

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
JULY 31, 2012
PUBLIC HEARING**

Charles Marino called the meeting to order at 6:02 P.M. with the following in attendance:

Charles Marino, Chair	Steven S. Macary, ZEO
Arlene Schwartz-Regan, Vice-Chair	Sue Goggin
Basiliza MacCalmon, Secretary	Public – 3
Edward Rachuba	
David Cronin, alternate	

1. Charles Marino took attendance, placed David Cronin as a regular voting member, and noted there was a quorum.
2. **VOTED:** Unanimously on a motion by Ed Rachuba and seconded by Basiliza MacCalmon to **APPROVE** the June 26, 2012 regular meeting minutes as written.
3. **6:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING APPEAL #1948-** Steven and Fay Oliver of 219 North Main St., will seek a variance of section 24.1 Schedule B- Section 5.3 of the Naugatuck Zoning Regulations.

Basiliza MacCalmon read the application for Appeal # 1948 into the record. The applicant, Steven Oliver, of 219 North Main St., explained that he would like a shed placed at the end of his driveway within 1 foot of the property line. He said he is asking for a 4 foot variance in order to do this. He said he and his wife have worked hard to fix up the property and that the shed would fit in nicely with the neighborhood. He showed the commission pictures of his property and the shed he would like to build. The commissioners commented on how nice his property looked and they felt that the shed would be a nice addition. Steve explained that because of the steep slope in the front, they couldn't put it on the North Main Street side. A discussion ensued regarding placement of the shed. The commission concluded that the shed isn't a permanent structure and would improve the property. There was no further discussion.

VOTED: Unanimously on a motion by Ed Rachuba and seconded by Basiliza MacCalmon to **GRANT** Appeal # 1948.

6:15 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING APPEAL #1949 Daniel Schenck of 89 Celentano Drive will seek a variance of section 24.1 Schedule B- section 5.3 of the Naugatuck Zoning Regulations.

Basiliza MacCalmon read the application for Appeal #1949 into the record. The applicant, Daniel Schenck, explained that he would like to put up a 24'x12' car port to prevent him from reinjuring his back clearing heavy snow off his car. He described the car port he would like to install and showed the commission pictures. He said he has a disposable car port now but would get rid of it before he gets the new one. Ed asked if it will be attached to the house. Daniel said it will be very close to the house but not attached to it. He said it

will be enclosed on 3 sides. There were no neighbors there to oppose the appeal. Daniel Schenck said he went to all his neighbor's homes to explain what he wanted to do. Arlene said if there was opposition they should have come to the meeting. There was no further discussion.

VOTED: Unanimously on a motion by Dave Cronin and seconded by Ed Rachuba to **GRANT** Appeal #1949 for a 3 foot side variance.

The commission recessed at 6:24 P.M.

The commission reconvened at 6:30 P.M.

6:30 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING APPEAL #1950 Mark Shinagel will seek a variance of section 24.1 Schedule B- section 5.3 of the Naugatuck Zoning Regulations for property adjacent to 397 East Waterbury Road (Lot K20E10) of the Naugatuck Zoning Regulations.

Basiliza MacCalmon read the application for Appeal #1950 into the record. Attorney Michael McVerry, of 35 Porter Avenue, explained that Mr. Alpert is the contract purchaser of the property owned by Mr. Shinagel. He explained the owner history of the property. He said the lot has existed as a 100' x 60' parcel for 110 years, well before zoning regulations existed in town. Attorney McVerry showed the commission a typical house plan that is 40' in width. He said the property to the right is owned by the Naugatuck Industrial Park and the parcel on the left is owned by Mr. Shinagel and is about 4 ½ acres, so this will really not have an effect on the neighboring properties. Ed asked Mr. Shinagel why he doesn't just carve off another 40 feet of his property and add it onto the other lot. Mr. Shinagel said he doesn't own his property outright and he would have to get a variance from his mortgage company. Ed said he wasn't comfortable granting a variance on something that they don't know is going to be built yet. He clarified that they are asking for a variance of 20' for a house when they don't know how big it will be because they don't have the specific house plans. Attorney McVerry said that the plans they showed the commission are one possibility. Ed said he has a problem with not knowing how much of a variance they are going to need. Steve said that they do not have an A-2 survey yet because they wanted to be sure they got the variance. Once the variance is granted they will get an A-2 survey. Attorney McVerry said all the styles of house his client is looking at are 40' in length. There was further discussion regarding the abutting properties and that there will not be any effect on them. Steve said he will show the commission the map when he gets it.

VOTED: Unanimously on a motion by Arlene Schwartz-Regan and seconded by Basiliza MacCalmon to **GRANT** Appeal #1950 for a variance.

4. There were no additional items added to the agenda.
5. **VOTED:** On a motion by Basiliza MacCalmon and seconded by Arlene Schwartz-Regan to adjourn the meeting at 6:53 P.M.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Basiliza MacCalmon, Secretary/sg