

Smithers

92

Marchant. Road

Mar

ch 16, 2021

To Chairperson Elizabeth Williams:
Redding Zoning Board of Appeals

Dear Ms Williams

We bought our property in 1983. It is an 8.5 acre parcel with a small house in the southwest quadrant of the property, which was too small for our family of five. We had plans designed for a new home intending to keep the small house as a house for my parents or a guest house. We were informed that zoning regulations would not allow two residences on one lot. We would have preferred not to subdivide our property but nonetheless complied, despite the financial ramifications. Last year we inquired about adding an accessory apartment to our property, and were told that the zoning regulations stipulated that 800 square feet was the maximum. We accepted that and decided that this would not be adequate for our needs presently.

In the Smithers' situation, the variance is for an accessory apartment on less than four acres. The pre-existing structure(s) are a 600 square foot barn and a 260 square foot shed, not living quarters. The proposed accessory apartment is basically a new house set on the footprint of the existing structures roughly 60% percent larger than regulations permit.

We have no objections aesthetically and wish the Smithers the best. Our concern is that the zoning laws are in existence for good reason. The limit on size for an accessory structure, I surmise, would be to keep intensification of use at a minimum, protecting the natural beauty of Redding, as well as property values. Redding is a very attractive town and many residents who have the allowable space would like to enjoy these same benefits, whether it be for the benefit of family or friends. Making exceptions is a sticky wicket. Whatever is decided should be equitably applied to all.

Based on the above we cannot give our support to this appeal.

Respectively submitted,

Paul and Laura Ruggiero
100 Marchant Rd.
Redding, Ct.