

Planning and Zoning Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, April 28, 2026  
(Unrevised/Unapproved)

ATTENDANCE

Commission & Staff

NAME	TITLE/ROLE	PRESENT		NOTES
		Yes	No	
Robert Hendrick	Chair	X		
Mariah Okrongly	Vice Chair	X		
Joe Dowdell	Commissioner	X		
Ben Nneji	Commissioner	X		via Zoom
Elizabeth DiSalvo	Commissioner	X		
Chris Molyneaux	Commissioner		X	
Joe Sorena	Commissioner	X		via Zoom
Sebastian D'Acunto	Commissioner	X		via Zoom
Ben Nissim	Commissioner	X		
Aarti Paranjape	Director, (Staff)	X		

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

*Chair Hendrick called meeting to order at 7:00 PM; Quorum established.*

- 1.1. **Distribution of agenda & previous minutes. (Published on Commission's webpage prior to meeting.)**
- 1.2. **Administrative Announcements & Correspondence**
- 1.3. **Approval of agenda.**

*Ms. Okrongly made a motion to move the Eagle Scout MISC-26-4 application to the first item discussed on the agenda. Seconded by Mr. Dowdell. Motion passes unanimously.*

**2. ENFORCEMENT (COMPLAINTS/VIOLATIONS)**

No ongoing enforcement to discuss.

**3. PUBLIC HEARING**

- 3.1. **(Contd) SP-25-15: 59 South Street:** Special Permit Application (per 9.2.A and 5.3.D.3 and Sec 4.2.B) for relocation of Pump station, decommissioning on pump station and construction of new gravity sewer from new pump station to South Street WWTF at 59 South Street (E14-0158), F15-0056 and F15-0057. *Owner: Town of Ridgefield; Applicant: Matthew Formica.* <https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/98507>

Mr. Hendrick gave a quick recap of the previous Public Hearings for this application and the process. Mr. Formica does not have his tree survey ready and was having difficulty entering the meeting.

Ms. Kozlark came to the table. She is on the WPCA and Board of Select People.

Mr. Formica entered the meeting. He responded to comments from the individuals at Prospect Woods. They were present at the WPCA meeting last week. The HOA is still asking about the outstanding walking path. Their concern was that the path would funnel walkers and bikers onto their property. Mr. Formica is hoping to receive clarity from PZC on this path. There seems to be multiple visions on where and if they anticipated this path to be located. The WPCA is also curious because they did not believe that the line is intended to be a walking path so they are asking for clarification on what exactly the PZC is asking them to do. Mr. Hendrick stated that there is no walking path that is part of this application. Mr. Hendrick explained that in a greater context he believed that some portion of the route may or may not be used in the future for a potential walking path. Ms. Okrongly explained her belief that they would like to leave the pipe in the condition where it would be prepared for a walking path if it were to be developed in the future. Ms. DiSalvo also explained that the intention from her perspective was not for the path to go onto the sewer line but to go from the end of the rail trail, through the woods, to the Goodwill trailer. The overall goal is to connect the rail trail to the rec center at some point in the future. Ms. Kozlark asked for clarification and her concern was that it would go closer to the condos. Mr. Formica explained that some of the grades are 8-12%. Mr. Sorena stated that the contractor would hay and seed the disturbed area and manage erosion. So, naturally there would be a cleared area that someone could walk if they wanted to it would just not be maintained. Ms. Okrongly referenced the letter with the Conservation Commission and explained that is what started the conversation in the Public Hearing. Mr. Hendrick stated that just talking it out helps. Ms. DiSalvo explains that the goal is to leave it in a condition that could be used in the future if a trail. If it is never used as a trail that is also fine. The WPCA has been in contact with the Conservation Commission to discuss their stance on the trail. Mr. Formica stated that the existing walking path that is not maintained, is not in the sewer easement. It is outside. Mr. Hendrick asked for clarification on the existing location. Mr. Formica stated that there was correspondence that it would not be constructed along the easement. Mr. Formica is going to respond to that comment for the record in writing. The WPCA is concerned about putting the whole benefit of the trail to the town on the district. Mr. Hendrick asked about the tree survey. Mr. Formica has not been able to obtain a surveyor who has been available to date for a tree survey. Mr. Formica will extend to a future Public Hearing. May 14 is the final date for extensions. Mr. Formica will do his best to have the survey prepared for the May 12 meeting.

