

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF RIDGEFIELD**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**November 17, 2025**

**NOTE:** These minutes are intended as a rough outline of the proceedings of the Board of Appeals on Zoning of Ridgefield held on November 17, 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, Alexander Lycoyannis and Michael Stenko.

**ROTATION OF ALTERNATES**

The rotation for this meeting was first, Mr. Byrne, second Mr. Stenko; third, Mr. Cole. Mr. Byrnes is no longer a member of the ZBA. New alternate member was not yet sworn in. Mr. Seavy was unable to attend so Mr. Stenko sat for him. Thus, the rotation for the next meeting will be remain the same: first, Mr. Santini; second, Mr. Cole, third Mr. Stenko.

**CONTINUED APPLICATIONS**

**Matthew Fishman**  
**Application 25-015**  
**194 High Ridge Avenue**

Continued to the next meeting.

**Michael and Desiree Cuniberti**  
**Application 25-017**  
**279 Ridgebury Road**

Continued to the next meeting.

**NEW APPLICATION**

**Jose and Carol Carvalho**  
**Application 25-021**  
**172 North Salem Road**

Mr. and Mrs. Carvalho appeared for their application. The proposed plans were to build an addition to their house. The current house was located within the 100' wetlands review area. Only 3 sides of the house were buildable. One side was sloped and would require 3 storys for the addition, the other side was the front door entrance area and not suitable for the proposed kitchen on the first floor with bathroom and bedroom additions on the second story. Currently the kitchen was located in the lower level and was only 8x8. This left the proposed location for the addition. The proposed addition would extend the existing north wall of the house enclosing the area. The setback, currently at 30.6' would not change. The property was in the RAA zone with a required 35' setback, so a setback variance was requested. Parts of the original house were built in 1760. The Board reviewed submitted photos of the applicant's current house with the proposed location of the addition. Mrs. Carvalho stated that since most of the house is located in the wetlands review area, approval from the wetlands department would be required. A neighbor at 162 North Salem Road appeared to review the submitted materials. She had no concerns about the proposal

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 November 3, 2025 meeting minutes.

**DECISION**

**Jose and Carol Carvalho**  
**Application 25-021**  
**172 North Salem Road**

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow an addition to a single-family home within the minimum yard setbacks; for property in the RAA zone located at 172 North Salem Road

DATES OF HEARING: November 17, 2025

DATE OF DECISION: November 17, 2025

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow an addition to a single-family home within the minimum yard setbacks; for property in the RAA zone located at 172 North Salem Road.

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny: 0

In favor

Bearden-Rettger, Byrnes, Lycoyannis  
Pastore, Stenko

Deny

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.

The Board voted this action for the following reasons:

1. Part of the original house was built in 1760, prior to Connecticut statehood and the enactment of zoning regulations. The location of the house within the current setback and within the wetland's setback area, diminishes the area of the property that can be used for expansion. This creates hardship that justifies the granting of a variance in this case.
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 Chair adjourned the hearing at approximately 7:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Kelly Ryan*  
Administrator