

OCT 26 2016

TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE  
EAST HAVEN, CONN.

Stacy Grwino, CTC  
TOWN CLERK

TOWN OF EAST HAVEN, CT  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING  
OCTOBER 20, 2016 7:00PM EAST HAVEN SENIOR CENTER

MEMBERS PRESENT:        ROBERT FALCIGNO-CHAIRMAN  
                                  GEORGE HENNESSEY-VICE CHAIRMAN  
                                  CHARLES LANG-ABSENT  
                                  JOSEPH PORTO  
                                  DONALD THOMAS

ALTERNATES PRESENT:    VINCENT LETTIERI

STAFF PRESENT:            ALFRED ZULLO-ATTORNEY  
                                  CHRISTOPHER SOTO-ZEO  
                                  SAL BRANCATI, DIRECTOR OF ADMIN. & MGT  
                                  SUSAN IANNONE-CLERK  
                                  DANELLE FEELEY

Chairman Falcigno called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M., appointed Vincent Lettieri as a sitting member, making it a quorum of 5 members. He then explained the procedure of the Board to all in attendance.

Joseph Porto made a motion to appoint Susan Iannone as clerk. Donald Thomas seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Donald Thomas made a motion to approve the minutes from last month's meeting. Motion seconded by George Hennessey. Motion carried unanimously.

**APPEAL HEARING #16-28**

**APPELLANT:** Gloria Rispoli; Property Concerned: 12 Smith St.; *Appeal of Notice of Violation/ Action of Z.E.O. (un-permitted structure)*

Attorney Bernard Pellegrino, The Pellegrino Law Firm, New Haven, addressed the board on behalf of the appellant. He stated there are 3 parts to the appeal and would refer to the documents he attached to the appeal. Attorney Pellegrino stated he does not dispute the first part that the 1986 variance granted to the prior owner that any work on the property requires a zoning permit; the second part states the building violates the set-back and height requirements; and the third part, what he considers to be the main issue, is that the dwelling continues to remain in violation of the 1986 variance. He explained that in 1986 the prior owner requested a variance to

move lot lines for the properties he owned, shown on the hearing map as Parcel A and Parcel B. The variance (Exhibit B) was granted and said nothing about the removal of any structure on the property. The minutes (Exhibit D), from that hearing, say nothing about the removal of the house as a condition of the variance. There is a note (Exhibit E), in the 1986 files, that said variance stipulation is the barn to be removed according to plan before permit issues. Map shows Parcel B, Morgan Ave., 2 barns and says both of which to be removed. Map for Parcel A, which is the property Mrs. Rispoli now owns, shows existing house to be removed. Subsequent to the variance being granted one barn on Parcel B was removed, one barn remained and a permit (Exhibit F) was issued for that property. The prior owner pulled a building permit to construct a house, on Parcel A, shown on the map as new proposed house. He requested the zoning permit, with the other house still remaining, zoning permit was issued, building permit (Exhibit G) was issued, the proposed house was built and a C.O. was issued. Attorney Pellegrino went on to say his position is the original variance did not stipulate the house, built in 1920, needed to be removed; that all permits were issued while the house remained and has remained, uncontested for the past 30 years, makes it a legally non-conforming structure on the site. He made the same argument for the set-back/height requirement violation since there were no zoning regulations in 1920. It has been there for more than 3 years without an enforcement action taken making it legally non-conforming and any notice of violation under the legal doctrine for a municipal estoppel bars the town to order the house be removed. The house has been on the towns' assessment and Mrs. Rispoli has been paying taxes on it for many years.