Ms. Paranjape asked for clarification on behalf of a resident. How would the residents access their homes and garages during construction while the active work is ongoing. Mr. Formica said he provided correspondence to the HOA but they are requiring the contractor to follow requirements including street parking during day hours and the trench will be closed in the evenings for access to homes.

Mr. Hendrick opened the floor to the public.

Mr. Charles Hawkins, 120 Prospect Street, Unit #63 of Prospect Woods. His unit directly abuts the sewer corridor, and the property line is on wetlands owned by the state. He has been looking at the maps and wants to state that the maps don't do justice to how close eight units are to the sewer line and how close that work is going to be to the houses. He also does not believe that the maps clearly show that the houses are three stories built into the side of a hill with a history of construction weakness. He asked the contractor to confirm that when the construction equipment comes onto the property, it stays on the asphalt. He isn't clear how the equipment can do the work in that space without entering the wetlands. He also believes it is important to monitor vibration near the foundations. He also would like to see the tree survey and suggests a 25-foot radius behind the houses where they don't remove trees because that would be about 5 feet into the wetlands. Around the house and HOA area, he suggests allowing the corridor to naturally grow over once the construction is complete so it looks good. He is all for fixing the sewer line. It is good for the community and good for him, but he fears that the houses down at the end are going to take the brunt of the negative impacts from construction.

Mr. Hendrick stated that these topics have been discussed in past meetings. Ms. Kozlark believes they have taken into consideration. The WPCA has discussed the various means and methods of handling construction and vibration management. Mr. Hendrick agreed they had discussed this topic and created draft conditions around monitoring. Ms. Okrongly asked if the PZC could make a condition that there are stipulations for the big concerns. The WPCA feels they have already taken this into consideration for bid specifications. Mr. Hendrick

said there are a number of draft conditions and ultimately municipal work would have to comply with that but it sounds like the RFP for construction is already in. Ms. Okrongly would like to make sure the condition is enforceable on the PZC end which means it would have to be written as a condition.

Ms. McMahon, 120 Prospect St, Unit #61. She has asked if there are any situations similar to what the back units are going to go through, to use as a reference. Her driveway is not big and her concern is that there other residential units that are as close as her unit. She asked if the contractor has experience doing this in such close proximity in addition to wetlands. She understands the location of the proposed sewer and the reasoning, but she wonders how many other options there might be that are less direct but have less impact and interruption on the property. She is asking if there are other options that have been considered. She believes this is a big ask to her by the applicant in such close proximity to her home.

The WPCA and Mr. Formica responded that they have looked at alternative options. Buried infrastructure isn't really thought much about once completed and in the ground. They referenced work on Limekiln Road and stated that contractors are used to working in tight spaces. Mr. Sorena asked if the Prospect Woods units are on sewer. He explained that if this sewer line fails, it would also be a negative impact on the owners.

Mr. Shane Herlet, 120 Prospect St, Unit #66 at Prospect Woods. He is less concerned about direct impact but asked if Mr. Formica was aware of the foundational concerns prior to looking at the line. Mr. Formica stated that he found out after. Mr. Herlet wants to make sure that the construction would not exacerbate the problem. He asked about the trees directly behind the buildings and whether or not they will be taken down. Mr. Hendrick states that this is not a back and forth between home owners and the applicant but the purpose of public comment is testimony. Mr. Herlet has concerns that not everyone has been notified. He has concern that he doesn't know what trees will be impacted. He has concerns that the communication has been fragmented. He has concerns that pieces and changes continue to be added on at the end of the application. He is upset by the PZC responses.

Ms. Kozlark and Mr. Formica stated they sent 170 additional certifications. They also had three separate meetings for the homeowners. Mr. Sorena asked about the certified letters. He asked if he got a response from the units that directly about the work. Mr. Formica gets a receipt of mailing and not receipt of acceptance so he cannot answer that question. Mr. Hendrick clarifies that the PZC gets evidence of mailing not evidence of receipt.

