

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF RIDGEFIELD
MINUTES OF MEETING

MAY 10, 2021

NOTE: These minutes are intended as a rough outline of the web-based Zoom proceedings of the Board of Appeals on Zoning of Ridgefield held on May 10, 2021. Copies of recordings of the meeting may be obtained from the Administrator at cost.

The Chairman called the web-based meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. Sitting on the Board for the evening were: Carson Fincham (Chair), Sky Cole (Vice Chair), Terry Bearden-Rettger, Mark Seavy, Joseph Pastore and Robert Byrnes.

ROTATION OF ALTERNATES

The rotation for the meeting was first, Mr. Lockwood; second, Mr. Stenko; third Mr. Byrne's. Mr. Byrnes continued to sit for Mr. Cole for the continued appeal and sat for Ms. Bearden-Rettger for the new applications. Mr. Lockwood and Mr. Stenko were unable to attend. Thus, the rotation for the next meeting will be: first, Mr. Lockwood; second, Mr. Stenko; third Mr. Brynes.

CONTINUED APPLICATION:

This appeal was heard by Mr. Fincham, Ms. Bearden-Rettger, Mr. Seavy, Mr. Pastore and Mr. Byrnes:

Appeal No. 21-011

Richard Arita and Krystin Moonan
10 Stonecrest Road

Richard Arita appeared again for his hearing. He stated he consulted his architect as the Board suggested at the last hearing and planned an exchange of floor area ratio for the needed lot coverage. He further stated there was no other options for scaling back the planned addition. Mr. Fincham stated the Board would only have jurisdiction over the portion of the house relating to the variance. The Board reviewed the letter from Mr. Arita's architect. It was proposed in the letter to give up 525 sq ft of FAR to get the needed 252.85 sq ft of lot coverage needed for the proposed addition. The Board agreed that they would like the house to remain 1-story to maintain the character of the neighborhood that contained primarily ranch homes. They agreed to condition the variance to maintain the 1- story status.

No one appeared to speak for or against the application and the hearing was concluded. A decision can be found at the end of these minutes.

NEW APPLICATIONS:

These appeals were heard by Mr. Fincham, Mr. Cole, Mr. Seavy, Mr. Pastore and Mr. Byrne's:

Appeal No. 21-012

Nnenna Duke
22 Whitlock Lane

Rebecca Luraschi a representative for the pool company and the applicants appeared. She stated the application was for a setback to construct a pool within the setback, 19 ft from the property line. She listed hardships as nearby wetlands and the location of the septic fields. Ms. Luraschi also stated the property sloped at many points. Mr. Cole

asked if the septic could be moved, or at least one of the septic fields. Ms. Luraschi replied that retaining walls would still be needed and some areas still had slopes. Applicants were trying to limit unsettling the earth as much as possible. The lot was undersized, slightly over 1 acre in the RAAA zone, but it was located in a Planned Residential Development and only 25 ft. setbacks were required. Mr. Cole thought 19 ft was no close when other locations for the pool existed. Other Board members agreed. No one appeared to speak for or against the application and the hearing was concluded.

The applicants were granted a continuance until a future ZBA meeting to consider revising their proposed plans.

Appeal No. 21-013
David and Angela Farabee
16 Clearview Terrace

The applicant’s David and Angela Farabee appeared for their application. They stated to the Board that they purchased the home in July 2020 and are doing renovations. They wished to re-construct the front porch slightly smaller and add an overhang over the front door. The house located in the RA zone, was already nonconforming to setbacks. The proposed deck rebuilt was a 5x14 deck, 8.3 ft from the south property line. Setbacks were listed as position of the house on the undersized lot, and the house built prior to zoning regulations in the Town. Plans for the overhang were not submitted prior to the hearing. A later review showed the plans for the overhang exceeded the approved 5x14 deck. The hearing will be re-opened at the June 7 ZBA meeting

No one appeared to speak for or against the application and the hearing was concluded.

DECISION:

Appeal No. 21-011
Richard Arita and Krystin Moonan
10 Stonecrest Road

REQUESTED: variances of Sections, 3.5.F., lot coverage and 3.5.H., setbacks, to construct an addition to a single-family home that will exceed the permitted lot coverage and will not meet the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 10 Stonecrest Road.

DATES OF HEARING: April 19, May 10, 2021

DATE OF DECISION: May 10, 2021

VOTED: To Grant, variances of Sections, 3.5.F., lot coverage and 3.5.H., setbacks, to construct an addition to a single-family home that will exceed the permitted lot coverage and will not meet the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 10 Stonecrest Road.

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny:

In favor
Bearden-Rettger Fincham,
Pastore, Seavy, Byrnes

Opposed

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, and the plans submitted for the building application shall be the same as those submitted and approved with the application for variance.
2. The addition granted in this variance shall be limited to a single story to preserve the ranch-style aesthetic of the neighborhood.

The Board voted this action for the following reasons:

1. The location of the house on the undersized lot creates a hardship for setbacks. The approved plans do not create an increase in setback nonconformity.
2. The Board found that the expansion of the single-story ranch home, maintained the character of the neighborhood better than 2nd story addition which would be the only other expansion option for property.
3. The proposal is in harmony with the general scheme of development in the area and the Town's Plan of Conservation and Development and will have no negative impact on surrounding properties.

As there was no further business before the Board, the Chairman adjourned the hearing at approximately 8:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Ryan
Administrator