

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF RIDGEFIELD
APPROVED MINUTES OF MEETING

April 22, 2024

NOTE: These minutes are intended as a rough outline of the proceedings of the Board of Appeals on Zoning of Ridgefield held on April 22, 2024. Copies of recordings of the meeting may be obtained from the Administrator.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. Sitting on the Board for the evening were: Mark Seavy, Joseph Pastore, Alexander Lycoyannis, Robert Byrnes and Michael Stenko.

ROTATION OF ALTERNATES

The rotation for the meeting was first, Mr. Lockwood; second, Mr. Stenko; third Mr. Byrnes. Mr. Cole was unable to attend the hearing and asked Mr. Stenko to sit for him. Ms. Bearden-Rettger was unable to attend and asked Mr. Byrnes' to sit for her. Mr. Lycoyannis had to recuse for one application as noted below. Thus, the rotation for the next meeting will be: first, Mr. Lockwood; second, Mr. Byrnes; third Mr. Stenko.

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

Application 24-003
Steven Bronfield
5 Palmer Court

Applicant asked for a continuance prior to the start of the hearing.

Application 24-014
Ashlea Andrews, agent for Scott Callahan
635 Danbury Road

Applicant withdrew the application prior to the meeting.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Application 24-017
Richard Vail, agent for Colleen and Earl Flath
149 Main Street

Architect Richard Vail appeared along with the owner Earl Flath. The submitted plans showed scaled back plans from a previous application submitted earlier this year. Current application had a mudroom addition to the west side of the house and a sunroom addition to the northside. The house, built in 1750, predated zoning regulations. The proposed plans no longer included a larger family room addition. Also included in the submitted plans was the reconstruction of a barn in the rear of the lot, removing approximately 4' of the barn to make up for lot coverage. The lot was in the RA zone and over for the allowable lot coverage. With the barn reconstruction the total lot coverage would be less than what it was currently by 2'. The lot was still over the allowable amount under the regulations; therefore, a lot coverage variance was requested. Mr. Vail stated the applicants received Historic District Commission approval for the project.

No one spoke for or against the application. A decision can be found at the end of these minutes.

Application 24-018
John Bamman, agent for Karen Banoff
76 Blackman Road

John Bannon appeared along with the applicant Karen Banoff. The submitted plans were for a bump out addition to the house and the elimination of an existing deck. The deck removal would reduce the setback by 3.8’, but the addition would still be within the required 35’ setback at 21.5’ and a setback variance was required. Mr. Bannon listed the hardships as the size of the lot, 1.5 acres in the RAA zone and odd shape of the lot. No one spoke for or against the application. A decision can be found at the end of these minutes.

Application 24-019
Richard and Danielle Furey
27 Sunset Lane

This application was heard by Mr. Seavy, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Stenko and Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. and Mrs. Furey appeared along with their designer Susan Corvo. The submitted plans were for decking and a 13x19 pergola in their back yard. The property was in the R7.5 zone with a required 8’ setback. The proposed pergola was to be .5’ from the property line. Lot was .207 acres. The decking would have slits and gravel underneath for water runoff. A 13x13 pergola was also planned, but is under 200’ and attached to the deck and allowable under the zoning regulations. Mr. Furey stated that all his surrounding neighbors supported the application. The Board agreed to condition any decision to state that the pergola could not be enclosed. No one spoke for or against the application. A decision can be found at the end of these minutes.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Approval of April 8, 2024 meeting minutes.
Mr. Pastore motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Stenko. All approved.

DECISIONS:

Application 24-017
Richard Vail, agent for Colleen and Earl Flath
149 Main Street

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.F., maximum lot coverage, to allow an addition to a single-family home that will exceed the permitted lot coverage; for property in the RA zone located at 149 Main Street

DATES OF HEARING: April 22, 2024
DATE OF DECISION: April 22, 2024

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.F., maximum lot coverage, to allow an addition to a single-family home that will exceed the permitted lot coverage; for property in the RA zone located at 149 Main Street

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny: 0

<u>In favor</u>	<u>Deny</u>
Byrnes, Lycoyannis	
Pastore, Seavy, Stenko	

CONDITIONS:

This action is subject to the following conditions that are an integral and essential part of the decision. Without these conditions, the variance would not have been granted:

- 1. The addition shall be located exactly as shown on plans and drawings presented to the Board during the hearing and made part of this decision.
- 2. The plans submitted for the building permit application shall be the same as those submitted and approved with the application for variance.

The Board voted this action for the following reasons:

- 1. The lot predates zoning regulations which resulted in a nonconforming lot. This created a hardship that justifies the granting of a variance in this case. It is noted that the plans will result in a decrease of the lot coverage nonconformity.
- 2. The proposal is in harmony with the general scheme of development in the area and will have no negative impact on surrounding properties or on the Town’s Plan of Conservation and Development.

Application 24-018
John Bamman, agent for Karen Banoff
76 Blackman Road

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow a bump-out addition to a single-family residence within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 76 Blackman Road

DATES OF HEARING: April 22, 2024
DATE OF DECISION: April 22, 2024

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow a bump-out addition to a single-family residence within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 76 Blackman Road

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny: 0

In favor Deny
Byrnes, Lycoyannis,
Pastore, Seavy, Stenko

CONDITIONS:

This action is subject to the following conditions that are an integral and essential part of the decision. Without these conditions, the variance would not have been granted:

- 1. The addition shall be located exactly as shown on plans and drawings presented to the Board during the hearing and made part of this decision.
- 2. The plans submitted for the building permit application shall be the same as those submitted and approved with the application for variance.

The Board voted this action for the following reasons:

- 1. The odd shape of the slightly undersized lot creates hardships that justifies the granting of a variance in this case. It is noted that the plans will result in a decrease of the setback nonconformity.
- 2. The proposal is in harmony with the general scheme of development in the area and will have no negative impact on surrounding properties or on the Town’s Plan of Conservation and Development.

Application 24-019
Richard and Danielle Furey
27 Sunset Lane

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow a 13’ x 19’ pergola with surrounding decks within the minimum yard setback; for property in the R 7.5 zone located at 27 Sunset Lane

DATES OF HEARING: April 22, 2024
DATE OF DECISION: April 22, 2024

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow a 13’ x 19’ pergola with surrounding decks within the minimum yard setback; for property in the R 7.5 zone located at 27 Sunset Lane.

VOTE: To Grant: 4 To Deny:

<u>In favor</u>	<u>Deny</u>
Byrnes, Pastore,	
Seavy, Stenko	

- CONDITIONS:
- This action is subject to the following conditions that are an integral and essential part of the decision. Without these conditions, the variance would not have been granted:
1. The pergola shall remain open and cannot be enclosed in any manner.
 2. The pergola and decking additions shall be located exactly as shown on plans and drawings presented to the Board during the hearing and made part of this decision.
 3. The plans submitted for the building permit application shall be the same as those submitted and approved with the application for variance.

- The Board voted this action for the following reasons:
1. The location of the house on the small lot creates hardship that justifies the granting of a variance in this case.
 2. The proposal is in harmony with the general scheme of development in the area and will have no negative impact on surrounding properties or on the Town’s Plan of Conservation and Development.

As there was no further business before the Board, the Chairman adjourned the hearing at approximately 7:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Ryan

Administrator