ZEO Christopher Soto explained someone came into his office making inquires on the property and his office also received several complaints about an illegal unit and work being done on the property. Upon inspection he noticed an illegal floating deck being constructed (on Parcel A) without permits and within the required 10' set back. Once he looked at the files he then noted the violation of variance to take down the other house. Also, from aerial reconnaissance and from GIS, he realized there was other non-permitted construction including several additions and a pool. The original variance was to make the non-conforming lot a conforming lot and therefore tear down the existing house and build a new house. As far as he could tell the town has always had a rule of only one dwelling on a lot. If the board, in 1986, intended to allow a second house on the property then there would have been a second variance granted. State statute 8-13a, 3-year rule for which a structure can stand without zoning actions, applies to the size of a non-conforming parcel and the location of the structure on the lot. It does not apply in this situation in regards to the building and variance violations. He believes the issue of the house removal needs to be resolved before any other permits can be issued. The record he provided to the commissioners included a full history of what he has in his office on the property. The comment on the map regarding the barns was not an issue for him. He does not know why that was the only comment or stipulation. His stand is that the plan was submitted with the house to be removed and that would have given the board the impression that the house would not remain standing. It now creates a non-conforming situation that was never addressed when the original variance was granted.

Attorney Alfred Zullo agreed with ZEO Christopher Soto that regulations do not allow for two houses on a lot. If another house had been intended on the lot, then another variance would have been asked for. It was unnecessary to put a condition on the variance that the house should be removed since it was not an allowed use. He believes the condition of the barns was put there because it represented they were going to do them and we had no control over forcing them to take down on another parcel. The town probably allowed the house to stay up while the other house was being built but the applicant represented on the map to the board the house was to be

removed. 8-13a only applies to setback lines, location and height. This involves a second house on the lot that is not allowed by our regulation. Passage of time is not an element that prevents the estoppel for laches to be evoked against the municipality. The towns' delay in proceeding against a property owner cannot be deemed a waiver of their duty to the public to uphold the zoning requirements. There is no evidence of the four requirements to establish municipal estoppel. He believes the zoning enforcement officer's actions were proper and correct in issuing the violations.

Attorney Pellegrino responded he has spoken to the original applicant Mr. DeBenedet. No minutes of what was said existed and the map was presented at the hearing. Variance was recorded so it provided record for future residents. Mrs. Rispoli bought the property with both houses on land records. She had a title search, relied on recorded variance when she bought the house and spent thousand of dollars. He thinks that's municipal estoppel. Says there are many properties with multiple houses. This preceded zoning. The letter doesn't state set back violation relates to the deck. Attorney Zullo said that she was talked to first about the deck. So the first part of the notice is about the deck and the second part of the notice is about variance violation. When she saw the variance it directed her to the zoning file with map that said house would be removed. Attorney Pellegrino stated the note said only one barn to be removed. The other barn and house remained when zoning permits were allowed. He questioned why were zoning and building permits issued in 1987 if the house was suppose to be removed. Chairman Falcigno asked when original owner got the variance with stipulation then why didn't he take it down and buyer should beware. Attorney Pellegrino said variance had no stipulation and the filing in zoning office has note that says barn to be removed. He said the map shows 2 houses, stipulation was met and she did her due diligence. Attorney Zullo stated variance did not need stipulation since zoning does not allow for two houses and it clearly stated on the map. This should have been a red flag. Attorney Pellegrino said the assessor couldn't believe it's illegal since she has been paying taxes on it.

In Favor:

- Tom Rispoli, 11 Cove Street, New Haven spoke in favor of his mother who lives on the property. He stated she's done her best to keep the house she and his father purchased about 15 years ago. His father passed away suddenly about 4 years ago. She's worked tirelessly sometimes 70-80 hours per week to keep the house. She has a 33 year old, disabled son living with her who can't work and doesn't leave the house. Just wants them to know she is not being sneaky. Just trying to raise a family and to be a great person in society.
- Rich Salone, New Haven, spoke in favor. He stated the house has had 2 title searches done and questioned if the town was doing their due diligence wouldn't these violations come up on the title search. How can you come down on a resident now when someone dropped the ball 27 years ago? She is not the original owner. Now you want her to tear down the house and devalue her property. The town loses taxes and everyone loses. Borders on insanity. Step back and take a reasonable view. Nobody gets hurt by this house staying.

