

Planning and Zoning Commission
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 12, 2026
(Unrevised/Unapproved)

ATTENDANCE

Commission & Staff

NAME	TITLE/ROLE	PRESENT		NOTES
		Yes	No	
Robert Hendrick	Chair	X		
Mariah Okrongly	Vice Chair	X		via Zoom
Joe Dowdell	Commissioner	X		via Zoom
Ben Nneji	Commissioner	X		via Zoom
Elizabeth DiSalvo	Commissioner	X		
Chris Molyneaux	Commissioner	X		
Joe Sorena	Commissioner	X		
Sebastian D’Acunto	Commissioner		X	
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

Mr. Hendrick announced that he was asked after the last meeting to speak to the Public Safety Facilities Advisory Committee. It was a nice conversation that went on for 30-40 minutes about the Special Permit process. He also made sure they understood rezoning, particularly around Branchville, and mandates around housing developments and possible impacts to Ridgefield housing over short and long term. He encourages stronger preapplication review before the process because he is worried that the voters would approve something from a budget perspective and then the Special Permit process would change things.

1.3. Approval of agenda.

2. ENFORCEMENT (COMPLAINTS/VIOLATIONS)

No ongoing enforcement to discuss.

3. PUBLIC HEARING(S)

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 gives an overview of the application and process. Mr. Formica was present to discuss the application. He announced to the Commission that a letter was received from Attorney Dwight Merriam, a land

use attorney. He is representing Shane Herlet of 120 Prospect Street, #66. It is a lengthy document that should be reviewed.

The applicant team discussed new information including the tree survey. In response to the request by the PZC a formal response was sent to the Conservation Commission about the trail and that the WPCA has no intention of creating the trail by the Goodwill trailer. He provided April 23, 2026 meeting minutes that included discussion with the property owners at Prospect Woods. They received the tree survey and included significant trees on the updated plans that were submitted to the permit portal. The WPCA responded to the attorney letter that was newer to the record. Mr. Formica is willing to work with an engineer to make the trench shallower in certain locations as requested by the homeowners. Mr. Hendrick believes the letter from the attorney states that there should be changes to the plans but we are out of time. Mr. Hendrick suggests adding a special condition that some specifics remain in discussion and need final administrative review by Ms. Paranjape. Mr. Hendricks suggests potential language to state that if staff feels the changes or future changes are too substantial to be handled administratively it could be raised to board review and a revision to the Special Permit would be proposed.

Staff comment included reference to a revised staff report that included language for the easement. Mr. Hendrick thinks the easement could also allow Ms. Paranjape to give final administrative review on the easement. Mr. Hendrick would like to review easement language to make sure nothing is contrary to the PZC Special Permit.

Mr. Nissim asked if Attorney Merriam's comments are consistent with what the PZC can do. Ms. Paranjape clarified that the PZC extended the Public Hearing for as many days as they possibly could statutorily. Mr. Hendrick explained that Mr. Merriam thinks the PZC should wait until everything has been clarified. Mr. Sorena asked if Mr. Herlet received the mailed notice. It was confirmed that he was on the second certified mailing list. Mr. Herlet was very actively engaged with the applicant team throughout the process to ask and have his questions answered – so he was aware of the plans. Mr. Sorena stated he felt the applicant team did a great job of engaging the public.

Mr. Hendrick opened the floor to the public.

Mr. Wilson, Prospect Woods, Unit 62. He gave full disclosure that he knew Ms. Okrongly in her childhood. He stated that Mr. Herlet could not be present so he is making some statements on his behalf. The letter was drafted with his attorney and Mr. Herlet wanted to make sure his letter was read and received by the PZC. Mr. Wilson feels the theme of this is important – that the residents want to see this move forward expeditiously but done in a manner that protects their properties. He feels there are still topics the owners of the back row building would like to discuss with the HOA for conditions of the easement. He doesn't feel it is the responsibility of the PZC to wait for this to be finalized. He has a question for the WPCA. Under the CT FOI act he asked for the financial specifics of the cost, both operating and capital, of the two alternatives that were presented in the meeting that he attended. The alternatives were to replace in kind and bigger and better down the road. He has not been given that information, but he believes and hopes that it does exist. He thinks we are good here at the PZC.

