

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

**June 1, 2026**

**NOTE:** These minutes are intended as a rough outline of the proceedings of the Board of Appeals on Zoning of Ridgefield held on June 1, 2026. Copies of recordings of the meeting may be obtained from the Administrator.

The Chair called the regular meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. Sitting on the Board for the evening were: Mark Seavy, Terry Bearden-Rettger, Robert Byrnes, Alexander Lycoyannis, Joseph Pastore.

**ROTATION OF ALTERNATES**

No alternate was needed for this meeting. Thus, the rotation for the next meeting will stay the same: first, Mr. Santini; second, Mr. Cole, third Mr. Stenko.

**CONTINUED APPLICATION**

**238 Mimosa Circle LLC**  
**Application 26-007**  
**238 Mimosa Circle**

Applicants withdrew their application prior to the start of the meeting.

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

**First Tribeca Connecticut LLC d/b/a Tribeca Community School, Ridgefield**  
**Application 26-009**  
**66 Grove Street, Unit 1**

Attorney Robert Jewell represented the applicants. Mr. Jewell stated to the Board that the Planning and Zoning Commission previously approved a school on the upper level of the property called Unit 1. The 5-acre lot was developed in 1954 and has two egresses, one on Grove Street and one on Old Quarry Road. Unit 2 on the lot is also a commercial building. The lot also contained 20 townhouses. The property has two levels, built into a hillside. Level 1 is accessible thru Grove Street. Level 2 where the school was planned was only accessible via Old Quarry Road. The variance request was to add an additional freestanding sign near the entryway on Old Quarry. There currently are freestanding signs on the corner of Grove Street and Old Quarry and on Grove Street for Unit 2 businesses only. Those additional freestanding signs were granted to the property in variances #02-057 and #05-009 for businesses on level 1, unit 2.

Currently there was no sign for unit 1, the school, on Old Quarry but the adjacent townhouses had their own freestanding on Old Quarry. Mr. Jewell stated hardships for the additional sign as the unique building, built into the hillside with two levels and safety issues for drivers turning into lot being easier to locate the school. The proposed sign did meet the allowable dimensions under the regulations including being 1-sided.

Ms. Bearden-Rettger asked if all the signs could be combined to one sign with arrows pointing the specific structures. Mr. Jewell replied that the dimensions of the sign were likely too small to contain that much detail and therefore be hard to see. A wall sign was planned for the school near the main door.

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

**Triple L LLC**  
**Application 26-010**  
**20 West Lane**

Attorney Robert Jewell represented the applicants. The variance request was to modify an existing condition of a variance previously awarded to the property. The first building on the lot was built in 1875 and first became a restaurant in 1938, the applicant's restaurant is now known as R House. Mr. Jewell stated to the Board that the restaurant always had outdoor dining and outdoor events like weddings. Under the previous variance, three circular brick areas were allowed. These brick areas were surrounded by grass. The variance request was to allow a modification of that variance condition to expand that patio area but not increase in seating capacity. Mr. Jewell stated that the surrounding grass areas results in uneven walking surfaces and uneven seating. Safety for patrons walking in these areas was listed as a hardship, along with the same hardships as listed in variance. Mr. Jewell listed two changes in zoning that had occurred since the 1993 variance. In 2023, Section 8.9 of the zoning regulations was enacted for outdoor dining regulations. This regulation allowed 30% of total seating area for outdoor dining. In 2020, Stormwater Management regulations were passed that managed the level of impervious surfaces a property has and would require a stormwater engineer to manage the run off. The applicant is aware stormwater management is an issue in this application and plans a run off system near the rear parking area.

Neighbor Steve Wolf of 10 West Lane appeared. Mr., Wolf stated he has lived next door to the restaurant for 37 years. He has concerns about the application and the additional of more patio area. Specifically, drainage and run off onto his property. Currently the run off from the lot drains onto his front yard and with a new stormwater management system, he fears flooding in his rear lot. Mr. Wolf also had concerns about noise pollution. Mr. Wolf further stated the condition of the 1993 variance are currently not being adhered to, so any expansion was a concern. Mr. Jewell suggested the owner and Mr. Wolf meet to discuss his concerns.

Mr. Jewell stated he was unsure if the correct zoning regulation was advertised and wanted to discuss with the ZEO, so a continuance was granted until the next ZBA meeting. Mr. Jewell also wanted to discuss the concerns of the neighboring property with the applicant.

**Clotilde Farrell**  
**Application 26-011**  
**11 Hillsdale Avenue**

Contractor Patrick Donovan appeared for the applicant. The variance application was to allow a deck expansion in the property setback. The proposed deck would be 16.5' from the side property line. There will be no increase in the setback as the house was nonconforming to setbacks. The home owner was now immobile and requested a deck extension to enjoy the outdoors and her pets. The backyard of the property had a steep drop off with 14 steps down to the backyard; the deck extension would be from the house to the edge of the stairway. These steps to the backyard would not be expanded. The proposed deck would be 16.5' from the side property line. The property was in the R20 zone with a required 20' setback. Hardships were listed as the long narrow shape of the lot and the location on the lot and the steep drop off to the road.

Ms. Bearden Rettger asked that a condition of the variance include additional privacy fencing with the neighboring property.

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

**DECISIONS**

**First Tribeca Connecticut LLC d/b/a Tribeca Community School, Ridgefield**  
**Application 26-009**  
**66 Grove Street, Unit 1**

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 7.2.E.8., type of sign, to allow the premises one additional free-stranding sign; for property in the B2 zone located at 66 Grove Street, Unit 1.

DATES OF HEARING: June 1, 2026

DATE OF DECISION: June 1, 2026

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 7.2.E.8., type of sign, to allow the premises one additional free-stranding sign; for property in the B2 zone located at 66 Grove Street, Unit 1.

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny: 0

In favor Deny  
Bearden-Rettger, Byrnes, Lycoyannis,  
Pastore, 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:

1. The sign 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 sign 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. The unique shape of the property, built into the hillside on two levels, with upper and lower entryways creates an unusual hardship that justifies the granting of a variance. The additional free-standing sign will improve safety for drivers entering the lot and decreases traffic driving thru the neighboring condominium driveway.
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.

**Clotilde Farrell**  
**Application 26-011**  
**11 Hillsdale Avenue**

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow a deck addition within the minimum yard setback; for property in the R20 zone located at 11 Hillsdale Avenue.

DATES OF HEARING: June 1, 2026

DATE OF DECISION: June 1, 2026

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow a deck addition within the minimum yard setback; for property in the R20 zone located at 11 Hillsdale Avenue.

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny: 0

In favor Deny  
Bearden-Rettger, Byrnes, Lycoyannis,  
Pastore, Stenko

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 deck shall be located exactly as shown on plans and drawings revised and presented to the Board during the hearing and made part of this decision.
2. Property owner will add two sections of privacy fencing.
3. 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. The shape of the lot and the location of the house on the lot, along with the steep grade, present unusual hardship that justifies the granting of a variance in this case.
2. It is noted that the approved plans do not increase into the setback.
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.

**ADMINISTRATIVE**

**Meeting Minutes**

The Board voted for approval of the May 11, 2026 meeting minutes.

As there was no further business before the Board, the Chair adjourned the hearing at approximately 8:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Kelly Ryan*  
Administrator