswold, CT 06351  
Phone (860) 376-7060, Fax (860) 376-7070

## GRISWOLD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

JULY 1, 2009

GRISWOLD TOWN HALL

### I. REGULAR MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING(S) (7:00 P.M.)

#### 1. Call to Order

Theodore Faulise, Chairman, called this meeting of the Griswold Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 7:05 p.m.

#### 2. Roll Call

**Present:** Theodore A. Faulise, Dorothy Doucette, Ronald Jodoin, William Przulucki Alternate Louis Demicco, ZEO Peter Zvingilas, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

**Absent:** Ronald Anthony, Alternates Maryann Manning, III Jeffrey Petersen,

#### 3. Determination of Quorum

T. Faulise appointed L. Demicco to sit for R. Anthony. There was a quorum for this regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

#### 4. Matters Presented for Consideration

- A. ZBA 12-09 Jensen, Peter & Janet, P.O. Box 652 Jewett City, CT. Property location: 72 Latham Drive, Griswold, CT.** Requesting relief from Town of Griswold Zoning Regulations Section 10.4.1 to reduce the right side yard requirement from 15. ft. 5o 12. ft. and the rear yard requirement from 15 ft. to 12 ft. in order to relocate an existing shed. The property is in an R-40 zone.

T. Faulise stated that the applicant had been before the board and his variance had been denied. He asked for the green cards for the record. Peter Jensen submitted the green cards for the record. Peter Jensen explained that their previous variance was denied. He explained that his new variance was asking for 12 ft. from the side and rear property line and it will be 3 ft from the house for access to due maintenance. R. Jodoin asked if the shed could be moved up along side of the house. P. Jensen explained that the house is not built yet and it will be used for storage and that the septic system and leaching fields are in that area. He stated that the proposed location is the best location.

T. Faulise asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of the application. He asked if anyone was opposed. T. Faulise stated that there were two people who were opposed and to speak for the record.

Scott Swanson, 74 Latham Drive was opposed to the shed being placed. He stated that they were not notified correction, and putting the cart before the horse because there is no house, and that it is close to the property line and that this was a self-imposed hardship. D. Doucette asked if there was another shed and how big it was. S. Swanson stated that there was a shed before. Bhadresh Shah stated that the old shed was 5 ft by 7 ft. and was in the middle of the property.

T. Faulise stated Mr. Shah and Mr. Swanson were at the last public hearing and voiced their concerns. He stated that their feelings will be taken into consideration. T. Faulise that they are allowed 15 ft. and asked if the 3 feet would make a difference as far as public safety and property values. S. Swanson stated that Mr. Shah built a beautiful home and they go out their door and there's a shed that is half the side of the housing they are building. T. Faulise stated that if the shed was moved over 3 ft towards Mr. Swanson's side of the property that Mr. Jensen would not need a variance. S. Swanson stated that he understood this.

T. Faulise asked for any others who were opposed. Bhadresh Shah, 68 Latham Drive, stated that the regulations say 15 ft from the property line. He stated that it is right in front of his front door and he didn't want it there. T. Faulise asked that if the shed was 3 ft. narrower, that Mr. Shah would still not be happier. B. Shah stated that it should be 15 ft from the property line. T. Faulise asked how the shed would affect him negatively. B. Shah stated he was concerned that his guests would make comments. D. Doucette asked B. Shah how close his house was to the property line. B. Shah stated that it was 30 ft.

T. Faulise asked for other comments. P. Zvingilas stated that it could not be moved over the 3 feet because it would be attached and 30 feet setback would be required and a variance would be needed. P. Zvingilas explained that on August 1, 2009 the Connecticut State Supplement will go into effect and all detached garages and sheds will need a 10 foot separation from the house. There was discussion of this matter.

P. Jensen stated that they are opposed for having a shed and the shed will be there according to town zoning regulations. D. Doucette asked if the shed could be moved to the other side of the house. P. Jensen explained that the septic system takes up the left side of the house and the reserve takes up most of the back. R. Jodoin asked about the right hand side. P. Jensen stated that there is a driveway on that side and that it could be over there. He stated that they will have to get someone to move the shed for him.