Mr. John Wilson, 120 Prospect Street, Unit #62 of Prospect Woods. He wanted to respond to Mr. Sorena concern about a catastrophic failure. He understands that these units are 40 years old and have used this pump for 40 years that has a lifespan of 20 years. It seems they could replace it in kind and get another 30 or 40 years. But it might not address greater capacity needs for units that have been built in the last 40 years. Not related to the 71 units that have been there, the plumbing has not changed at all in 40 years. So, he is talking about spending 7 million dollars to address the bad pump. He is asking if there is no better alternative. Mr. Hendrick states that the economic side is not in the PZC per view. Mr. Wilson also stated that his unit is very close to the trench, approximately 12 feet, and asks how far from his unit the trench would begin. Mr. Formica asked if it is a question about the distance from the deck or from the building. Ms. Paranjape shared the site plan on the screen. Mr. Hendrick said that this comment was also one of the biggest concerns of the PZC during their site walk. Mr. Formica clarifies that it is 8 feet from the edge of the trench box to Mr. Wilson's unit. Mr. Sorena asked if Mr. Formica can explain what a trench box is. Mr. Formica pulled up a slide and explained what a trench box is.

Hearing no further comments, Ms. Paranjape asks Mr. Formica to extend the Public Hearing to May 12. The Public Hearing will continue to May 12.

- 3.2. **SP-26-3: 223 West Mountain Road**; Revision to Special Permit (per RZR 3.2.c.2) for addition to academic building and associated site work on the "Ridgefield Academy" campus located in RAAA zone. Owner: Ridgefield Academy Inc.; Applicant: Kurt Lavaway. <http://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/104670>

Ms. Paranjape read the legal notice into the record and added the applicants as panelists so they could share their screen. Mr. Lavaway was also in the room to present the application. Mr. Hendrick has a relationship with the Ridgefield Academy for full disclosure. He used to be on the Board and his daughter graduated from the school. The PZC does not feel he needs to recuse because he is no longer active. Mr. Nissim also has students currently at Ridgefield Academy. The PZC does not believe he needs to recuse. Mr. Hendrick explains the process of the Public Hearing.

Mr. Lavaway shared his screen and discussed the specifics of the application. He introduced the project team and explained that the project has many components including a building addition, campus center, access road, and west lot. He has already met with the APA, IWB, Health Department, Fire Marshall, and AAC. A site walk was held.

Ms. Okrongly asked if sustainable development would be discussed in the classroom. Mr. Sorena discussed the existing stormwater issue on the property and future conditions of the property. Ms. Okrongly stated that the parking lot was noted during the site walk and flagged as a sheetflow issue and asked if permeable surface was an option. Mr. Sorena asked about a more permeable surface elsewhere.

The civil engineer addressed the stormwater questions. The current area is curbsless and just flows. As part of the project, they will be upgrading this issue and add a stormwater system that will discharge into a hydrodynamic separator and ultimately into a detention basin. Mr. Sorena asked for further clarification about the stormwater system. Ms. Okrongly mentioned green space. Mr. Sorena asked about infill on the lawn area being created. Ms. Okrongly asked what the turf was made of. Mr. Sorena asked about the G-max rating for children. Ms. Okrongly said she would prefer dirty clothing than a safety concern associated with her children playing on toxic materials. Ms. DiSalvo is curious about pushback from a sustainability perspective.

