

Ledyard Zoning Board of Appeals

Application # 852 - Startz, 9 Mullberry Drive 10/19/05

Application # 846 - Fuller, 103 Military Hwy. 4/20/05

Application # 837 - Bancroft, 4 Smith Pond Way, 8/18/04

Application # 822 - Onorato, 109 Military Hwy, 2-19-03

**#85 Inchcliffe Drive, next door to #83 Inchcliffe Drive is
Approx. 54' from the center line of Town road.**

This application is consistent with the other homes in the area that don't meet set backs under 9.2.2 of the Zoning Regulations.

This application is consistent with the above mentioned properties that the Zoning Board of Appeals has approved on the dates listed.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this application.

**Zoning Board of Appeals
Regular Meeting Minutes
October 19, 2005**

Town Council Chambers, Town Hall Annex, Ledyard, Connecticut

- I. The regular meeting was called to order at 8:20 p.m.
- II. Roll Call: Present were members V. Godino, P. Iby, J. Mathews, J. Proctor and S. Uschmann. Mr. King was absent and Ms. Moritz was excused.

Chairman Mathews noted that according to State law no additional information could be added either verbal or written.

III. NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Mathews asked if the members had any further questions regarding the application. No additional questions were asked at this time.

MOTION to approve Application #852 - Todd & April Startz, (owner/applicant) 9 Mulberry Drive, Gales Ferry request for a variance of Section 9.2.2, a 44ft reduction of the 75ft minimum setback from a Town Road (R-20), based on the hardship of location in a CAM zone requiring the structure be placed above the 100 year flood line, wetlands are on the property and the topography (steep decline) directly behind the house. The house as constructed is not detrimental to the neighborhood which is attested to by the letters of support for the variance. Moved by Mr. Godino, seconded by Mr. Proctor
VOTE - Unanimous and so declared

Mrs. Iby noted the proposed variance is the best solution for a very real problem with the placement of the house.

Mr. Godino stated his reasons for recommending approval are contained in the main motion.

Chairman Mathews commented the owner should not be held accountable for the actions of the contractor, this combined with the reasons noted in the motion by Mr. Godino.

Mr. Uschmann believed the owners did everything possible to make the project go correctly and was hindered by the contractor.

Mr. Proctor stated he voted to approve based on the errors made by the contractor and that this variance is still within the scope and intent of the original variance.

MOTION to approve Application #853 - Edwin Ivy, (owner/applicant) 1646 Center Groton Road, Ledyard request for a variance of Section 9.1, a 3ft