

Planning and Zoning Commission
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 10, 2026
(Revised/Approved)

ATTENDANCE

Commission & Staff

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hendrick called meeting to order at 7:05 PM; Quorum established.

1.1. Distribution of agenda & previous minutes. (Published on Commission's webpage prior to meeting.)

1.2. Administrative Announcements & Correspondence

- Letter received from Ridgefield Historical Society re: 559/563 Main Street. This will be entered into the miscellaneous file. It was uploaded as correspondence in response to the preapplication meeting.

1.3. Approval of agenda.

Mr. Hendrick ran through the agenda and states that it is rather light compared to other agendas. No changes to the agenda.

2. ENFORCEMENT (COMPLAINTS/VIOLATIONS)

2.1. 34 Bailey Avenue

Mr. Hendrick states that there was some back and forth with the owner. He had a discussion with counsel and Ms. Paranjape. Mr. Hendrick proposes an Executive Session with the PZC and Counsel. Mr. Hendrick suggests putting off discussion until the executive session occurs.

3. PUBLIC HEARING

- 3.1. 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>

The hearing was opened. Mr. Formica was present to represent the application. Mr. Formica works for AECOM and was hired by the WPCA. Mr. Hendrick runs through the setup of the meeting. Ms. Paranjape read the legal notice into the record. Mr. Formica shared his screen and ran through a slideshow presentation of the proposed relocation of the Pump station. The focus of the application is Subarea 4. He discussed the project needs and drivers as well as project alternatives and project components. Ms. Okrongly asked for clarification on decommissioning components and what components remain functioning. She also asked for clarification on the gravity flow. Mr. Sorena asked for additional clarification on the gravity flow. Ms. Okrongly asks for clarification on current site conditions. Mr. Sorena asked for profile of the new line. The applicant has it as part of his presentation and will show the profile later in his presentation. Mr. Formica continued on with project components and then onto project description and potential sequence. Mr. Formica went over the mitigation plans to mitigate environmental impacts and mitigation of public and residential impacts. Ms. Okrongly asked for clarification on work hours and days. She feels that 7AM is a little early in residential neighborhoods. The applicant will consider this. Mr. Hendrick asked if the applicant could show a map of how close the new line is to the back of the homes in the development. Ms. Okrongly is also interested in tree removal and clarity on detail on a map. Mr. Formica would like to complete his presentation and then will show the map. Mr. Formica continues with project schedule and sequence. Mr. Sorena asks for clarification on the front end of the timeline. Mr. Sorena asks if it is realistic to assume a 12-to-15-month timeline from start to end. The applicant agreed that that is a reasonable timeframe. Mr. Formica discussed project financing, and it is no cost to taxpayers, but it is a cost to sewer users. Ms. Okrongly asks for clarity on who pays and the correlation of a fee that the sewer users are paying to the town. The applicant stated that the sewer users will pay, the taxpayers do not have a fee, and there is no fee paid to the town. Mr. Formica went through the remainder of the process. Mr. Hendrick asked the applicant again to see an elevation profile of the 2300 foot and for a zoom in map to see the distance to the residents on Prospect, he also asked to see a map of understanding of clearing for the cross-country route. Mr. Nneji inquired about the mechanics during a power outage. The applicant stated that there is a generator. Mr. Nneji asks about hydrogen sulfide level and what will happen if there is a level too high for safety. The applicant does not believe this is required or will be of impact. The applicant changed his screen to show the design plans. Mr. Nneji asks how much noise will be created by the pump and how close the closest neighbor is. The applicant responds that the closest neighbor is the WPCA. Mr. Sorena asks if they are increasing capacity. The applicant responds no. Mr. Sorena asks about the structure and what was required for upgrade. The applicant responded that the proposed plan was all necessary. The applicant describes the plan view. Mr. Sorena asks for clarifications on the plan view. Mr. Sorena asked additional questions about the easement. Mr. Sorena was concerned about the proximity of a pool and how that would be protected. The next section of proximity near units is approximately 10 feet from some units on Prospect. Mr. Hendrick asks whether there was evaluation on making this line run at more of a distance from the homes on Prospect Street. Mr. Formica states that the Great Swamp is the driver, to keep the infrastructure out of the wetlands and swamp. Mr. Formica shows plans and proximity to Quail Ridge. Ms. Okrongly asked what the fence was made out of and for a picture. Mr. Formica says it is made of vinyl and shows a drawing. Ms. Okrongly states that it is hard to tell what that drawing would look like in real life. Ms. Okrongly asks for a picture of that because it will be visible. Mr. Formica states that there are pictures submitted with the AAC application. Mr. Hendrick asks Mr. Formica to find the pictures while the public comments. Mr. Hendrick asks about asphalt. Mr. Nneji asks about lack of sewer tie in for limitations on Affordable Housing and how many new sewer units are projected to be built in to correlate with the assumed population growth over time in Ridgefield. Mr. Hendrick clarifies that the pump station is changing where and how the flows go but not changing capacity in a meaningful way because capacity is set at the plant and we are not changing the plant. Mr. Sorena asks questions about the force main. Mr. Nneji asks if the pump station will accommodate population growth or if Ridgefield will need to upgrade to accommodate population growth. Mr. Formica states that this population only accommodates some of the flow. Mr. Sorena asks for clarifications on pipe size. Mr. Nneji asks if the pump is designed to grow with the town or if it will max out. Mr. Formica says it will max out at some point but without known development he cannot answer that question. Mr. Hendrick clarifies that this is not something that has been modeled in this application. Mr. Formica believes the pumps can run more frequently. Mr. Sorena discusses capacity. Mr. Hendrick asks for clarification on Ms. Okrongly's question on

