

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

**JULY 18, 2022**

**NOTE:** These minutes are intended as a rough outline of the web-based Zoom proceedings of the Board of Appeals on Zoning of Ridgefield held on July 18, 2022. Copies of recordings of the meeting may be obtained from the Administrator.

The Chairman called the web-based special meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. Sitting on the Board for the evening were: Terry Bearden-Rettger (vice chair), Sky Cole, Mark Seavy, Joseph Pastore and Robert Byrnes.

**ROTATION OF ALTERNATES**

The rotation for the meeting was first, Mr. Lockwood; second, Mr. Stenko; third Mr. Byrnes. Mr. Carson was unable to attend the hearing and asked Mr. Byrnes to sit for him. Thus, rotation for the next meeting will be: first, Mr. Lockwood; second, Mr. Stenko; third Mr. Brynes.

**NEW APPLICATION**

**Application 22-016**  
**Christopher Tanana**  
**25 Revere Place**

The contractor Adam Zaglauer appeared along with the applicant Christopher Tanana. Mr. Zaglauer explained to the Board that they planned to remove and replace the existing deck and propose the wider deck stairs on the side. Currently, the existing deck was 28 feet to the side setback. The proposed new setback for the deck would be 25.83 ft., so a setback variance was requested. The property was on 1.01 acres in the RAA zone. The new deck setbacks would conform to the RA setback at 25ft.

No one appeared to speak for or against the application and the hearing was concluded. A decision can be found at the end of these minutes.

**DECISION**

**Application 22-016**  
**Christopher Tanana**  
**25 Revere Place**

**VOTED:** To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow a deck enlargement that will not meet the minimum yard setbacks; for property in the RAA zone located at 25 Revere Place.

**VOTE:** To Grant: 5 To Deny: 0

In favor Opposed  
Bearden-Rettger, Byrnes,  
Cole, Pastore, Seavy

**CONDITION:**

This action is subject to the following condition that is an integral and essential part of the decision. Without this condition, the variance would not have been granted:

1. The deck shall be located exactly as shown on plans and drawings presented to the Board during the hearing and made part of this decision, and the plans submitted for the building 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 undersized lot, along with the location of the house of the lot, all combine to present an unusual hardship that justifies the granting of a variance in this case. The approved deck plans conform to the RA setback.
2. It is noted that the approved new deck stairs will be built to current building codes and will increase the structure's overall safety.
3. The proposal is in harmony with the general scheme of development in the area and the Town's Plan of Conservation and Development and will have no negative impact on surrounding properties.

As there was no further business before the Board, the Vice Chair adjourned the hearing at approximately 7:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Kelly Ryan*  
Administrator