T. Faulise stated that there is 30 feet on each side for the house. and on the right side if he turned the shed on the right hand side the narrow way, the rear setback can be met and that the side setback could just about be met. P. Jensen stated yes. R. Jodoin stated that if the shed was on the right hand side there would be less opposition. There was discussion of this matter.

S. Swanson stated if he wants it on the right side of the house, he was amiable to giving him a variance to allow that 3 feet. T. Faulise stated that the board can modify the application and grant a variance for the right side. There was discussion of this matter to resolve this to everyone's satisfaction. T. Faulise stated that if 15 ft. can be kept to Mr. Shah's boundary to the rear, we won't grant the rear variance and the 12 ft variance on the right side. P. Jensen stated that he was agreeable to changing the shed to the right side.

S. Swanson was agreeable to this change and he asked what the time frame would be. P. Zvingilas stated that it must be done before August 1st or it cannot be done. P. Jensen stated that he will try to find someone to move the shed. There was discussion of this matter.

P. Jensen stated that for the record that it was too bad that the house in the back was built offset and that he hoped that his shed was 15 ft from the side and that the other gentleman has a 12 x 12

shed. T. Faulise stated that if no one complains then it isn't an issue; but if a neighbor complains, it has to be taken into consideration. There was discussion of this matter.

T. Faulise stated that there was no correspondence in the file for or against. Hearing no objections, he closed the public hearing. He asked for a motion.

D. Doucette made a motion to grant variance for the right side yard requirement from 15 ft. to 12 ft. and that the rear yard variance be denied. W. Przylucki seconded the motion. All were in favor of granting the right side yard variance from 15 ft. to 12 ft. The motion was carried. The right side yard variance was approved.

T. Faulise asked for those in favor of granting the rear yard variance. He asked who was in favor of granting the rear yard variance. There were no aye votes. There were 3 nay votes. All were opposed to granting the rear yard variance. The rear yard variance was denied.

**B. ZBA 13-09 Ceccarelli, Raymond & Jennifer, 41 Burdick Lane, Griswold, CT.**  
Requesting relief from Town of Griswold Zoning Regulations Section 10.4 to reduce the left side yard requirement from 30 ft. to 16 ft. in order to construct a 27 ft. by 24 ft. attached garage and installation of an above-ground pool. The property is in an R-40 zone.

T. Faulise asked if the application was present. Raymond Ceccarelli, 41 Burdick Lane was present and gave the four green cards to the board. He explained that they would be building a two-car garage. R. Jodoin stated that he spoke with Mr. Ceccarelli yesterday and he had a good idea of what is going on. R. Ceccarelli explained where the abutters were located. R. Jodoin stated that there were wetlands on the right hand side and that there is a lot of land on the left. R. Ceccarelli stated that his driveway in on the left side and that was where he wanted to put the garage.

R. Jodoin asked if there was a pool involved. R. Ceccarelli explained that when his wife applied for the variance application there was talk about a pool and that their intent was to be behind the garage attached to the deck. There was discussion of this matter.

T. Faulise asked R. Ceccarelli if he owned to the extreme to the left. R. Ceccarelli stated yes, but that it was a separate lot. There was discussion of this matter.

T. Faulise asked if there was anyone to speak in favor. He asked if there was anyone opposed. He stated that there was no correspondence either for or against in the file. He asked for any discussion. R. Jodoin stated that he looked at the property and doesn't have a problem with it. T. Faulise closed the public hearing

T. Faulise asked for a motion. L. Demicco made a motion to grant the variance as presented. W. Przylucki seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

T. Faulise explained the 15 day appeal period after the legal notice appears in the newspaper.

## **5. Old Business**

**A.** Approval of the minutes from June 3, 2009.

R. Jodoin made a motion to accept the minutes as presented. L. Demicco seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

**6. New Business**

T. Faulise asked P. Zvingilas what planning and zoning thought of that new requirement. P. Jensen asked how it would affect a carport. P. Zvingilas stated that there has to be a fire rating on the wall. There was discussion of this matter.

**7. Correspondence**

There was no correspondence.

**8. Adjournment**

R. Jodoin made a motion to adjourn. D. Doucette seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna M. Szall  
Recording Secretary