analysis of the quantity of trees that would need to be cleared or significant trees. Mr. Formica states that the sewer easement and by rights of the easement the trees are not protected. As part of the project, the tree path would be as narrow as possible but there will be areas of bump out to accommodate the equipment. Mr. Hendrick states that no, there is not an inventory to see what trees are at risk. Mr. Sorena asks about restoration. Mr. Formica states that it will be seeded and planted and stabilized. Ms. Okrongly asks about the WPCA not including trail connection planned for this area. Ms. Okrongly asks that if the trees are cut along the area of the trail, that it will follow the proposed pathway for future use so no additional tree clearing would have to occur for the trail. Mr. Formica states that the contractor will stage their own areas and it is not part of the plans, it is part of the preconstruction work to get pre discharge from the state. Ms. Okrongly restates that if they are already bringing bulldozers, perhaps it could make it easier to make the extra effort to set the Conservation Commission up for success to build the trail in the future more easily. Mr. Formica states that the concept is to provide a mechanism for a clear path with no trees for a future walking path. Mr. Sorena asks to see the plans for the bedding material and compaction and a section where the pipe will be because he has a concern about water. No other questions from the PZC. Mr. Hendrick turned it over to Ms. Paranjape for the staff report. Ms. Paranjape read her report topics into the record. Ms. Paranjape opens the AAC comments and read them into the record. Ms. Paranjape returns to the staff report and reads it into the record.

Special Conditions from the Staff Report:

- *Preconstruction meeting*
- *Phasing plan*
- *Construction Schedule*
- *Anti tracking pads*
- *A spill prevention plan*
- *The application must submit E&S plans*
- *The Zoning permits shall be submitted to the PZ Dept*
- *No work shall be conducted without an individual from the WPCA management company present*
- *Orange construction fencing must be present*
- *Drawing shall be revised to show planting plan*
- *No Storage of hazardous materials*
- *All site work shall be monitored with reports to the Director of PZ Department*
- *Stormwater maintenance plan must be submitted*

Standard Conditions shall apply

IWB Approval with Standard Conditions shall apply

Ms. Okrongly asked if the work impacts current trails. Mr. Formica says no. Ms. Okrongly asks if there is an A2 survey and if not why. Mr. Formica states that there is one. Ms. Okrongly states that significant trees shall be marked on the survey because it was not. Mr. Hendrick directs the applicant to Sec 10.2.E which is the checklist for a special permit application. Item 5 is the A2 survey description with 17 items required. One of the 17 items is significant trees. It is a requirement of the Special Permit process. Mr. Formica asks about whether significant trees would require a reroute of a project. Mr. Hendrick explains that the significant trees are required to be noted so that they are inventoried and then if they are proposed to be disturbed. The PZC has discretion to require remediation. Mr. Formica is suggesting that he marks “potentially to be removed” instead of “to be removed” because he does not know what the contractor will want to remove.

Mr. Hendrick then opened the floor to public comment.

Nancy Tine, 120 Prospect Street, Board of Prospect Woods. Present in the room. Her question is about the easement and what that will entail. She would also like to know who her point of contact is and what the time frame is. Mr. Formica responds with the information she has been given and clarifies her points. The Board of Prospect woods has requested a meeting with the WPCA and it is in progress. She also suggests that she would publicly need to have an owner meeting to solicit decisions and find out who approves the easement on the Board end. She would like to know the timeline and responses to construction timeline. She has also asked about onsite presence and how long that will be. Mr. Formica states that 12 months is reasonable. Mr. Hendrick

states that there is no written correspondence submitted to the office or to the PZC. Mr. Hendrick states she draft a letter and submit it to the PZC as soon as possible.