Opposed to:

- Kenney Barber, 7 Old Town Highway, stated there's a back story and in 1986-87 he was a member on the council, got a call on this issue, spoke to Czar and that the house was suppose to come down. He 's sure Mrs. Rispoli bought the house in good faith and did her due diligence. The reason there were complaints was in August moving vans came and a bunch of college students moved in. People got alarmed that this 3500 s.f. house was turning into a frat house. People were defending the neighborhood and their properties. He is not trying to take money out of her pocket but wants the neighborhood to stay nice. There are expensive homes and a lot of money spent on taxes and on maintenance. When they saw 7-8 college students, a party with students spilling over into the street and the police got involved. He said everyone knew the house was suppose to be taken down, but that is not the issue rather the concern over the number of people living there and the affect on their property values.
- Anthony DellaRocco, 187 Morgan Avenue, pointed out 12 Smith St. is a short distance from the back of his property. Area is zoned R3 and properties are small and close together. He said in August Mrs. Rispoli moved out of the big house into the small cottage and her son and 7 college students moved into the big house. He presented a copy of the police report filed in August related to a large party of college students being held at the house. He stated the owner never applied for or obtained a special exception or a certificate of compliance to have unrelated people living in the house. His main issue is if this is allowed it will set a precedent making way for other residents to do the same. Quality of life and property values will suffer and would have the same problems as Hamden. He doesn't know Mrs. Rispoli very well, but said her son Rick is a nice kid.

Chairman Falcigno said this is getting away from the issue of a secondary house on the property. Creating a rooming house would be a separate issue. ZEO Soto stated this issued would also be addressed later this evening to set a public hearing. Attorney Zullo stated a notice of violation was sent out on this issue.

- Dana Walker, 177 Morgan Avenue, stated her property backs up to the yellow house. When she purchased her house she was told the yellow house would come down and improve the value of her property. She feels the house is unsightly and it does affect other property values.
- Sandra Stratman, stated her property abuts this property. She was told in 1986-87 that the yellow house was coming down. The builder told her he was going to build another house and alerted her to that fact. The house has been rented for the last 11 years.

Attorney Pellegrino agreed the two issues are separate and a hearing will be set for a future date. In conclusion to reiterate the record is unclear that the variance required this house to come down. The house is still standing since 1986 and subsequently permits have been issued. The deck is another issue. The municipal estoppel argument is directly on point. To uphold the order to have the house come down would be significantly detrimental to her and since she bought the house after doing her due diligence. Their appeal should be sustained and the house should be allowed to remain.

Attorney Zullo stated the assessor's record shows the main house is 3,510 s.f. The house they are talking about is 704 s.f. and does not add significant value to the property.

Sal Brancati asked if there was a zoning compliance letter issued on this property and wouldn't it be on the title search.

Chairman Falcigno responded that is not involved with a title search.

Attorney Zullo requested the assessor's card be part of the record.

Attorney Pellegrino stated the assessor's card depicts the modest nature of the house and maybe it should be restored and allowed to remain.

Attorney Zullo reiterated he wanted the assessor's card for the record to reflect it doesn't have significant value.

Chairman Falcigno closed Hearing 16-28

Donald Thomas looked at lot size/coverage to figure a way to keep the house. He would have to vote against appeal. Wondered if the two houses can be connected to be one house.

Attorney Zullo stated you would need a variance.

Soto stated regulations do not allow two dwellings on one lot and would require a variance. If the houses were combined it would become a multiple dwelling unit and would trigger other variances needed for lot size.

Attorney Zullo said he wants each commission member to state their reason when they vote.

Chairman Falcigno stated the town does not sanction two houses on a lot and combining them would require additional variances. Stipulations are put on variances when needed as a control. Recommendation is to deny the appeal. It should be further addressed in court. The deck being illegal also has to be addressed.

