

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF RIDGEFIELD
MINUTES OF MEETING

June 15, 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 15, 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, Michael Stenko.

ROTATION OF ALTERNATES

Ms. Bearden-Rettger recused herself from one application as noted below and asked Mr. Stenko to sit for her. Thus, the rotation for the next meeting will stay the same: first, Mr. Santini; second, Mr. Cole, third Mr. Stenko.

CONTINUED APPLICATION

Triple L LLC
Application 26-010
20 West Lane

Applicants asked for a continuance until the next ZBA meeting.

NEW APPLICATIONS

The following application was heard by Mr. Seavy, Ms. Bearden-Rettger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Lycoyannis and Mr. Byrnes.

Nejame and Sons, agents for Bennett and AnnMarie Covino
Application 26-012
6 Ritch Drive

Thomas Nejame appeared along with the property owner Bennett Covino. The application was for a setback variance to allow a 14 x 35 inground pool within the required 35' setback, 13' from the property line. Mr. Nejame listed hardships as the lot having 3 fronts, two on Ritch Drive and one on Haviland Road. The topography of the property was also listed as a hardship. Photos of several locations were entered into the file and discussed. The photo of the proposed location showed a stone retaining wall that would help to conceal the pool from a neighboring property along with the tree line.

Other photos showed the drop off to Haviland Road on one side. A letter from the closest neighboring property was also submitted in support of the application.

Ms. Bearden-Rettger asked if they considered applying for a special permit with planning and zoning commission for the pool to be located in the front yard. Mr. Covino replied that they considered that option but the front yard did not offer privacy screening and could interfere with the driveway entrance. Mr. Nejame also stated that the location of the septic fields and well would require the pool to be located 25' away, so several other locations on the property were not available. Mr. Byrnes suggested the pool be constructed in front of the existing shed in the rear. Mr. Covino stated that location was likely to close to the well and closer to the neighboring property.

Board members also expressed concerns that the pool would be fully within the 35' setback and questioned if a smaller pool could be built further from the property line. The Board did recognize that hardship in the undersized lot and topography existed, however, there may be other location options available and a special permit could still be explored.

A continuance was granted until the next ZBA meeting to allow the applicant to review options.

238 Mimosa Circle LLC
Application 26-013
238 Mimosa Circle

The following application was heard by Mr. Seavy, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Lycoyannis, Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Stenko.

Attorney Ward Mazzucco appeared for the applicants who were also present. Mr. Mazzucco submitted a legal memorandum outlining the applicants request for the variance. The application was to allow an existing 2nd floor addition and a deck to a single-family home. The house was nonconforming to setbacks, so a setback variance was requested. Mr. Mazzucco provided background on the property; originally in the RA zone with 25' setbacks the lot was later upzoned to the RAA zone with a required 35' setback. Mr. Mazzucco further stated when applicants purchased the property, the existing sunroom and deck were in poor condition. Applicant submitted plans to excavate the basement and expand the second floor over the existing rebuilt sunroom beginning in March 2025. A field decision during construction resulted in the expansion of the original footprint of the deck. The setback for the house went from 27.1' to now 29.4'. When applicants asked for final zoning compliance in March 2026, the ZEO stated she was not aware of the second story addition over the sunroom and the deck expansion was not included in the plans submitted for the zoning and building permits. A final zoning compliance was therefore not issued. Applicants had also filed an adjoining Appeal of the ZEO determination to not issue final zoning compliance but withdrew that Appeal prior to the start of the meeting. Board members reviewed the Zoning Permit that was issued and asked for clarification that a 2nd story was noted. Mr. Mazzucco stated the 2nd story was described in the permit description. Hardships for the variance were listed as the upzoned, undersized lot, the presence of a brook in the front of the lot and the elimination of the drop-down rule for lots that were upzoned.

The owner of 238 Mimosas Circle, Roman Rozinka, stated to the Board that the deck and sunroom were rotting and needed to be replaced. The deck was originally 8x6 and was now 19x14 and squared off to the end of the house. A flagstone patio was underneath. Mr. Rozinka confirmed he did not tell the Town his plans to expand the deck prior to construction. Board members reviewed the original survey of the property prior to the project starting. It was confirmed that the Board would be voting for an approval of the addition and deck within the property setback.

Surveyor Eric Kristoffersen appeared. Mr. Kristoffersen did the surveys for the property. He stated to the Board that the language in the permit was correct just worded differently and the errors were just a result of poor communication. A neighbor at 234 Mimosa Circle, Tom Figgatt appeared and previously submitted a letter in support of granting the variance. Mr. Figgatt supported the improvements to the property.

Neighbor Jon Paradiso of 386 North Street submitted a letter prior to the hearing objecting to the granting of the variance.

Christopher Vahlsing of 382 North Street appeared. Mr. Vahlsing also submitted numerous documents to the Board prior to the hearing. Documents included timeline of the work done on the property, photos and information about the permitting process and requirements of the Inland Wetland Board. Based his review of such documents and photographs, Mr. Vahlsing questioned if the dimensions of the addition were accurate. Mr. Lycoyannis asked if Mr. Vahlsing was contesting the survey. Mr. Vahlsing replied that he was contesting it based on the before and after photos of the house he submitted. Mr. Stenko stated that the only legally binding document submitted to the Board was the certified stamped survey submitted by the applicant. Mr. Vahlsing stated he was aware of the plans with the Inland and Wetlands Board to remediate the runoff concerns for his property and believes those diversions would help, but still primarily had concerns about the size and height of the addition. Board members asked if a screening plan would be acceptable. Mr. Vahlsing stated that future owners could cut down any future plantings but would agree to discuss a screening plan with applicants. Mr. Kristoffsen stated that there was already a screening plan in place with the Inland Wetlands Board but revisions are still being discussed with that plan. Mr. Pastore stated he would like the applicants to present that finalized screening plan.

A continuance was granted until the next ZBA meeting to allow the applicants to present the planting and screening plan between the two properties.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Meeting Minutes

The Board voted for approval of the June 1, 2026 meeting minutes.

As there was no further business before the Board, the Chair adjourned the hearing at approximately 9:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Ryan
Administrator