The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:06 pm. Audio recording was available beginning at 7:09 pm.

Board roll call was taken.

Minutes:

Chairman O’Connor referred to the June 1, 2015 minutes. He asked for any corrections or changes. Hearing none he asked for a motion. Douglas Hamilton made a motion to approve the minutes as published. Douglas Glazier seconded. The vote was 5-0, the motion was approved.

Bills and Correspondence: None

Old Business: None

New Business

Public hearing on application for a reduction in front yard at 18 Jubrey Lane, applicant and property owner Nancy Quish.

Douglas Glazier asked the applicant to summarize the proposal. A discussion followed regarding yard requirements and steps to access the porch, followed by a discussion related to accommodating a front yard of only 23 feet in order to consider the steps as part of the structure. Applicant agreed that a reduction of 23 feet would be favorable.

A discussion followed regarding the house being built prior to current requirement of a 40 foot front yard and whether the applicant had a hardship. Douglas Glazier found the proposal to be in harmony with the neighboring properties.

Chairman O’Connor opened the public hearing, asking for those in the public in favor of the application to speak. There were no public comments. He then asked for those opposed to speak. There were no public comments.

Douglas Glazier made a motion to approve the reduction in the required front yard from 40 feet to 23 feet in order to accommodate a front porch and steps, commenting that the proposal was in harmony with the neighboring properties. Ronald King seconded. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.

Public hearing on application for a reduction in side yard at 43 Smalley Road, applicant Michael Blanchette, owner Sales Corporation.

Attorney Paul Smith, representing agent, summarized the application and request. The proposed use of the addition will be both office and storage. He continued to describe the current and proposed uses of the property including the number of employees (2) as well as proposed updates to siding, windows and a new roof for the existing building. He stated that the use would not be more intense due to the minor
nature of the addition proposed. A discussion took place about the history of the lot. Attorney Smith stated that the property has been listed for sale for quite some time with very few inquiries. A discussion took place about the hardship, the continuation of the building line to a building, so situated close to the lot line, which predates current yard requirements.

Douglas Hamilton asked the applicant to describe the proposed use in more detail. The applicant explained that the use would continue as a construction yard for small projects, storage of vehicles. Douglas Glazier asked the applicant questions about the material containers in the rear of the building. The applicant said that the container would be removed. Douglas Hamilton asked why the application and proposal wouldn’t require a use variance in addition to the side yard variance. Attorney Smith replied that the use was preexisting and may exist and continue, the variance was requested due to side yard and extension of the building. A discussion followed regarding same. A discussion then took place about landscaping. Attorney Smith suggested the addition of a white fence, privacy fence and arborvitae in order to soften the look of the property for neighbors as a condition of approval. His client, the applicant, was agreeable to offering this. Douglas Hamilton had further questions about the legal non-conformity of the use and a discussion followed.

Chairman O’Connor opened the public hearing asking for those who were in favor of the application to speak.

Tamie Quagliaroli of 233 Sutton Avenue spoke in favor. Tara Wabalas of 37 Smalley had questions about the location of the addition, which Attorney Smith clarified that the location was to the rear of the building. A short conversation followed. Joe Sartori of 460 Reed Avenue spoke in favor. David Bonvouloir of DBON Ironworks at 442 Spring Street spoke in favor. Lori Quagliaroli of 4 Norman Drive spoke in favor. Joe LaPierre of LaPierre Electric at 445 Spring Street spoke in favor.

Chairman O’Connor reminded the public to give their comments one by one, then after all comments are in, the applicant will speak to those comments made. He then opened the floor to those in opposition. Rick Oliveira of 47-49 Smalley was not in favor. Michael Dondeck of 33 Smalley was not in favor. A discussion occurred about the abutters notices.

Attorney Smith addressed questions and comments from the public and showed various elevations related to the addition proposed. Discussion followed about potential uses for the property.

Chairman O’Connor asked for any wishes for further discussion from the Commission members. There were none. Douglas Glazier made a motion to approve, commented on the hardship, clarified the use as office and storage and stated that the proposal was in harmony with the existing use and was a small addition, that the proposal would also have to go to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval as a next step and finally would require a building permit. Ronald King seconded. The motion was approved 5-0.

Public hearing on 11 Northgate Drive Department of Motor Vehicle License Location Approval – General Repair, applicant Thomas Hillary. The applicant described the proposal and stated that the current owner uses most of the space in the building to store his tree service equipment. Douglas Glazier summarized what the applicant proposed and a discussion followed about the uses on the site such as crane storage, equipment storage and a tree service office space. The applicant clarified that no body work or spray painting would occur as part of this license approval. Douglas Hamilton clarified that this was a General Repair license. A discussion followed about parking designation for the applicant and the space of the bay to be used.
Chairman O’Connor opened the public hearing to those in favor. There were none. He then opened the hearing to those opposed. There were none. Douglas Glazier made a motion to approve, clarified that a hardship was not needed due to this being a DMV location application. Douglas Hamilton proposed to add to the motion that 1) the parking was not to exceed the spaces allocated on the plan for this user and 2) work would not take place prior to obtaining the DMV license through the State of Connecticut. Ronald King seconded. The motion was approved 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:35.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chairman Shane O’Connor