

**Town of Milford
Zoning Board of Adjustment
August 1, 2019
Case #2019-18
Nathan and Kristine Chamberlin
Special Exception**

Present: Steve Bonczar, Chair
Rob Costantino
Michael Thornton
Wade Scott Campbell, Alternate
Karin Lagro, Alternate

Lincoln Daley, Community Development Director
Paul Dargie, Board of Selectmen Representative

Absent: Joan Dargie, Vice Chair
Tracy Steel

Secretary: Peg Ouellette

MINUTES OF 2019-18 WERE APPROVED 8/15/19

Motion to Approve: _____

Seconded: _____

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Steve Bonczar, Chair, opened the meeting and introduced the Board members. He informed all of the procedures of the Board. He read the notice of hearing and invited the applicant to present the case.

S. Bonczar asked if it was front setback or side.

L. Daley said it was a corner lot – two front setbacks to comply with.

S. Bonczar said he was just double checking.

N. Chamberlin said they were seeking relief from the front setback on the side for a garage. They had been in the area since the early '70's. In Temple the last twenty years and downsized to this property about a year ago. House was built in the '70's. Holly Lane was a paper street. It was Residential A. Side setback was 15 ft and front was 30 ft. Holly Lane is a street and they have 30 ft. setback on Holly Lane and Valhalla. Front of the house faced Valhalla. Addition was put on house in the '80's, which he pointed out on the plan. He handed out photos of the house. 24 x 20 garage main building with a jut out across front. Will be taking it back for the addition. Trying to get entryway to work. Four steps there now. That is why it was offset. He did a couple of elevations. Existing bulkhead jutted out. There would be a step. Will extend existing roof line. Will carry it down to reduce the portion in the front. Will be a step and then two steps to the door and step to the existing landing. He liked the look of the ridge running parallel to the existing roof.

M. Thornton said it was hard to do with the shallow pitch on the house and steeper on the garage.

N. Chamberlin said either way would line up with the existing eave. Wanted a six pitch on the roof. Existing was four pitch. Distance from the slab to the eave will be 12 ft. and to the existing pitch, putting it at 18 ft. This was Hilton Homes. All ranches. None originally had garages. About a third of them had added garages. Did consider an ADU but that was scrapped. He pointed out the garage in the pictures. Approximately 2 ft. over eave of existing drive.

S. Bonczar said that was his question. Pictures were helping to put into perspective with Holly Lane.

N. Chamberlin pointed it out with the picture. Neighbor was fine with it. Across the street was pretty well screened and no windows on that side. Only way to see them was on their deck. Down Holly Lane it was a very short street with no residences on it. It was just a connecting street. He outlined on another picture where it was superimposed. Re the criteria, there was no place to put it. Only other place would be in the back which didn't work. Would be more of an impact to bring it in the back.

S. Bonczar said based on the fact that he could not put in a two car garage there based on the setback.

N. Chamberlin agreed. Would also lose window looking out back. Re nuisance, no nuisance because he would do mechanical work and will be doing it in the garage instead of outside. Will increase the value of other properties. Will not affect sight distance. There was already some screening there but could put in more if that was a concern.

S. Bonczar said the design looked appropriate. If you put a two car garage on that lot that was where you could. That eave of the house was probably 15 ft. from the 30 ft. side setback.

N. Chamberlin said nol. It was 10 ft.

S. Bonczar said it was far enough off Valhalla. People coming down Holly Lane to Valhalla toward his house, it would not obstruct anything.

R. Costantino asked if there was a driveway on Holly Lane.

N. Chamberlin said no drives on Holly Lane.

R. Costantino said asked where the garage was going.

N. Chamberlin said facing Valhalla on existing drive.

R. Costantino said so it didn't impact traffic. Holly Lane was not heavily used place. He asked about property there.

N. Chamberlin said it was just a connecting street. Some people cut through from Sunview II. Not heavily travelled. Four houses on Holly Lane

S. Bonczar asked for any questions . None. He opened public comment. None. He asked for any further questions from the Board. None. He closed public comment and moved on to discussion of the special exception criteria.

1. Was the proposed use similar to those permitted in the District?

S. Bonczar said they do grant setbacks. What was proposed was a garage, which was similar to what was in the district.

M. Thornton said he thought he heard it addressed – sight lines for cornering and safety.

K. Lagro said in the picture it was very faint.

M. Thornton said from what he could ascertain he didn't see a problem.

S. Bonczar said they had to remember when they did setback it didn't mean it was the edge of the street. You still had town property to the edge of the street.

2. Was the specific site an appropriate location for the proposed use?

R. Costantino said yes, it was a driveway.

S. Bonczar said there was no issue. No change to the access to Valhalla. Will change where drive was.

3. Would the use as developed not adversely affect the adjacent area?

R. Costantino said no issue.

S. Bonczar didn't believe it would.

K. Lagro said if it was forward it could, but since it was further fall back.

S. Bonczar agreed.

4. There will be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians.

M. Thornton said none.

S. Bonczar didn't see any. Same curb cut. Sight distance form Holly and Valhalla.

R. Costantino said none

5. Adequate appropriate facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the proposed use.

R. Costantino said yes. It was a garage.

W. Campbell agreed.

S. Bonczar said they had to go through the building permit process.

VOTE: On Special Exception:

1. Is the Special Exception allowed by the ordinance?

R. Costantino – yes

K. Lagro – yes

W. Campbell – yes

M. Thornton – yes

S. Bonczar - yes

2. Are all the specified conditions present under which the Special Exception may be granted?

W. Campbell – yes

R. Costantino – yes

M. Thornton – yes

K. Lagro – yes

S. Bonczar - yes

S. Bonczar said, based on the vote, the criteria for special exception had been satisfied. The application was unanimously approved. He reminded applicant of the 30-day appeal period.

Other Business:

S. Bonczar asked if there was any other business. None. There being no other business S. Bonczar asked for motion to adjourn.

M. Thornton moved to adjourn.

R. Costantino seconded.

All in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.