Nancy Tine, 120 Prospect Street #24, President of the HOA for Prospect Woods. She sent a letter to the WPCA and stated that the HOA supports moving the project forward.

Ms. McMahon, 120 Prospect Woods. She stated that she requested a meeting with the HOA and she feels people are getting bits and pieces of information. She claimed she was denied to have a meeting with the Prospect Woods HOA. Ms. Tine made a statement that said a meeting could be held but she would not be present. Mr. Hendrick interjects that he didn't think back and forth was appropriate. Ms. McMahon is supporting the application in front of the PZC. She echos what Mr. Wilson said. She has been reaching out for information since February to get the finances behind the alternatives to both the HOA and Diana VanNess with the WPCA. She feels that two pump stations would be the alternative project. She believes she reached out to the WPCA and feels there is information lacking. Mr. Hendrick tries hone in on relevant topics and asks for

specifics on what the PZC has per view over. He explains that he cannot push the WPCA to do anything. This is not the right audience for that comment.

Hearing no additional public comment, Mr. Hendrick asks the applicant team to walk the PZC through the tree survey and discuss the significant trees and which are to be removed and which are to remain. Mr. Hendrick shared his screen and goes through the survey. Mr. Hendrick states that the trees that will be removed must be noted on the plan or the default is that they will all be protected. Mr. Hendrick suggests telling the contractor that they must follow all municipal approvals including the to remove and to save trees as noted. Ms. DiSalvo explains and suggests how to add this to the plan to avoid taking all unnecessary trees down. Mr. Hendrick suggests drawing a 10-15 foot easement line and mark all the trees within that line to be removed. The WPCA will identify all trees that may be impacted and could be removed. Mr. Formica explains that the easement does not cover the whole line. Mr. Sorena states that within the easement you can easily identify the construction limits. In the area where there is town property, you can dictate to the contractor and annotate and area on the drawings where the trees are not to be removed. Discussion continued back and forth on the best approach to labeling trees. Mr. Formica stated the trees that could be removed.

Ms. Kozlark, on behalf of the WPCA specified that the FOI was submitted on May 6 which was after the public meetings were held with the WPCA.

Mr. Formica asked what to do with the markup plans. Mr. Hendrick suggests a screen shot and emailing it to Ms. Paranjape right now, it will be considered actively submitted during the Public Hearing while it was open. Ms. DiSalvo suggests just adding the details as a note.

Unidentified Homeowner. Asks how much it will cost the owners for septic increase. Mr. Hendrick states that it is an economic question and it is not part of PZC. She read in the paper that the cost would go to the owner.

Proposed Special Condition discussed:

- Trees to be removed will be added to the plans. Contractor is to assume removal of all trees within the 20-foot easement.

Public Hearing was closed at 7:52PM.

- 3.2. **(Contd) 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>

This is the second night of the public hearing. The applicant team- Kurt Lavaway and Paolo Compos, came to the table. They shared their screen for a presentation to discuss outstanding items: POCD alignment with Special Permit Regulations, Slope Check at Proposed Access Driveway, Delivery Vehicle Turning Maneuvers, Turf Surfacing Material, and Lighting Cutsheets. All topics were addressed but they were submitted on the town website. Hard copies were also brought to the meeting.

The first topic was the POCD and sustainability of the project. They are complying with sustainable Ridgefield and are looking to minimize an increase in footprint and trying not to impact undisturbed areas. They are reducing fossil fuel use. Ms. DiSalvo asked about ePanels. The applicant responded that they currently exist and more will be added. The building is currently energy efficient. They were asked to relook at the proposed access drive. They had exceeded slope by a small amount, so they changed it from 12.5% to less than 12% by adding a very slight extension and keep it under the threshold. They looked at the delivery truck maneuvering radius and it does allow for them. The length used for the study was 30 feet. They discussed the synthetic lawn and material including water usage. The PZC expressed concerns with the material used here. They added cutsheets to the application and reviewed them on the screen and discussed the lighting.

No additional comment from staff. No additional comment from the public.

At this point the conversation went back to the PZC. No additional comment.

Public Hearing closed at 8:14PM.