Donald Thomas made a motion to deny the appeal to uphold the regulation that does not allow for two houses on a parcel and the deck is not allowed because of the set back and there is no variance for it. Joseph Porto seconded the motion.

George Hennessey, Joseph Porto and Vincent Lettieri all denied the appeal for the same reasons.

Motion carried.

16-31

APPLICANT: Sergio & Maria Ramirez; Property Affected: 371 Thompson St.; Zone R-4, Map 540, Block 6530, Lot 002 – *legalize kitchen addition (already built)*.

VARIANCE: Schedule B, Line 9: side yard setback: 25 ft. required, 20.84 ft. proposed

Angelo Reyes spoke on behalf of Sergio Ramirez. His wife was not present. Mr. Reyes helped Mr. Ramirez rebuild and orchestrate everything. He explained there was a fire about 1 year ago leaving them homeless. He has had issues with the banks and insurance companies. Mr. Reyes stated he offered to help rebuild, pulled the required permit and used the towns plot plan from the assessor's office.

Chairman Falcigno asked Mr. Reyes if he ever had the property surveyed by an engineer.

ZEO Christopher Soto stated this is a standard variance application, therefore he should state the variance requested (line 6) and the hardship (line 7).

Mr. Reyes seeking variance where 25 feet is required and 20.84 ft. are proposed according to Schedule B legalized kitchen addition that is already built. He then read the hardship that the dimensions on the plans drawn either moved or were wrong. The home and addition is already built.

ZEO Christopher Soto stated the applicant used hand drawn plot from his files and which was erroneous and was probably used for a pool or a shed. They believed they had 25' set back. He can't proceed with C.O. until additional permits are pulled and the variance issue is resolved. They pulled permits, hired a surveyor and architect to review plans. Attempted lot line adjustment with neighbor.

Falcigno questioned if he is a contractor and that there was a problem.

Reyes takes full responsibility and wants to comply with everything.

Chairman Falcigno asked if there are other issues.

ZEO Christopher Soto replied the initial permit was for the kitchen addition. Subsequent to that dormers were put on and retaining walls without permits. The permit was rescinded and notice of violation was issued. He will not issue any other permits until the variance issue is rectified. If the height of the house exceeds 30' they will have to come back to submit new paperwork. If any other variances are needed they will have to come before the board again and explain their hardship.

Chairman Falcigno questioned if fines should be issued since he Mr. Reyes is a contractor and should know better. ZEO Soto answered that would be up to the board to decide if fines should be issued.

Donald Thomas asked if we could stipulate no further variances.

Mr. Reyes stated they hired the surveyors and architects and he doesn't believe any other variances will be needed.

In favor: none

Opposed to:

- Bob Sand, 501 Thompson St. stated he lives in the neighborhood and has watched the reconstruction since after the fire. He thought the house would be re-built, but instead is a reconstruction. They have added a front porch, retaining wall and a deck. He inquired with the building department if a plan had been submitted and at that time was told no. The roof has been raised and added height to the house. He has concerns this house is not legal with the things they have done. They should have followed the correct procedures and now come back before the board asking for a pass.
- Michael Gargano, 395 Thompson St. stated the property line is along his backyard. His only concern is if the variance is granted will it have a negative impact on his property value. The set back is the only issue, but the house is larger than it was before and is 4 ft. closer to the property line. Mr. Reyes notified him there was an issue and asked about a land swap which he did not agree to. He questioned why the building department did not notify him that there was an issue since he is a neighbor.

ZEO Soto explained it is not typical to notify the neighbors of a notice of violation.

Donald Thomas stated he did not think the 4' set back would make a difference to his property value.

Mr. Reyes stated when he approached Mr. Gargano he was not aware the he had future plans for his property. He did not want to cause any problems for the neighbors. He said this family wants to stay there forever. He again stated he takes full responsibility. He thanked Chris (Soto) for guiding him. Nothing else is out of code.

Chairman Falcigno closed hearing 16-31.