The applicant continued presenting the specifics of the application by the applicant team. Mr. Sorena inquired about curb cuts. He also asked about the area for emergency vehicles. Ms. Okrongly asked about a garden option that could be designed for the future. Mr. Sorena referenced the contour change and the retaining walls on the plans. He asked to see details of the retaining walls. He confirmed that the largest retaining wall would be 4 feet in height above grade. Ms. Okrongly asks about the POCD and how this application is designed per the POCD. The applicant team will review the POCD answer the POCD meeting question in writing after the meeting. Mr. Sorena asks about design certification for materials and ethical standards. Ms. DiSalvo asks again to revisit the proposed plastic turf. Mr. Sorena comments on this. Mr. Nissim discusses the composition of the turf. Collectively the PZC comments on their disapproval of the turf in this application. Mr. Hendrick asks about cut sheets. Ms. Okrongly asks about the extent of tree removal. Mr. Hendrick asked if the applicant has engaged with the neighbors. Mr. Sorena asked about the contour and slope of the new access roads. Mr. Sorena asked about a firetruck being able to navigate the roadway. Mr. Hendrick asks that the applicant confirms in writing the maximum turning radius for each vehicle.

At this point the applicant has finished their presentation. Mr. Hendrick asks the PZC for additional question.

Ms. Paranjape went through outstanding issues from her staff report. She has concerns with screening and parking lot lights impacts on neighbors. The applicant responds that they have screening at all times of year between them and the neighbors and staggered vegetation growth. They have added additional screening for this. Ms. Paranjape had no additional comments. She referenced the AAC meeting notes. The AAC had added a comments that they would like to see additional screening.

Mr. Hendrick opened the floor to the public.

Mr. Forester, 290 Oscaleta Road. He lives in a house several hundred feet below the Ridgefield Academy property. He is at the bottom of the hill. He has more concern now that the application has been presented than when he came in. He is concerned that all of the stormwater from the property will be sent to a stormwater retention basin that is directly adjacent to his property. If that system fails, he is in very close

proximity, and it could negatively impact him. Otherwise, he is in support of the application. Historically he has not had any stormwater issues despite being at the bottom of a hill and steep slope nearby.

The applicant team responded to this by saying that they have looked at stormwater on the property and their goal is to make sure the drainage pattern does not change. Ms. Okrongly asks if that area gets wet during current rainstorms. The applicant team does not know the answer to that question definitively because there is limited access to this area and very dense vegetation. Ms. Okrongly asks about the context and location of this on the property based on her memory during the site walk. Mr. Hendrick states that the drainage report shows no increase in offsite runoff for a 100 year storm event using the system as designed and presented.

Ms. Forester 290 Oscaleta Road. She asked why the location of the stormwater basin was chosen in its presented location instead of somewhere further from the homes.

Based on the context of the property, the applicant team placed it in this location because alternate plans would have placed the basin too close to the leaching fields.

Hearing no further comment from the PZC or public, Mr. Hendrick suggests the applicant provide information on the following for the next meeting:

- *Follow up on how the application follows the POCD*
- *Verify the percent grade on the driveway*
- *Describe the delivery vehicle plan in the event something large needed to come through*
- *Show lighting cut sheets*
- *Add information about the synthetic turf.*

Hearing no further comment, the Public Hearing will be continued to May 12.

3.3. **(Contd.) A-26-1: Text Amendment** application (per RZR 9.2.b) to amend Section 2.2 – revise definitions for “Bed and Breakfast” and add new for “Short-Term Rentals”; amend Section 3.2.C.12 – Bed and Breakfast to include “Short Term Rentals”. *Commission Initiated.* <https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/104870>

Mr. Hendrick gave a general overview of this proposed text amendment. No changes have been made to the language. Ms. Okrongly mentioned that some Commissioners weren’t present at the last meeting and didn’t comment which is why this was extended.

Mr. Jewell, 156 Bob Hill Road. He submitted some additional information to add to the file based on other towns and how they had handled this. He thinks an exemption would be important. He thinks properties can be capped in amount of rental time or days per year to prevent someone from buying an investment property and just renting it out. He thinks it would be a mistake to not allow rentals for someone like a snowbird who wants to rent while they are not on the property.

Ms. Okrongly thanked Mr. Jewell for submitting the information. Discussion ensued by the PZC on how this would be regulated. Conversation continued on having a registry or a temporary permit. They agreed that a fee for a registry would make more sense than requiring a permit for each stay.

Mr. Hendrick suggests leaving this open to read the information submitted by Mr. Jewell in more detail.

