

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF RIDGEFIELD
APPROVED MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

October 21, 2024

NOTE: These minutes are intended as a rough outline of the proceedings of the Board of Appeals on Zoning of Ridgefield held on October 21, 2024. Copies of recordings of the meeting may be obtained from the Administrator.

The Chair called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. Sitting on the Board for the evening were: Terry Bearden-Rettger, Mark Seavy, Sky Cole, Joseph Pastore and Alex Lycoyannis.

ROTATION OF ALTERNATES

The rotation for the meeting was first, Mr. Lockwood; second, Mr. Byrnes; third Mr. Stenko. No Alternates were needed for this meeting. Thus, the rotation for the next meeting will be the same: first, Mr. Lockwood; second, Mr. Byrnes; third Mr. Stenko.

CONTINUED APPLICATION

Application 24-031
Trillium Architects, agent for Lisa Kuller
80 Topstone Road

Kevin Ligos of Trillium Architects appeared again. The hearing was continued from the October 7 meeting to allow the administrator to notify the Town Clerk of Redding and a neighboring property in Redding. Part of the lot was located in the Town of Redding. Mr. Ligos again went over the application and hardships. They were asking for a 21' setback in the RAA zone with a required 35' setback. The 21' was not any closer to the current setback, so there would be no increase in nonconformity. The lot was long and thin only 51' wide, built in 1880 prior to the enactment of zoning regulations. No one appeared to speak about the application. A Decision can be found at the end of the minutes.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Application 24-032
Robert and Sarah Hendrick
17 East Ridge Road

Attorney Peter Olson represented the applicants. The Hendricks purchased the property in 2017, the house was built over 100 years ago, now in the RA zone at .8 acres, the property is undersized and the existing side yard setback was nonconforming to the setback at 17.3' at the closest point on the north property line. In March 2024 a fire destroyed the home. The owners would like to rebuild, alter the footprint and add a second floor over a deck area. A review of the architectural plans shows the rebuild shifting the structure away from the north side of the lot decreasing the proposed setback from 17.3' to 18.25'. Mr. Olson listed hardships as the long, narrow, undersized lot, with a pond located in the rear of the lot. The upland wetlands review area of 100' goes all the way to the house.

No one appeared to speak about the application. However, a letter in support from surrounding neighbors was signed and submitted to the file during the hearing. A Decision can be found at the end of the minutes.

Application 24-033
Andrew Vento
58 Silver Spring Road

Andrew Vento appeared for his application. He submitted a packet to the Board detailing his application. A letter in support from abutting neighbors was included. The existing deck was already demolished for an addition of a screened in porch using the same footprint as the deck. The existing deck and proposed porch would be in the setback at 26’ at its closest point, so a setback variance was requested. Hardships were listed as the undersized lot, 0.9 acres in the RAA zone. The lot was long and narrow and the house was built in the rear of the lot.
No one appeared to speak about the application. A Decision can be found at the end of the minutes.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The Board voted for approval of the October 7 meeting minutes.

DECISIONS:

Application 24-031
Trillium Architects, agent for Lisa Kuller
80 Topstone Road

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow an addition to an existing house within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 80 Topstone Road.

DATES OF HEARING: October 7, 21 2024
DATE OF DECISION: October 21, 2024

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow an addition to an existing house within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 80 Topstone Road.

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny: 0

<u>In favor</u>	<u>Deny</u>
Bearden-Rettger, Cole,	
Lycoyannis, Pastore, Seavy	

- 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 and is undersized, 1 acre in the RAA zone. This along with the shape of the narrow lot, creates hardship that justifies the granting of a variance in this case.
2. It is noted that the approved plans do not increase the setback nonconformity of the lot.

3. 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 24-032
Robert and Sarah Hendrick
17 East Ridge Road

REQUESTED: a variance of Sections 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow the reconstruction of single-family home that does not meet the required setback; for property in the RA zone located at 17 East Ridge Road.

DATES OF HEARING: October 21, 2024
DATE OF DECISION: October 21, 2024

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Sections 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow the reconstruction of single-family home that does not meet the required setback; for property in the RA zone located at 17 East Ridge Road.

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny: 0

In favor Deny
Bearden-Rettger, Cole,
Lycoyannis, Pastore, Seavy

- 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 original house predates zoning regulations and is on an undersized lot. This along with wetland restrictions from a pond in the rear and the location of the house in the front of the lot, creates hardships that justify 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.

Application 24-033
Andrew Vento
58 Silver Spring Road

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow an addition to an existing house within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 58 Silver Spring Road.

DATES OF HEARING: October 21, 2024
DATE OF DECISION: October 21, 2024

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow an addition to an existing house within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 58 Silver Spring Road.

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny: 0

<u>In favor</u> Bearden-Rettger, Cole, Lycoyannis, Pastore, Seavy	<u>Deny</u>
---	-------------

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 undersized lot, less than 1 acre in the RAA zone, and the position of the house in the back of the lot, creates hardships that justify 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 7:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Ryan

Administrator