Chairman Falcigno recommended the application be denied because there are too many issues pending. He will waive the usual 6 months and give him 30 days to get all issues resolved.

ZEO Soto recommended to table the application and that they bring proof at the next meeting instead of having to re-apply by Monday at noon.

Donald Thomas questioned that this would hold up other permits.

ZEO Soto replied that if tabled he will not move forward with any other permits. The envelope of the house is already done and any other work is interior and permits are a procedural matter.

Donald Thomas made a motion to table. Joseph Porto seconded.

Roll call vote: all in favor. Motion carried.

16-32 & C.A.M.

**APPLICANT:** Michael Mauriello; Property Affected: 31 Cosey Beach Ave; Zone R-1, Map 30, Block 32, Lot 01 – *repair/rebuild two family home.*

**VARIANCE:** Schedule B, Line 2: lot area; Line 7: front yard setback; Line 8: rear yard setback; Line 9: side yard setback; Line 11: lot coverage; Section 44.11.3; Section 25.4.3

ZEO Soto explained the board would be deciding on two items. The coastal site plan/CAM application and the variances to build a new home on the existing footprint. There are comments from DEEP to help decide if there is any negative impact on the environment.

Attorney Bernard Pellegrino, The Pellegrino Law Firm, New Haven, addressed the board on behalf of Mr. Mauriello. Also, with him is Rick Raymond from Giordano Associates who is the project engineer who designed the plans. The home, built in 1922, is located in the R-1 zone. It suffered irreparable severe storm damage and is uninhabited. The most prudent action is to demolish and rebuild. Due to changes in zoning regulations, DEEP and FEMA rules the house will need to be elevated above flood plain. Mr. Mauriello has done the due diligence and has gotten a favorable letter from the DEEP. The hardship is the house needs to be rebuilt according to new the regulations and why the variances are needed. Attorney Pellegrino then outlined the lot size requirements and the variances requested. The new plan will reduce the non-conforming lot size. The house is 34' and is within the height requirements, but did expand the yard requirements by the step up provisions. The letter from DEEP is favorable and supportive from an environmental standpoint and recognizes the grandfathered nature of the use.

Opposed to:

- Sue Pellegrino, Bradford Ave. expressed her concern why the house has not been torn down, neighbors complained of rodents and the lack of upkeep. She wants to know why the house is not being taken down now and that it would be a better initial first view to have a clear lot to sell.

Chairman Falcigno stated that the applicant with his attorney have stated the house will come down. If the applicant was to get a favorable report from the board tonight, then they could mandate the house be torn down in 30 days.

ZEO Soto stated that would be problematic since the owner still needs to finish several processes with the state and get a certificate of permission.

Mr. Brancati explained that about 9 months to a year ago, he issued a demolition order. Since Mr. Mauriello started the process to build a new home he held back on enforcing the order. If Mr. Mauriello refused to demolish the house, then the town would step in and do it. The town's building inspection could not determine if the property was unsafe, therefore he could not force them to take it down. He has not seen any rodents himself, but does not deny that the neighbors have. The DEEP sited in their letter that it is a tear down. We need to know what the states' time frame is in order to put a definitive time frame on the demolition.

ZEO Soto stated the building official still retains his authority to enforce a demolition order at any time. We've been understanding of the process that Mr. Mauriello has to go thru.

Mr. Raymond stated upon this approval he is still waiting for Marcie (from the state) to tell him if it's a certificate of permission or a full-blown application and which would take another month or two for their approval. Then the process starts to move forward with demo and rebuilding the house. One of the reasons it hasn't been taken down is this property is in the coastal jurisdiction line. If vacant for two years the state could take it over and his client loses a lot of money. Engineers say the house will not fall over.

Mr. Brancati thinks as long as Mr. Mauriello is cooperative with the neighbor then they can work in harmony to get this accomplished. We need to be sensitive to the people that live in the area. Grass can be cut in front of the property to improve the appearance.

