MINUTES

Sachem's Head Association Zoning Board of Appeals

Town of Guilford

February 23, 2021

A virtual meeting of the Sachem's Head Association Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) was held on February 23, 2021 at 7:30 p.m. through the means of a Zoom call. With Chairman Jeffrey Cooper presiding, the meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Cooper indicated that the meeting was being recorded as required by Connecticut statute.

ZBA Members Present: Jeffrey Cooper, Doug Rollins, and Jonas Lieponis, constituting all the members of the ZBA, were present. Alternate Barbara Riley was also present.

Additionally: Jim Pretti of Criscuolo Engineering LLC appeared on behalf of Thuis Haven LLC, the property owner at 92 Prospect Avenue, Guilford seeking a variance from a decision of the Sachem's Head Association Zoning Board. Matt Wilson, the Zoning Enforcement Officer of the Sachem's Head Association was also present.

Chairman Cooper certified that the legal notice for the public hearing was posted and was being held within the specified required time. It was advertised twice in the Guilford Courier, a newspaper of general circulation, on February 11 and February 18, 2021. Notice was also given to the applicant's abutting neighbors and neighbors directly across the street by a mailing deposited in the U.S. mail on January 25, 2021.

The meeting was called on application of Paul Rebeschi of Thuis Haven, LLC, owner of 92 Prospect Avenue, Guilford, Connecticut, Map No. 001, Assessor's Lot No. 12, following a decision by the Sachem's Head Association Zoning Commission to deny the application for Zoning Compliance with respect to the building of a swimming pool in the rear of the subject property. The Zoning Commission denied the

applicant's request due to its failure to comply with the zoning requirements of maintaining a minimum distance from a principle building to qualify as an accessory structure and the failure to meet waterfront district setback requirements.

Following Mr. Pretti's presentation and questions from members of the Board, the Board, by a vote of 3-0, found that that the applicant failed to meet the conditions for a variance as established in the Sachem's Head Association Zoning Regulations. The applicant neither proved a case of a true hardship, as required, nor did the applicant establish the existence of special circumstances attached to the applicant's property which did not generally apply to other property in the neighborhood.

Accordingly, the application for a variance was denied.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Cooper

Chairman, Sachem's Head Zoning Board of Appeals