3.4. **(Contd.) A-26-2: Text Amendment** application (per RZR 9.2.B) to amend Section 5 – Additional Standards – Traffic Impact analysis for the following Sections – 5.1.F; 5.2.F; 5.3.F; 5.4.F; 5.5.F; 5.6.F; 5.7.F; Section 10.2.E.13 – application checklist and add a new Section 7.17 – Traffic Impact Analysis. *Commission Initiated.* <https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/104872>

Mr. Hendrick gave a background to this proposed text amendment. He wrote the language and presented the language for changes to the traffic impact analysis.

Discussion ensued by the PZC. This was left open because Mr. Sorena dropped off the meeting.

Mr. Hendrick suggests leaving this open to read the information in more detail so Mr. Sorena can comment.

- 3.5. **(Contd.) A-26-3: Text Amendment** application (per RZR 9.2.B) to amend Section 7.5: Excavation Filling and Grading. *Commission Initiated.* <https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/104873>

Mr. Hendrick gave a background on this proposed text amendment. He worked very closely with Mr. Sorena to draft the updated language associated with excavation filling and grading.

Mr. Hendrick used his own home as an example of how this would impact someone.

Mr. Hendrick opened the floor to the public.

Mr. Fossi, 174 St. Johns Road. He did some calculations and thinks the number of fill proposed is far too low. He thinks 500 is too low. He states that all new homes need permits so he is concerned that this isn't necessary.

Mr. Hendrick says over the last few years a few people had built homes on small lots and upset the neighbors by also not doing great E&S. The goal is that if you are building on a smaller lot he thinks the numbers need to be less than the current threshold of 2000 square feet but is open to suggestion on what number might make more sense.

Mr. Fossi believes you just need to be willing to inspect and constantly monitor and maintain erosion control measures. He doesn't know what the answer to small lots is but understands the PZC perspective.

Ms. DiSalvo thinks it should be more about the grade change than the fill amount. Ms. Okrongly suggests addressing grade at the property line.

Mr. Jewell, 156 Bob Hill Road, suggests using a threshold other than square feet of fill. He thinks maybe a chart would make sense that balances these concerns. He thinks small lots with homes over 10,000 square feet is the concern and that possibly a regulation drafted more specifically to that concern would answer the question.

Mr. Fossi agrees with what Mr. Jewell is saying.

Mr. Fossi states that building a home on an approved lot is as a right. But he agrees that perhaps a graduated fill number is the answer to consider.

Mr. Hendrick needs to revisit the language for this. The Public Hearing will remain open.

- 3.6. **(Contd.) A-26-4: Text Amendment** application (per RZR 9.2.B) to amend Section 10.1 – Application fees, Section 10.1.B: Application to the Zoning Enforcement Officer; Section 10.1.C: Applications to the Planning Director; Section 10.1.D: Applications to the Planning and Zoning Commission. *Commission Initiated.* <https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/104874>

Mr. Hendrick explained the amendment and added Ms. Paranjape's comment. She mentioned that adding a fee would make sense, or a class of fees, for an after the fact permit. There was general agreement of the PZC that this was a good idea to be the amount of the application plus a fee for being after the fact. Mr. Nissim and Ms. Paranjape think \$1,000 would be a reasonable number. Ms. Paranjape explained a recent case study where something like this created a measurable amount of administrative burden. Mr. Dowdell is concerned about the financial burden this would put on a home owner. Ms. DiSalvo expresses the concern about a new home owner finding out a previous home owner hadn't correctly handled the permits and having to pay the fees. Ms. Okrongly suggests asking Mr. Jewell if he has any experience with something like this. Ms. Paranjape suggests starting lower possibly at \$250. Ms. DiSalvo asks about solar array permit. She is specifically asking about rooftop solar arrays.

Mr. Nissim mentions a fine up to \$250 per day based on CT statutes. He drafted \$250 per day but it doesn't have to be that language. He can revisit to make it a bit more discretionary. Ms. DiSalvo talks about tearing down a house and how many days would apply to that and that it would be difficult to calculate. Ms. Okrongly thinks it should be opened up to discretion to allow the town to make recommendations. Mr. Nissim basically states that it is the ZEO discretion.