Attorney Pellegrino added they want to obtain variances before demo the house so non-conformances aren't lost. The same is true for DEEP if there is a lapse of time between take down and rebuild then they could retain their title jurisdiction.

ZEO Soto read an anonymous letter from the Cosey Beach residents requesting the town temporarily delay the CAM approval variance. They want the property taken down because of asbestos, fence and blight reasons.

Oppose to:

- Wendy Bellmore, 57 Catherine St., expressed her concern that at high tide the parking underneath the house would be flooded and will putting fill be a problem. Doesn't want to deny fair use of property. Had concerns about the numbers of variances needed and changes to the tidal flood plan.

Mr. Raymond explained the area would be raised approx. 2.5 ft. to raise house out of the high tide line. The plan first went to DEEP. It's their jurisdiction and they are on board.

Attorney Pellegrino stated we would get all permits in accordance with the guideline for removal and environmental issues.

- Joe Harding, 84 Catherine St. talked about his concerns for global warming and water rises and he hopes the town can look at a more comprehensive plan.
- Bob Sand, 501 Thompson St., East Haven Land Trust, stated their job is to take care of surrounding properties of the Bradford Preserve and that it is adjacent to this property. His concern is that raising the house and filling in underneath will push the water somewhere else. This could pose a problem to someone else.
- Niki Whitehead, Director of the East Haven Land Trust, stated they haven't had a lot time to review the application. The land trust is commenting on the coastal site plan. Provided photo to show relationship of house to the Bradford Preserve. She did does not believe the entire property is in the tidal wetlands. She stated that she and the DEEP

would like included, in the plan, meaningful set backs from the tidal wetlands during construction and once the structure is there.

Chairman Falcigno stated there is a pre-existing house on the property and which will be rebuilt on the same footprint. Owner has pre-existing non-conforming use.

In favor:

- Anthony Canjetto spoke in favor. He builds houses and is a friend of Mike. He put up for sale sign, but got people who wanted to renovate. He is willing to help Mike re-build in cooperation with the town and the state.

Chairman Falcigno closed hearing 16-32.

Donald Thomas made a motion to approve the variance and approve CAM report with the stipulation the builders comply with future CAM and DEEP requirements. Joseph Porto seconded the motion.

Roll call vote: all in favor. Motion carried.

APPEAL #16-33

**APPELLANT:** Gloria Rispoli; Property Concerned: 12 Smith St.; *Appeal of Notice of Violation/ Action of Z.E.O. (rooming/ boarding house):* Set Public Hearing Date

Donald Thomas made a motion to set the Public Hearing Date for November 17, 2016. Joseph Porto seconded.

Roll call vote: all in favor. Motion carried.

16-34

**APPLICANT:** Marko Mitrovic; Property Affected: 364 North High St.; Zone R-2, Map 270, Block 3417, Lot 005 – *dormer addition.*

**VARIANCE:** Schedule B, Line 8: rear yard setback: 25 ft. required, 10 ft. proposed; Line 9: side yard setback: 15 ft. required, 8 ft. proposed

Mark Mitrovic stated hardship: due to roof leak he built a dormer to use unused space. In 2006 he had new roof and windows put on. Roof is now leaking. An engineer looked at it and said the roof was improperly installed. The dormer is small and he would to change the roof in order to gain more space.

In Favor: none

Oppose to: none

Chairman Falcigno closed hearing 16-34.

Donald Thomas made a motion to approve. Joseph Porto seconded.

Roll call vote: all in favor. Motion carried.

16-35

APPLICANT: S & S Properties, LLC; Property Affected: 499 Thompson Ave.; Zone R-1, Map 190, Block 2314, Lot 006 – *Second floor expansion.*

VARIANCE: Schedule B, Line 7: street line setback: 25 ft. required, 19 ft. proposed (Tyler Ave Side); Line 7: street line setback: 25 ft. required, 22 ft. proposed (Thompson Ave Side)

Scott Santoroski spoke hardship. House is on a corner lot; wants to raise a foot and add a front dormer to make it more livable.