Resident from 120 Prospect Street, #11. Present in the room. She has questions about the row from the pump station to the pool. There is a row of apartments that access their garage. She is asking if the owners will not have access to their driveways. The applicant states that the line will be going in that area and therefore there will not be access to those driveways during that period of installation. The applicant agrees that the pipe will go into the road. She asks about the distance between the building and the line. The applicant states that there will be some portion of time when the pipe is installed that the owner will not have access during pipe installation. Mr. Sorena asks to see the profile. Ms. Okrongly states that it would be beneficial for the WPCA, Applicant, and Board to have a meeting to address these concerns and then bring detailed concerns back to the Board.

Maureen Kozlark, 24 O'Neill Court. Present in the room and a member of the Board of Selectpeople. She suggests that a meeting should happen between the home owners, the applicant, and the WPCA because of the public interest.

Mr. Hendrick suggests the applicant update their A2 and do some community outreach and then come back. But he would like to hear the remainder of public comment prior to continuing the public hearing.

Roger Kavanagh, 120 Prospect, Unit #21. He would like to understand what happens first and how this is going. He wants to know if it is possible if this could be approved by Planning and Zoning while the unit owners and association are finding their answers. He wants to know if the process will halt temporarily while the homeowners obtain sufficient information. Mr. Hendrick states that from a legal perspective, since the applicant has submitted the application, state statute requires the PZC to close the public hearing within 35 days unless the applicant grants an extension and at that time they can add up to 65 days. Whether it is 35 or 35+65, the PZC is legally required to make a decision within that time frame. In Mr. Hendricks experience that is plenty of time to remedy these issues and then eventually come back within 35-100 day window. Mr. Hendrick states that the PZC does not have forever, but there is time with extension. The home owner states that the applicant is the town and you would hope the town would grant an extension. Mr. Hendrick states yes, but the PZC is legally obligated to remain within those time frames.

John Wilson, 120 Prospect, Unit #62. His unit has a screened in porch that cantilevers over the back driveway that has been described. His concern that will likely be part of the Board interaction with the PZC, he believes there is a permanent easement and a temporary easement. He does not understand why there needs a permanent easement that appears to be below his cantilevered porch that is approximately 14 feet above grade. Mr. Formica states that it is necessary so if there is an issue the WPCA needs to be able to access it. Mr. Formica states that the easement goes around the porch and is not beneath his porch. Mr. Formica states that the contractor who has been hired on behalf of the WPCA will be responsible for any damages that could occur.

Andy Robertson, 120 Prospect, Unit #9. He wants to talk about the pump station down by Goodwill. He asks if there was a site walk through that the PZC did with an engineering firm. Mr. Hendrick states that there was. Mr. Robertson asks if there was a walk-through Prospect Woods. Mr. Hendrick says he did not walk through Prospect Woods. Mr. Hendrick states that it is something that could be discussed with the Commission. Ms. Okrongly is not opposed to doing a walk-through Prospect Woods. Mr. Robertson asks about the regulations limiting the line going closer to the wetlands. He would like to speak to the other agencies that have approved this to understand their perspective. Mr. Hendrick asks about pushing it back and he thinks in addition to the wetlands the issue is that you quickly get to land that is not owned by the town of Ridgefield, it is owned by the State of Connecticut. Mr. Formica states that there are reasons that the line cannot be constructed in the wetlands and as a general practice they stay out of wetlands unless absolutely necessary.

Resident from 120 Prospect #67. She asks about the individuals who are paying for the sewer. Mr. Formica explains who is paying for the proposed upgrade.

Karen Kavanagh, 120 Prospect Street, Unit #21. She asks about putting a new station in and if that would require a new line. She asks if there is an alternative, so it does not impact that properties. Mr. Formica states that you could build that, but a bypass pump would be required and it could be done but it was the opinion when it was looked at that the impacts to 120 Prospect would be longer and there would be no benefits of moving the DPW pump station and the known choke points would remain. The new configuration provides hydraulic relief. Ms. Cavanaugh asks if it could stop at the end of their property and not impact them. Mr. Formica states that you could, but it would be difficult. She states that you could dig a bigger hole somewhere but prevent impacting their driveways. Mr. Formica pulls up a map to show the current discharge. Ms. Cavanaugh confirms that the driveways will be dug up. Mr. Formica states that she is accurate.