Mr. Hendrick thinks this should be discussed informally with the Board of Selectman by getting on their agenda. Mr. Nissim will clean up the language to share with the PZC.

This will remain open.

#### 4. OLD/CONTINUED BUSINESS

- 4.1. **IF PUBLIC HEARING IS CLOSED: SP-25-15: 59 South Street:** Special Permit Application (per 9.2.A and 5.3.D.3 and Sec 4.2.B) for relocation of Pump station, decommissioning on pump station and construction of new gravity sewer from new pump station to South Street WWTF at 59 South Street (E14-0158), F15-0056 and F15-0057. *Owner: Town of Ridgefield; Applicant: Matthew Formica.*  
<https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/98507>

Public Hearing was not closed.

- 4.2. **IF PUBLIC HEARING IS CLOSED: SP-26-3: 223 West Mountain Road;** Revision to Special Permit (per RZR 3.2.C.2) for addition to academic building and associated site work on the "Ridgefield Academy" campus located in RAAA zone. *Owner: Ridgefield Academy Inc.; Applicant Kurt Lavaway.*  
<https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/104670>

Public Hearing was not closed.

- 4.3. **IF PUBLIC HEARING IS CLOSED: A-26-1: Text Amendment** application (per RZR 9.2.b) to amend Section 2.2 – revise definitions for "Bed and Breakfast" and add new for "Short-Term Rentals"; amend Section 3.2.C.12 – Bed and Breakfast to include "Short Term Rentals". *Commission Initiated.*  
<https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/104870>

Public Hearing was not closed.

- 4.4. **IF PUBLIC HEARING IS CLOSED: A-26-2: Text Amendment** application (per RZR 9.2.B) to amend Section 5 – Additional Standards – Traffic Impact analysis for the following Sections – 5.1.F; 5.2.F; 5.3.F; 5.4.F; 5.5.F; 5.6.F; 5.7.F; Section 10.2.E.13 – application checklist and add a new Section 7.17 – Traffic Impact Analysis. *Commission Initiated.* <https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/104872>

Public Hearing was not closed.

- 4.5. **IF PUBLIC HEARING IS CLOSED: A-26-3: Text Amendment** application (per RZR 9.2.B) to amend Section 7.5: Excavation Filling and Grading. *Commission Initiated.* <https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/104873>

Public Hearing was not closed.

- 4.6. **IF PUBLIC HEARING IS CLOSED: A-26-4: Text Amendment** application (per RZR 9.2.B) to amend Section 10.1 – Application fees, Section 10.1.B: Application to the Zoning Enforcement Officer; Section 10.1.C: Applications to the Planning Director; Section 10.1.D: Applications to the Planning and Zoning Commission. *Commission Initiated.* <https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/104874>

Public Hearing was not closed.

- 4.7. **VDC-26-3: 407 Main Street;** Village District Application (per RZR 8.3; 5.1.B and 7.2.E.1) for exterior walls sign “Sommlike” with sign illumination and building lights located in CBD zone. *Owner: Carnall Insurance LLC; Applicant: Robert Mordente.* <https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/105173>

The applicant is not present. Ms. Paranjape discussed the application because they made changes to the application to add lights.

Ms. Paranjape went over the highlights of her staff report. She also shows images of the proposed lights. The PZC needs to wait for AAC/VDC comment because they were supposed to meet this evening.

This will be continued to the next meeting.

#### 4.8. **Temporary Moratorium Activities**

##### 4.8.1. **MISC-26-1:** General Regulation and Zones review. c/o Chair

Ms. DiSalvo mentioned that she reached out to the RACE team and they had feedback on a few items. The comments were distributed to the PZC via email. There were three subjects they commented on. First was planted vs asphalt vs grass. Second was turning off lights during certain seasons. Third was EV chargers and adding them as parking requirements. They would like to come and give a presentation on the next meeting or a future meeting. The presentation would explain why we need these things. They might want 30 minutes or so to discuss. Mr. Hendrick was interested in getting the on the agenda on a future meeting as time permits. Ms. DiSalvo suggested that they are ready to be here by May 12.

