

Zoning Board of Appeals
Town Hall
Deep River, Connecticut 06417

2011 SEP 22 A 10: 14
RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
DEEP RIVER CT
September 20, 2011

Minutes

The following members were present: Grohs, Gamerdinger, Rayner, Judd, Alt: Scharr,
Atty: Sylvia Rutkowska

The Board on motion by Gamerdinger, seconded by Rayner the minutes of Jan. 17, 2011
were approved.

On motion by Gamerdinger, seconded by Rayner Scharr was appointed to sit for
Ackerman

The Board held a public hearing on the following case:

11-2 Thomas J. and Cheri Ann Perry, Owners, 112 Kirtland St. , Deep River, CT. 06417
appeal to add to structure for use as a family residence located at 112 Kirtland St., Lot
No. 62-22 on the South side of Kirtland St. 0 feet from the intersection of Phelps Lane,
Zone R-20 Variance of 5.5.1 Minimum Lot size and 5.5.11 lot coverage.

On motion by Gamerdinger, seconded by Judd, the call was approved.

Brian Buckley presented the case on behalf of the owners. Many pictures and views of
existing structures were viewed. Tom Perry added information about the property and its
previous improvements. Kent and Bethany Kohary had no objection, as well as
Katherine Smith, property owners in the area.

The following spoke in opposition: Ron Hedwell, father of adjacent owner Kristen
Hempel, raised objection to the water that comes from the barn eaves onto the property.

A letter was read from: Zoe McGamery stating that the proposed addition would have no
negative impact to the neighborhood. It was signed also by Christopher Gardner.
However, the letter from Kristen Hempel, owner at 10 Phelps Lane, was adamantly
against the Perry's being allowed a variance citing issues about existing wells, leach
fields, and septic tanks.

The Board questioned the Perry's about the previous additions and what they were used
for. Also the issue of water run off from the barn was discussed. After no more questions
the public portion of the meeting was closed.

For purposes of discussion, Gamerdinger moved and seconded by Rayner that the
variances be approved. After much discussion it was noted that the variance of 5.5.1
size of 30,000 feet would call for too much of a variance. Lot coverage as called for in
5.5.11 would be 3.63 % greater than the regulations permitted. It was finally determined
that it would be best to withdraw the motion for approval as moved by Gamerdinger and
seconded by Rayner. It was then moved by Scharr, seconded by Judd to deny the variance
without prejudice The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50p.m.

Donald R. Grohs
Chairman

