

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF RIDGEFIELD
MINUTES OF MEETING

September 14, 2026

NOTE: These minutes are intended as a rough outline of the proceedings of the Board of Appeals on Zoning of Ridgefield held on September 14, 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, Michael Santini.

ROTATION OF ALTERNATES

Mr. Pastore was unable to sit, so Mr. Santini sat for him on the new application at Mr. Pastore's request. Mr. Seavy sat for Mr. Pastore on the continued hearing. Thus, the rotation for the next meeting will be: first, Mr. Stenko; second, Mr. Cole, third Mr. Santini.

CONTINUED APPLICATION

Garian Building and Remodeling Inc., agent for First Lien Capital LLC
Application 26-017
20 Flat Rock Drive

Craig Werman appeared again for Garian Building and Remodeling. The hearing was continued from the August 31 meeting to allow applicant to consult with a surveyor regarding gutters needed for the proposed project. An updated plot plan was submitted to the Board now including the gutters to the proposed second story over the existing garage. The previous plans showed the setback at 27.4', the new proposed setback with gutters was 26' in the RAA zone. Hardships were listed as the position of the house on the narrow lot and the topography in the rear of the lot near the garage.

A Board member noted that the Town of Lewisboro, NY was not notified of the variance application, as the property abuts Lewisboro.

A continuance was granted to allow the administrator to notify the Town Clerk of the pending application.

NEW APPLICATION

Wayne Burritt
Application 26-018
73 Simpaug Turnpike

Architect Doug MacMillan appeared for the application. The application was to allow a bathroom addition to the rear of the house, closing off an open section. The addition would be 6x5 sq. ft. The open section was likely the result of additions to the house over the years. The house was first constructed in 1900 before zoning regulations were enacted. Mr. MacMillan listed hardships as the undersized lot, .63 acres in the RAA zone and 90% of the house currently located within the setback. Several nonconforming buildings on the lot have been demolished since the applicant purchased the property.

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

ADMINISTRATIVE
Meeting Minutes

The Board voted for approval of the August 31, 2026 meeting minutes.

DECISION

Wayne Burritt
Application 26-018
73 Simpaug Turnpike

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow an addition to single-family home within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 73 Simpaug Turnpike.

DATES OF HEARING: September 14, 2026
DATE OF DECISION: September 14, 2026

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow an addition to single-family home within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 73 Simpaug Turnpike.

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny: 0

<u>In favor</u> Bearden-Rettger Byrnes, Lycoyannis, Seavy, Santini	<u>Deny</u>
---	-------------

- 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. The house built in 1900 predates zoning regulations. This, along with the position of the house on the undersized lot, .63 acres in the RAA zone, creates hardship that justifies the granting of a variance in this case. It is noted that the approved plans do not increase the setback 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 Chair adjourned the hearing at approximately 7:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Ryan
Administrator