ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF RIDGEFIELD APPROVED MINUTES OF MEETING

October 7, 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 7, 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.

NEW APPLICATIONS

<u>Application 24-030</u> <u>Richard Vail, agent for Colleen and Earl Flath</u> <u>149 Main Street</u>

Architect Richard Vail along with Mr. and Mrs. Flath appeared for the application. The variance was to allow an existing barn structure on the property to be rebuilt on the same footprint but 4' smaller. The barn predates zoning regulations. The structure would be a planned 2-bedroom accessory dwelling unit with additional height added to its current 19.6' size. The closest rear setback nonconformity would be reduced, from 23.8' to 28.0'. The proposed 8.6' side setback was questioned by the Board if that number included gutters and overhangs. The applicant agreed allow the administrator to modify the submitted plans and requested 8" from the property line. Any setback number reference to + or - will also be removed from the approved plans.

A letter was submitted from the Historic District Commission approving the proposed plans.

No one appeared to speak for or against the application. A Decision can be found at the end of these minutes.

<u>Application 24-031</u> <u>Trillium Architects, agent for Lisa Kuller</u> 80 Topstone Road

Kevin Ligos of Trillium Architects appeared. He stated to the Board that the application was for an addition to a single-family home. The lot was 1 acre in the RAA zone with a 35' setback requirement. The narrow lot was only 51' wide and the house was nonconforming to setbacks. The proposed addition would be 21' from the setback. The current closest setback for the house was 13.4' so no increase in that nonconformity. The property was vested prior to the enactment of zoning regulations.

It was noted during the hearing that the property abuts the Town of Redding and the Town Clerk of Redding was not notified of the application. A continuance was granted until the October 21 meeting in order for the Redding Town Clerk to be noticed regarding the pending application.

Application was continued until the October 21 meeting.

ADMINSITRATIVE

The Board voted for approval of the September 23 meeting minutes.

DECISION:

<u>Application 24-030</u> <u>Richard Vail, agent for Colleen and Earl Flath</u> <u>149 Main Street</u>

REQUESTED: variances of Sections 3.5.H., setbacks and 8.1.B.4, nonconforming structures, to allow the reconstruction of an existing nonconforming barn structure that does not meet the required setback; for property in the RA zone located at 149 Main Street.

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

VOTED: To Grant, variances of Sections 3.5.H., setbacks and 8.1.B.4, nonconforming structures, to allow the reconstruction of an existing nonconforming barn structure that does not meet the required setback; for property in the RA zone located at 149 Main Street.

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny: 0

<u>In favor</u> Bearden-Rettger, Cole, Lycoyannis, Patore, 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:

Deny

- 1. The addition shall be located exactly as shown on plans and drawings modified by 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 modified and approved with the application for variance.

The Board voted this action for the following reasons:

- 1. The lot and barn structure predates zoning regulations which then resulted in a nonconformity. This created a setback hardship that justifies the granting of a variance in this case. It is noted that the plans will result in a decrease in the 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.

As there was no further business before the Board, the Chairman adjourned the hearing at approximately 7:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Ryan

Administrator