

EAST LYME ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
PUBLIC HEARING AND REGULAR MEETING  
MONDAY, JUNE 17th, 2019  
MINUTES

A Public Hearing and Regular Meeting of the East Lyme Zoning Board of Appeals was held on Monday, June 17, 2019 at 6 PM at the East Lyme Town Hall, 108 Pennsylvania Avenue, Niantic, CT.

PRESENT: Steve Carpenteri, Chairman, John Smith, Secretary, Mike Foley,  
Debbie Jett-Harris

ALSO PRESENT: Elizabeth DiSalvo, Representing the Applicants  
Lisa & David Smith, Owners/Applicant

ABSENT: Kevin Mace, David Schmidt, Alternate

FILED IN EAST LYME  
CONNECTICUT

Jun 20 2019 AT 10:01 AM/PM  
Brooke Stewart ATC  
EAST LYME TOWN CLERK

**1. Call Regular Meeting to Order**

Chairman Carpenteri called the Regular Meeting to order at: 6:05 PM.

**2. Read Notice of Public Hearing**

Mr. Carpenteri asked Mr. Smith, Secretary, to read the Agenda call of Case #3-2019 of the Meeting.

Mr. Smith, Secretary read the following:

**Case No. 3-2019: Application of Elizabeth DiSalvo, Trillium Architects, Agent for Lisa Smith, Owner, for a variance of Section 5.3.3 and Section 5.3.4 for property identified in the application as 260 Old black Point road, East Lyme, Connecticut for the demolition of an existing single family dwelling and construction of a new single family dwelling. Said parcel appears on the East Lyme Assessor's Map 2.3, Lot 21.**

The Public Hearing notice was sent to the New London Day for publication on 6/5/2019 and 6/13/2019.

Mr. Carpenteri introduced the Board members and polled each for any conflict of interest. Hearing no conflicts of interest from the members, he explained the rules of the meeting and asked that anyone speaking please stick to the subject matter of the application.

Mr. Carpenteri then called for the applicant or their representative to make their presentation.

Elizabeth DiSalvo, AIA with Trillium Architects said that she is representing the owners, Lisa and David Smith who are also present this evening. She explained that they did learn very late today that they are following the R-20 zone requirements rather than the previously thought RU-40 which does help. They are looking to demolish the existing home and build a new home in keeping with the area and trying to keep to the existing footprint. They have multiple frontages which they feel introduces the hardship and which creates a 'triangle' of space that makes it impossible to construct a home within so they have chosen to build on the existing house footprint. They are seeking a variance from the 20% lot coverage to 22.5% for the porches which are uncovered decks. If the deck is not counted they are at 19.5%. The height of the home is not an issue as it is 27.1' which is under the 30'. She noted that the shed would be an issue with regard to the 20' setbacks.

Mr. Foley asked if they could reduce the porches on the back and south side of the house or put one at ground level as that would get them to where they need to be. He noted that he had been out to see the property and that what they are proposing is in keeping with the other homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Carpenteri explained that they really are bound by working within the existing footprint and suggested that what they really should do is to work with the Zoning Official to see how they could make the plan work to their best advantage as what they are requesting really is not considered a hardship. While what they are

proposing is a wonderful addition to the neighborhood, not having a larger porch area or a shed is not considered a hardship as they can put a home on the property.

David Smith, owner said that they are seeking to live here full time and said that they really need a shed to be able to store lawn items in.

Mr. Carpenteri noted that they possibly could place a small shed 5' from the side yard (no larger than 8' x 10') as long as it was 75' from the front(s). He suggested that they meet with the Zoning Official and see what they could work out to get to the 20% lot coverage as they can do it.

Mr. Carpenteri asked how the Board members would like to proceed; noting that it was just recently that the applicant was made aware that they were following the RU-20 regulations.

Mr. Foley suggested that they continue the Public Hearing in the event that once they have worked with the Zoning Official they find it necessary.

Ms. Jett-Harris agreed it would allow them time to work on the plan and be the best way to proceed.

Mr. Smith concurred noting that he had to agree that they could not grant a variance at this time but felt that they would be able to have a nice home without seeking a variance as they are bound by the original footprint.

Mr. Carpenteri called for a motion.

**\*\*MOTION (1)**

Mr. Foley moved to continue the Public Hearing in the event it becomes necessary or until the time expires.

Ms. Jett-Harris seconded the motion.

Vote: 4 – 0 – 0. Motion passed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Carpenteri called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

**\*\*MOTION (2)**

Mr. Jett-Harris moved to adjourn this meeting of the East Lyme Zoning Board of Appeals at 6:35 PM.

Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

Vote: 4 – 0 – 0. Motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Zmitruk,  
Recording Secretary