

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF RIDGEFIELD
MINUTES OF MEETING

October 6, 2025

NOTE: These minutes are intended as a rough outline of the proceedings of the Board of Appeals on Zoning of Ridgefield held on October 6, 2025. 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, Joseph Pastore, Robert Byrnes, Sky Cole and Michael Stenko.

ROTATION OF ALTERNATES

The rotation for this meeting was first, Mr. Byrne, second Mr. Cole; third, Mr. Stenko. Mr. Byrne was unable to attend. Mr. Seavy was unable to attend, so Mr. Cole sat for him. Mr. Lycoyannis was unable to attend, so Mr. Stenko continued to sit for the hearing. Thus, the rotation for the next meeting will be remain the same: first, Mr. Byrne; second, Mr. Cole, third Mr. Stenko.

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

Kyle Stupi

Application 25-009

16 Midrocks Road

Applicants asked for a continuance until the October 20 meeting.

Daniel DeWoskin and Rebecca Cao

Application 25-013

19 Ned's Lane

Applicants both appeared for the continued hearing. Ms. Cao submitted to the Board revised plans that were electronically distributed to the Board the prior week. The revised plans for the garage structure now place it 20' from the front setback. Previously submitted plans maintained the 10' setback but enlarged the structure away from the property setback. The existing garage, 10' from the property line and built in 1950, will be demolished. Ms. Cao stated that by building the structure further away into the existing landscape, it would allow more landscaping options to screen the structure from neighboring properties and the roadway, as those were concerns of neighboring property owners. Hardships were listed as the topography of the property with a 100' elevation change and steep, 1300' long driveway.

Attorney Peter Olson appeared for the owners of 24 Ned's Lane. Prior to the hearing, he submitted a letter to the Board in opposition to granting the variance. Mr. Olson stated to the Board that the application did not fall within the Town's comprehensive zoning plan and that there was no unusual hardship on the property. Philip Mische of 24 Ned's Lane also appeared and read a letter into the record, stating that there was no true hardship for the garage structure and a variance should not be granted.

No one else appeared for or against the application. A decision can be found at the end of these Minutes.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The Board voted for approval of the September 15, 2025 meeting minutes.

DECISION

Daniel DeWoskin and Rebecca Cao
Application 25-013
19 Ned's Lane

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow construction of a garage structure within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAAA zone located at 19 Ned's Lane.

DATES OF HEARING: September 8, 15, October 6, 2025
DATE OF DECISION: October 6, 2025

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow construction of a garage structure within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAAA zone located at 19 Ned's Lane.

VOTE: To Grant: 4 To Deny: 1

In favor
Byrnes, Cole,
Pastore, Stenko

Deny
Bearden-Rettger

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.
3. The existing garage structure shall be demolished.

The Board voted this action for the following reasons:

1. The severe topography on the property including steep elevation and ledge, creates hardship that justifies the granting of a variance in this case.
2. In addition, the removal of the existing garage 10' from the property line, will result in a reduction of the setback nonconformity as the new structure will be 20' from the property line.
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.

As there was no further business before the Board, the Chair adjourned the hearing at approximately 7:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Ryan
Administrator