- 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 gives a brief overview of the amendment. Mr. Dowdell was the sponsor of this. This is the third night of the public hearing for this amendment.

Ms. Okrongly added that some Commissioners did not have an opportunity to weigh in on this. Ms. DiSalvo recapped the main points. You do not have to be a primary home owner and you can rent less than 6 months. Ms. Okrongly added that Mr. Jewell suggested less than 14 days is no registry, above 14 days it has to be registered. Mr. Hendrick really liked Mr. Jewells suggestions on this topic for a short term rental.

Ms. DiSalvo is reading the language off the screen. She feels that there is one umbrella. She feels that Bed and Breakfast is different than short term rental. Additional conversation included the definition of Primary Residence. She also thought it could only be done six months out of the calendar year. She thought it should not have to be the primary residence. Mr. Sorena agrees that it should not be restricted to a primary residence. Mr. Hendrick thinks the PZC should avoid renting properties out if they do not belong to a Ridgefielder and are just buying property for investment and short term rental. Ms. Okrongly suggests that a primary resident gets 10 weeks and a non primary resident gets 6 weeks or something like that. Mr. Sorena thinks you should be able to rent your place however you want and it should all be allowed as of right.

Mr. Hendrick goes back to the process and procedure. If the PZC wants an alternative to the language Mr. Dowdell drafted, somebody has to draft the edited language.

The main questions Ms. DiSalvo feels remain outstanding are: Do you have to be a primary resident? How many months can you rent it?

Ms. Okrongly reviewed her notes from the last meeting and stated that subjects discussed included: 14 days or less is an exemption with nothing, a registry, and if 6 weeks or more then you need a Special Permit.

Ms. DiSalvo asked if anyone had recommendations or opinions on length. Mr. Nissim is not offended by primary residence issue. He can also not conceptualize without a draft in front of him. Mr. Dowdell felt primary resident was to avoid an investment company purchasing homes. He does not care how long they are rented out as a general rule. He would like to change the language to something like a limiting factor that makes it not rented all the time.

Ms. DiSalvo is going to attempt to start the revised template based on the conversation.

Ms. Okrongly agrees that is a good next step.

Ms. DiSalvo suggests that at some point a Special Permit will be required. Possibly at 6 weeks. She asks for clarification on the registry concept. She also asks if there is a case where an Airbnb could be rented by right by putting it on a registry no matter how long. How would you have an Airbnb for more than 6 months? Mr. Sorena is saying he doesn't think there should be restrictions. Mr. Nissim stated that there could be an occupancy tax.

The public hearing remains open.

- 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 gives a brief overview of the amendment. Mr. Dowdell was the sponsor of this. This is the third night of the public hearing for this amendment.

Mr. Sorena was involved in this topic. He asked to share the screen to see if he could add comment. He was not present for the last few discussions which is why this one remained open.

Mr. Hendrick stated that this language was taken from Westport, CT. Mr. Sorena brought up distances between curb cuts. He shared the language on the screen and some highlighted sections for discussion. Ms. Okrongly added that not just entrance and egress of the actual site but also considering nearby intersections and adding something about that. Mr. Sorena stated that subject went to the general traffic study to capture the flow. Ms. Okrongly stated a recent project that did not talk about a big intersection near the exit and entry of the project. She feels it would be important to specify. Mr. Hendrick stated that this was incorporated.

Hearing no additional comment. The Public Hearing closed at 8:46PM.

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 gives a brief overview of the amendment. Mr. Dowdell was the sponsor of this. This is the third night of the public hearing for this amendment. Mr. Jewell commented at the last meeting that he felt 250 per acre was too low. Mr. Fossi came to the last meeting and felt that 250 was too low.

Mr. Hendrick brought an alternative proposal. Mr. Sorena was the lead on this topic. The concern initially was that the amount allowed on small lots was too high without getting a Special Permit. Mr. Molyneaux wants to know what to do if someone goes over the threshold without a permit. Ms. Paranjape explains the current excavation, grading, and fill triggers for permits and fines.

Mr. Hendrick states changing the multiplier number to apply to all lots and not just the smaller ones to catch all sizes and limits.

Public comment.