Mr. Nissim and Ms. Paranjape met on sign regulations. It is going to be a total redo of the sign regulations in order to properly represent their goals. Ms. DiSalvo asked if they were involving the AAC/VDC. Ms. Paranjape stated that they would reach out to them. Mr. Nissim would like to draft up the regulation before reaching out to AAC/VDC. Mr. Nissim is aware that the business community is very interested in this topic and he would like to make sure everyone is aware that this will happen.

Mr. Hendrick states that this will be a difficult subject with a lot of strong opinions. Ms. Paranjape mentions that not for profits ask if they can waive the fee. It needs to be stated if/when a fee might be waived. Ms. Paranjape stated that some of Ridgefield’s neighboring towns have good sign regulations.

Mr. Nneji mentions the research and work he has done on the density bonus regulation. He believes that for this regulation to succeed it would need to be marketed as profitable for the homeowner instead of developers. The 8-30g regulation is for a higher density development. He thinks if we share that it will maintain the character of Ridgefield and that would be a draw for the community. He also wants it to be an administrative permit approval to expedite the process. For the bonuses, by eliminating the Special Permit the approval bonus would save the home owner around \$8,000. The income is another bonus. Under 1 acre lots comprise approximately 19% of the town. Most of these homes have both water and sewer. He thinks there is opportunity here. He would like Commission input on lot size and whether it makes sense.

Ms. DiSalvo is talking through why we are limiting lot size for the density bonus. She thinks maybe they should open it up to all lots. Mr. Nneji stated that under 1 acre was the limit because they were around sewer and water and the village core because it is easier to do because they already have it there. The idea behind it is to start behind what is easy to do. Mr. Hendrick agrees with the question of what is our objective here and what are we trying to achieve. Mr. Nneji stated that within the draft language you wouldn’t really know. Mr. Hendrick agrees, but he always knew his neighbors. He thinks there are a lot of people who know the people and their objection wouldn’t be about the house change but that they see two families on the property. Ms. Okrongly thinks it is a way of thinking and it wasn’t what they were thinking when they bought their home. Mr. Nneji believes they could start small and extend it if there is demand.

Ms. Okrongly sent an updated checklist and contacted the Hartford tree lady to see if she would come. She is the city forester. Ms. DiSalvo said Bedford and Pound Ridge have good tree regulations.

#### 4.8.2. **MISC-25-3:** Branchville Strategic Review

This was not discussed.

### 5. **NEW BUSINESS**

- 5.1. **MISC-26-4:** Eagle Scout project to construct a 10' x 16' pavilion at Sturges Park to cover two picnic tables near the existing cabin. *Owner: Town of Ridgefield; Applicant: Phil Kearns.*  
<https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/105489>

Mr. Hendrick gives an overview of the process. Mr. Casciello addressed the PZC. He is a 10<sup>th</sup> grade student working on his Eagle Scout project and talked a bit about his background. The Sturges Park pavilion is useful on the property because no food can be consumed within the cabins or around them. He described the plan for the pavilion covering picnic tables. He described the plan and cost. Mr. Sturges will be helping. He received approval from Parks and Rec.

Discussion ensued by the PZC. Mr. Sorena asked about structural loading for proposed design. Mr. Sturges discussed this with the Building Department. Mr. Dowdell asked if there would be any construction equipment.

***Motion made by Mr. Okrongly to approve as presented with no special conditions. Seconded by Ms. DiSalvo. Motion passes unanimously.***

- 5.2. Regular Meeting Minutes – April 14, 2026

***Motion made by Mr. Dowdell to approve. Seconded by Ms. Okrongly. Motion passes and it is unanimous.***

### 6. **ADJOURN**

Hearing no further business or public discussion, meeting adjourned at 10:39 PM.

#### **Notes**

*Lis pendens: Addressi vs Planning & Zoning Commission Re 389 Main Street.*

Submitted by Beth Peyser,  
Recording Secretary (via video recording)

#### FOOTNOTES:

PZC =Town of Ridgefield Planning and Zoning Commission

RZR = Town of Ridgefield Zoning Regulations

CGS = Connecticut General Statutes