

Town of Milford
Zoning Board of Adjustment Minutes
April 19, 2007
William Mahar
Case #12-07
Special Exception

Present: Len Harten, Chairman
 Katherine Bauer
 Bob Levenson
 Fletcher Seagroves
 Steve Bonczar - Alternate

Secretary: Kathryn Parenti

William Mahar, owner of GTA Auto, 19 Perry Road, Map 7, Lot 25, in the Integrated Commercial Industrial "ICII" district, is requesting a Special Exception from Article VII, Section 7.067.H.C to allow a sixteen (16) square foot off-premise sign on 108 Old Wilton Road, Map 7, Lot 26.

Motion to Approve: _____

Seconded: _____

Signed: _____

Date: _____

L. Harten, chairman, read the notice of hearing into the record.

B. Levenson noted there should be a correction in the notice of hearing; it should read Article VII, Section 7.067 not Article V, Section 7.067. Also, he noted the district should be ICI II instead of ICI.

L. Harten then read the abutters list into the record. William Mahar, Jr, applicant, Roger Bucknam owner of Map 7 Lot 26, 108 Old Wilton Road were present. He then invited the applicant to present his case.

W. Mahar passed around a photo of his proposed sign.

B. Levenson asked if the sign would be lighted.

W. Mahar replied that it was not; it would only be seen during the day. He stated it would be smaller than a 4'x4' sign. He noted a sixteen (16) square foot sign is allowed and his would not be that large. He said he has permission from Roger Bucknam for a sign that is similar in size to the one currently on the corner.

S. Bonczar asked where the sign would be located.

W. Mahar said it would be on the corner of Perry Road and Old Wilton Road.

L. Harten asked where it would be facing and if it could be seen from both sides.

W. Mahar replied it would be seen from both directions on Old Wilton Road.

S. Bonczar asked what material the sign would be made of, how much maintenance would be needed and what kind of posts it would be mounted on.

W. Mahar said it was comprised of a piece of painted steel with vinyl lettering. The sign was made by Patterson Signs. He said it would be mounted on a small metal frame that was very similar to real estate signs.

K. Bauer wondered if it would be visible when snow from the road is plowed around it.

W. Mahar replied it probably wouldn't be visible as it wasn't visible during the flood. He stated he would probably have to shovel around it.

K. Bauer noted it could be mounted up higher, as high as eight (8) feet.

W. Mahar said he would have to discuss any changes with Roger Bucknam, on whose property the sign will be placed. He said the goal was to attract more business and to show where he is located.

B. Levenson commented it is very straightforward and is allowed by the ordinance.

L. Harten asked him to go through the five criteria.

1. The proposed use shall be similar to those permitted in the district:

W. Mahar replied the proposed use is allowable by special exception.

2. The specific site is an appropriate location for the proposed use:

W. Mahar said the site was appropriate for the sign because the business is off the main road and a directional sign would help to improve visibility.

3. The use as developed will not adversely affect the adjacent area:

W. Mahar said this location is a commercial /industrial area and it will not adversely affect the area.

4. There will be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians:

W. Mahar replied the sign location is out of the right of way and will not affect driver visibility.

5. Adequate appropriate facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the proposed use:

W. Mahar said the adequate location of the sign would not cause any hazards.

K. Bauer wanted it noted in the record that there was no opposition to the five criteria.

L. Harten asked if there were any additional comments.

Roger Bucknam, owner of the site where the sign will be placed stated there was a small sign at the corner of Perry Road and Old Wilton Road and he did not have any problems with it.

L. Harten asked if the board had any questions. There were none so he closed the public portion of the hearing. He asked the board if there were any additional comments. There were none so he then called for a vote.

1. Is the exception allowed by the ordinance?

K. Bauer – yes S. Bonczar – yes F. Seagroves – yes B. Levenson – yes

L. Harten – yes

2. Are the specified conditions present under which the exception may be granted?

S. Bonczar – yes F. Seagroves – yes B. Levenson - yes K. Bauer – yes

L. Harten – yes

L. Harten asked for a motion.

B. Levenson made the motion to accept case #12-7, a request for a special exception, as amended.

F. Seagroves seconded the motion.

Final Vote:

F. Seagroves – yes B. Levenson – yes S. Bonczar – yes K. Bauer – yes

L. Harten – yes

Case #12-07 was unanimously approved.

L. Harten reminded the applicant of the 30-day appeal period.