Mr. Bellina. 26 Marcadon. He is an architect in town and asks if the quantity is net or if you touch it then it is considered disturbed. Ms. DiSalvo states that other towns are net soil. Mr. Bellina believes that it should be net. He believes there should be a chart based on lot size and that spoils going off site should be as of right based on building permit.

Ms. DiSalvo thinks there is wiggle room to breathe in the bigger lots. It's not a no it is that you have to acquire a Special Permit.

This Public Hearing remained 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. Nissim worked on this topic. He drafted additional language and shared with Ms. Paranjape. Ms. Paranjape shared her screen. Mr. Nissim would like to add this language into the fee section of the regulations. He wants to make sure that this is not cumulative but needs to be included.

Mr. Dowdell asked what would happen if you acquired the property if you acquired the problem, is it then your fine. Ms. Paranjape expressed a state statute that if a zoning permit was issued and it is open, the home owner comes to close and the As Built shows it is not in the setbacks. 8-13a applies to this. At that time it becomes a non-conforming structure. This is a complication of the statute, but this would need to be discussed with the legislature. Mr. Hendrick states that this is why the ZEO and staff needs to be reviewing active permits. Ms. Paranjape is going to give limits for expiration within two years.

Ms. DiSalvo asks if there is a foundation survey required. Ms. Paranjape says yes but only if it is more than 500 square feet. She is going to add the required survey for everything from this point forward.

They discuss the language and how it would play out with the ZEO taking on the responsibility of following up on outstanding permits. Mr. Dowdell questions whether we want to include the new owner as subject to fine.

The PZC did not agree to a dollar amount or the in lieu of language. He revised the ordinance language as well. Ms. DiSalvo asked AI what the typical cost was and the response was \$200-\$500 per tree. Mr. Hendrick asks for explanation of the fee for a regulation change. Mr. Hendrick suggests that there is a substantial burden that a text change puts on the Commission.

Ms. DiSalvo asks for clarification on the added fees with a regulation change monetary amount. Mr. Hendrick thinks it should be higher but not crazy high. Mr. Dowdell asks if someone can come to the PZC for a preconcept discussion on a regulation amendment.

Mr. Nissim asks if there are any opinions on the format of the fees. Ms. Okrongly mentions legacy trees. The person responsible for tree regulation in Hartford has not responded but Ms. Okrongly is going to try calling her again. Ms. Okrongly suggests \$400 per tree and also initiating another section. This could add to Ms. Okrongly tree section within the regulations that she is drafting. Ms. Paranjape explains the permit fee trigger. Mr. Hendrick asks if the PZC is ready to close the public hearing or keep it open.

The tree number will be finalized in Ms. Okrongly's tree regulation, the F section, and the updated fees will be edited. Hearing no further comment, the Public Hearing closed at 9:36PM.

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 is closed for this item. The PZC continues discussion from the series of Public Hearings.

Mr. Nissim asked about the letter from the lawyer on behalf of a property owner at Prospect Woods. Mr. Hendrick summarizes that the home owner would like to see some changes that would take some more time to resolve. He asked for the Public Hearing to remain open. Mr. Nneji stated that the individual doesn't seem opposed to the application but just has a few things they would like to see resolved.

Mr. Nissim asked what happens if they cannot agree on easement language. Mr. Hendrick states that it will be a condition so the project could not proceed without the condition.

Mr. Sorena and Ms. Okrongly have additional comment on the importance of traffic management. Ms. Okrongly supports Mr. Hendrick's restricted work hours near residences.

Mr. Hendrick had a few things to add to the Special Conditions as presented in the staff report:

- Insert Ms. Paranjape into the drafting process of the easement because the easement might have things that are different than what we heard in the Public Hearing so she can be aware of the language to assure that it matches our approval.
- Temporary traffic management and if it allows staff the ability to review the plans.
- The contractor shall adhere to designated work hours. He suggested 7AM to 4PM and no public holidays. The timing is restricted to 8AM to 4PM within 200 feet of the residences.

Mr. Hendrick stated that the applicant made a solid effort to work with the residents and the town.