Hearing no further interest in public comment. No additional applicant comments. No additional staff comments. Mr. Hendrick states that it is clear that this hearing will be continued. He asks if the applicant is opposed to another site walk. The applicant is not. Mr. Hendrick asks if anyone is interested in doing another site walk. Ms. Okrongly is not opposed to doing another site walk. Ms. DiSalvo, Mr. Nneji, and Mr. Dowdell would like to do another site walk. Ms. Paranjape states the next site walk on Feb 22 was cancelled but the next scheduled would be March 8 if continued to March 10 meeting.

Mr. Formica will not be able to attend the site walk but perhaps the WPCA will be able to attend on his behalf. He does not believe the A2 survey will be completed by March 10. Mr. Hendrick states they can put it on the calendar for March 10 and the applicant to do the necessary public engagement but also work on the A2 survey. Mr. Hendrick states that the public hearing will be continued and it will not need to be renoticed. Mr. Hendrick states that today the 35-day clock starts. Mr. Formica states that they need permission from the WPCA. With no objection from the applicant the site walk will be on March 8 with a continued public hearing scheduled for March 10 but can be continued further if necessary to collect the stated pieces.

Ms. Okrongly made a motion to do a site walk on March 8 and continue a public hearing for March 10. Mr. Nneji seconds the motion. No opposition. Motion carries. The public hearing is continued.

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>

The Public Hearing was not closed.

4.2. Temporary Moratorium Activities

4.2.1.MISC-26-1: General Regulation and Zone Reviews

Mr. Nneji had submitted some materials today at 4:00PM. He would like to discuss the density bonus. The law in Connecticut allows the density bonus inclusionary zoning, CG8-21. The statute allows facilities to swap for long term retention of affordable units. In Ridgefield, the existing multi-family development district allows up to 18 units per acre with 15% affordable. These are normally for larger developments. For small parcels under 1 acre, we need a regulation that triggers units per lots and not units per acre regulation. Mr. Nneji shows his suggested language and read into the record. Mr. Hendrick states that the project would qualify for 8-30g and clarifies that he believes the PZC has a policy goal on 1 acre lots, they would be ok with three dwelling units as long as it is an 8-30g. Mr. Nneji agrees that that is correct, but it is more under control as opposed to going to the state. Mr. Hendrick wants to ask counsel and Ms. Paranjape if they came in under this if they have protection. Ms. Paranjape says yes if they come in under 8-30g they are okay but if they come in under this regulation then perhaps no. Mr. Nneji suggests a density bonus regulation. Mr. Nissim suggests that this would take some of legislation burden out and provide an incentivized hat but not switching the burden of proof. Discussion ensued

by the PZC on whether or not this makes sense taking into consideration the benefits to the applicant to bypass 8-30g. Ms. Paranjape discusses existing regulations that are similar but not exactly what Mr. Nneji is saying because they do not have an affordable component. Mr. Nneji believes that this would be a way to go back and make multi-family housing. Mr. Nissim has drafting question on C1 and 2. He also has a context question on how many parcels this impacts and how many less than 1 acre served by water and sewer. Mr. Nissim also asks for 1.5 parking spaces and whether that is impacted by any of the new state law. Mr. Nneji did research on this and found that small lots have more stringent parking requirements there are less takers and that is why the state is moving to limit the parking requirements. Mr. Hendrick states that this is solely to prevent PZC from denying an application because of parking requirements. Mr. Nneji has the number of lots but cannot find it. He will send it to the PZC but off the top of his head he believes it is approximately 300 and centered mainly around the Main Street and overlay area in the transit district. Mr. Hendrick thinks there will be a fair cluster in Branchville and Mamasasco. Mr. Nneji returned to this subject and had located the numbers which he read into the record.

Mr. Hendrick states that this will be something for the PZC to chew on.

Mr. Nneji worked on a B item. This item is related to accessory structures in the front yard. He divided it into two sections: traditional accessory structures which encompasses most of the regulations and sustainable accessory structures that he suggests should be permitted as of right. Mr. Nneji reads his suggested language into the record. The PZC then decided they wanted to reread the language Mr. Nneji and digest a bit more.

Hearing no further discussion from the Commission at this time he moved back to the agenda.

4.2.2.MISC-25-3: Branchville Strategic Review

This item was not discussed.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1. Meeting Minutes

5.1.1. Regular Meeting Minutes – January 27, 2026

Mariah sent an email with edits. The PZC would like to see Special Conditions written out in the meeting minutes. Discussion was held that significant time stamps could be included on minutes.

Ms. Okrongly made a motion to approve the minutes with suggested changes. Mr. Nissim seconded. No opposition and the motion carries.

6. ADJOURN

Hearing no further business or discussion, meeting adjourned at 9:42 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