



**RIDGEFIELD BOARD OF APPEALS ON ZONING**

Town Hall Annex, 66 Prospect Street  
Ridgefield, Connecticut 06877  
Phone: (203) 431-2786 Fax: (203) 431-2737  
E-Mail: zba@ridgefieldct.org

**APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE**

Date 6/22/23

- 1) Applicant Skyview Ventures / Davis Hill Development  
Address 105 Prospect St Greenwich CT 06830
- 2) Premises Located at: 750 N Salem Rd Ridgefield CT  
Closest cross street or nearest intersecting road: \_\_\_\_\_
- 3) Interest in Property:  
owner \_\_\_\_\_ contract purchaser \_\_\_\_\_ lessee  agent \_\_\_\_\_  
Owner of Record: Town of Ridgefield
- 4) Tax Assessor Map No: 8219 COB-0004
- 5) Zone in which property is located RAA Area of Lot (acres) 5
- 6) Dimensions of Lot: Frontage 1500' Average Depth 400'
- 7) If this is residential property: single family \_\_\_\_\_ multi-family \_\_\_\_\_ n/a - School \_\_\_\_\_
- 8) Does this proposal involve the demolition of an existing building? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
- 9) Is property within 500 feet of Danbury, Wilton, Redding? No  
Is property within 500 feet of New York State? No
- 10) Have any previous application been filed on this property? Yes  
If so, give dates and/or variance numbers: 92-030, 95-001, 95-012, 01-007, 01-042, 01-075, 05-036, 14-028, 20-013
- 11) Is this property subject to any wetlands, conservation or preservation restriction? Yes, wetland commission has confirmed carport wont trigger other studies.
- 12) Do you give Board members permission to visit the property? Yes
- 13) Describe variance being requested:  
The current zoning regulation does not claerly define solar carports and has brought this application to halt and has forced the P&Z Commision to draft an addendment

Signature of Owner *Michal Brill*  
Or Signature of Agent \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address 105 Prospect Ave Greenwich CT 06830 Phone No. 314 757 1363  
E-Mail Address micah.brill@skyviewventures.com

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE

REVIEW BY THE ZONING ENFORCEMENT OFFICER

VARIANCE APPLICANT: Skyview Ventures

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 750 No. Salem Rd.

ZONING DISTRICT: RAA

PROPOSAL:  
Install pole mounted solar array over existing parking area at school.

DATE OF REVIEW: 6/23/23

ZEO COMMENTS:

Please note that based on the information provided by the applicant, this proposal would fail to meet the following zoning requirements.\*\*

As was discussed at the P+Z Comm. meeting on 6/20/23, the regulations were created to avoid large solar arrays <sup>at single family properties</sup> elevated off the ground. The P+Z are working to amend regulations to include pole mount arrays. Variance for 7.16.F.2.d.

  
Alice Day  
Zoning Enforcement Officer

**\*\*NOTE:**

*The information on this form is to guide the variance applicant and the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding a variance application and is based upon representations made by the applicant.*

*A full review of an application for a zoning permit may reveal additional zoning requirements that are not met by the proposal.*

*This guide shall not be considered an order, requirement or decision as delineated in Section 8-6 of the Connecticut General Statutes.*

*The petitioner/applicant shall be responsible for any decision made in reliance on this form and it shall not create liability on the part of any officer of the Town of Ridgefield.*



6/22/23

Davis Hill Development  
105 Prospect St  
Greenwich CT 06830

**RE: SP-23-13; 750 North Salem Road, Variance Application:**

To Whom it May Concern:

Davis Hill Development, the solar carport project developer, is requesting a variance on the code for solar carports. The only revision to the code is allowing for pole mounted solar facilities to be able to be constructed at a height of 19' instead of the current 12' limit. We believe this variance is warranted because of the following reasons.

1. HARDSHIP 1: Current regulation is not designed for projects like this. This regulation was undertaken in 2018 and it was started by an angry homeowner whose neighbor put a ground array near his property line. The homeowner was advised that the structure met the zoning regs and that there was no solar regulation- that it was just a structure—like a shed- and that it met the regs. The homeowner was not satisfied (it was on Canterbury Lane in Ridgebury). That homeowner appealed permits to the ZBA and lost (of course because it was a pretty clearcut case) but then started a groundswell of hysteria that led to the regulation. The entire discussion was focused on the impact on neighbors on smaller lots- this project- and the use of the wasted space that is a parking lot- was never contemplated, so the height limitations were limited to the assumption that these would be arrays in someone's yard in a residential neighborhood- not heights that would accommodate vehicles parking below them.
2. HARDSHIP 2- Large arrays like this are supposed to be exempt from the regulation. The regulation is designed entirely to protect neighboring property owners from panels on neighboring residential lots not large arrays on already developed, pseudo-commercial space.
3. HARDSHIP 3- The regulation does not meet the industry standard. The regulation does not meet the industry standard for solar array design and construction. The industry standards include; ground mount\pole mount, roof mount and carports. The Commission at their June 20th meeting have voted to amend the existing regulation to include a more accurate depiction of the solar deign and installation. Our proposed carport design meets all industry standards and building codes and is ready to build. Any further delays, will continue the use of more fossil fuels to provide the power that this solar array can generate.
4. Public policy: This is an important municipal project that converts a traditional parking lot into a renewable energy power source for Ridgefield. The installation of the carport will reduce energy costs for the Ridgefield High School, further reducing Ridgefield's carbon footprint. zoning regulation that we are seeking relief from.



Davis Hill  
Development

5. Public policy: Construction of some solar arrays can have a significant negative ecological impact where land is cleared for the arrays. In this case, there is no negative environmental impact because the land is utilized as a existing parking lot. This is a rare win-win.
  
6. Practical Difficulty: The current time-line with the P&Z amendment review process will add months under the applicable statutes and while that is not in itself a hardship, the delay will have a materially negative impact because construction MUST be performed before school opens, due to safety and logistical concerns. If the project is not permitted soon, the project will lose value and will be delayed until the summer of 2024. This is a uniquely positive project for the town and the delay may impact its viability.

Please reach out with any questions and thank you for your consideration.

Micah Brill

314 757 1363