Ms. DiSalvo made a motion to approve the application as presented with standard conditions and special conditions with the changes that Mr. Hendrick introduced. Seconded by Mr. Sorena. Motion passes unanimously.

- 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>

Mr. Sorena doesn’t appreciate the grass. Mr. Nissim agrees but overall he is in support of the overall project. Mr. Hendrick thinks it is a rather small addition considering the size of the overall campus. Mr. Nissim is also pleased with the acknowledgement of the downstream neighbors. Mr. Hendrick was pleased with the organization of the application. Ms. Okrongly was pleased with the POCD and asked Ms. Paranjape to push back on an application that does not address compliance with the POCD. Ms. DiSalvo suggests adding this to the application checklist.

Mr. Sorena made a motion to move forward with the conditions drafted in the staff report. Seconded by Mr. Nneji. Motion passes unanimously.

- 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>

This 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 closed. No further discussion.

Mr. Nissim made a motion to approve as drafted with changes suggested during the Public Hearing this evening. Seconded by Ms. DiSalvo. Motion passes unanimously.

- 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>

Ms. Paranjape suggests June 30th as the date to begin the changes.

Mr. Sorena made a motion to approve with changes suggested during the Public Hearing this evening. Seconded by Ms. DiSalvo. Motion passes unanimously.

- 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.

This will be continued to the next meeting on May 26.

4.8. **Temporary Moratorium Activities**

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

Ms. DiSalvo discussed the RACE Committee. They want to come in to discuss the level of lighting for migrating birds, planting only native plants on a Special Permit project, and adding of EV chargers to more lots. They will be coming in to give a quick talk.

Ms. Okrongly drafted native plant language for Special Permits. Ms. DiSalvo added some language to that folder.

Ms. DiSalvo addressed the surprise issue of not having a vehicle for oversight if a drawing does not come in. She suggests adding a line on the agenda to include the new additions to a permit application. Mr. Hendrick agrees that it is a good idea. Mr. Hendrick suggests adding a dashboard for Zoning Permits, Special Permits, new projects, and an overall tracker to know what is happening in the overall Zoning world for already approved permits. Ms. Okrongly supports this particularly with big public permits.

Ms. Paranjape read the language addressing native plantings.

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

This was not discussed.

5. **NEW BUSINESS**

- 5.1. **SP-26-5: 66 Grove Street, Unit 1:** Revision to a Special Permit (per RZR 9.2.A and 5.3) to revise the previously presented and approved fence style at “Tribeca Community School Ridgefield”. *Owner: Lisa Eng Props LLC Lydia Li Trust Props LLC Et Al; Appl: Robert Jewell. For receipt and schedule discussion (Staff suggest discussion on May 26)* <https://ridgefieldct.portal.opengov.com/records/105657>

Mr. Hendrick gives a brief overview of the application.

Motion made by Mr. Sorena to receive the application and schedule discussion on 5/26. Seconded by Ms. DiSalvo. Motion passes unanimously.

- 5.2. **SP-26-6: 137 Ethan Allen Hwy:** Revision to a Special Permit (per RZR 9.2.A and 5.2.D.5) for change of use from retail to manufacturing, production of food item-Popcorn for “Prospector popcorn LLC” in B-2 Zone. *Owner: BHD Ridgefield Realty LLC; Applicant: Robert Jewell. For receipt and schedule discussion. (Staff suggest discussion on May 26th)* <https://ridgefieldct.portal.com/records/105658>

Mr. Sorena will recuse from this application because his son works at the Prospector. Ms. Paranjape states that a site walk could be conducted this Sunday if interested.

Mr. Bellina added minor clarification to the discussion on the space.

Motion made by Ms. DiSalvo to receive the application and schedule discussion on 5/26. Seconded by Mr. Nissim Mr. Sorena recused. Motion passes with 7-0-1.

5.3. Regular Meeting Minutes – April 28, 2026

Motion made by Mr. Nissim to approve. Seconded by Mr. Molyneaux. Motion passes and it is unanimous.

6. ADJOURN

Hearing no further business or public discussion, meeting adjourned at 10:19 PM.

Notes

FYI – This item will likely be dismissed because they went to the ZBA and received a variance from the ZBA. This should end shortly.

Lis pendens: Adessi 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