In favor:

- Fred Parlato, 146 Tyler St., owns adjacent property. Says Scott's work is excellent. Plans for the house will enhance the neighborhood and improve his property value.
- Michael Liso, 85 Victor St., he has seen 3 other houses rehabbed by Scott and thinks he does excellent work. Work on this house will greatly improve the neighborhood.

Oppose to: none

Chairman Falcigno closed hearing 16-35.

Donald Thomas made a motion to approve. Vincent Lettieri seconded.

Roll call vote: all in favor. Motion carried.

16-36

APPLICANT: EH 653 LLC c/o David McDermott; Property Affected: 655 Main St.; Zone CB-2, Map 230, Block 3108, Lot 005 – *sign replacement.*

VARIANCE: Section 43.5.1.3 Sign height: 25 ft. max height, 47 ft. existing, 35 ft. proposed; Section 43.5.1.4 Sign area: 120 sq. ft. max (12 ft. max dimension in length or width), 225 sq. ft. existing (15 ft. width), 315 sq. ft. proposed (47 ft. Height x 9 ft. width)

Kevin Syombathy, spoke on behalf of McDermott Auto Group/Lexus, New Haven. The current sign has a 1997 variance. The total face of the new sign will be slightly increased.

ZEO Soto stated the new sign would be more conforming.

In favor: none

Oppose to:

- Francis Carbone, 639 Main St. asked for clarification about which sign would be replaced on the property.

Chairman Falcigno closed hearing 16-36.

Donald Thomas made a motion to approve. Joseph Porto seconded.

Roll call vote: all in favor. Motion carried.

16-37

APPLICANT: Timothy Lee c/o Maria Saulino; Property Affected: 280 Foxon Rd.; Zone CD, Map 470, Block 5936, Lot 002 – *restaurant addition*.

VARIANCE: Schedule B, Line 9: side yard setback 20 ft. required, 2.5 ft. proposed

Attorney Timothy Lee spoke on behalf of Neil Saulino, John and Maria's Pizza. The surveyor did not show the full amount of the addition on the site plan. He has a letter from the neighbor and property owner approving the plan.

In favor: none

Oppose to: none

Chairman Falcigno closed hearing 16-37.

Joseph Porto made a motion to approve. Donald Thomas seconded.

Roll call vote: all in favor. Motion carried.

SEE VOTING

VOTING:

16- 28 DENIED

Falcigno - yes  
Hennessey- yes  
Porto - yes  
Thomas - yes  
Lettieri - yes

Appeal 16-31 TABLED

Falcigno - yes  
Hennessey- yes  
Porto - yes  
Thomas - yes  
Lettieri - yes

16-32 & C.A.M. APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS OF STIPULATIONS

Falcigno - yes  
Hennessey- yes  
Porto - yes  
Thomas - yes  
Lettieri - yes

16-33 APPROVED

Falcigno - yes  
Hennessey- yes  
Porto - yes  
Thomas - yes  
Lettieri - yes

16-34 APPROVED

Falcigno - yes  
Hennessey- yes  
Porto - yes  
Thomas - yes  
Lettieri - yes

16-35 APPROVED

Falcigno - yes  
Hennessey- yes  
Porto - yes  
Thomas - yes  
Lettieri - yes

16-36 APPROVED

Falcigno - yes  
Hennessey- yes  
Porto - yes  
Thomas - yes  
Lettieri - yes

16-37 APPROVED

Falcigno - yes  
Hennessey- yes  
Porto - yes  
Thomas - yes  
Lettieri - yes

A motion was made by Donald Thomas to adjourn, seconded by George Hennessey.

Voice vote: all in favor-none oppose-none abstain. Motion carried.

Chairman Falcigno adjourned the meeting at 9:52 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan Iannone  
Clerk