

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

**December 5, 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 December 5, 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: Carson Fincham, Terry Bearden-Rettger, 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. Byrnes will hear the continued application and the new application for Mr. Cole. Thus, the rotation for the next meeting will be: first, Mr. Lockwood; second, Mr. Stenko; third Mr. Brynes.

**CONTINUED APPLICATION**

**Application 22-024**  
**Nicholas and Lauren Schede**  
**91 New Street**

Mrs. Schede appeared again for the application. She had submitted revised plans for the addition. Originally the plans showed a 16 ft wide addition to the house, with a setback of 10.9ft to the property line. The Board asked if the plans could move the setback further from the property line. The revised plans showed the addition as 14 ft wide with a 12.2 ½ ft. setback. Mrs. Schede said the setback calculation included overhangs. Mr. Pastore asked if the buffer was the 2.5 inches. She replied it was.

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

**NEW APPLICATION**

**Application 22-025**  
**John and Ngaire Duncan Radzin**  
**65 Cedar Lane**

Mr. Radzin appeared for the application. He stated to the Board that the submitted plans were to add a second shed on the lot within the setback, 28.5 ft. The lot was undersized, 1 acre in the RAA zone requiring 35 ft setbacks. Mr. Pastore asked if the proposed location could be moved within the 35 ft. Mr. Radzin stated the location was chosen due to the location of the existing well. Mr. Bearden-Rettger asked if the applicants considered getting one larger shed and eliminating the other shed structure and the need for a variance. Mr. Radzin stated that he planned on storing different types of things in the respective sheds and did not want to combine storage.

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE:**

**Election of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson**

After a brief discussion, the Board will elect the Chair and Vice Chair at the December 12 meeting.

**DECISIONS**

**Application 22-024**  
**Nicholas and Lauren Schede**  
**91 New Street**

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow the construction of a two-story addition that will be within the south side setback; for property in the R20 zone located at 91 New Street.

DATES OF HEARING: November 7, December 5 2022  
DATE OF DECISION: December 5, 2022

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow the construction of a two-story addition that will be within the south side setback; for property in the R20 zone located at 91 New Street.

VOTE: To Grant: 4 To Deny: 1

In favor  
Byrnes, Fincham,  
Pastore, Seavy

Deny  
Bearden-Rettger

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 addition 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 narrow shape of lot creates a hardship.
2. Upzoning has also created a hardship due to an undersized lot that justifies the grant of a variance in this case. The proposed addition complies with the setbacks for the appropriate down-zone, of 12 feet, and the house was built prior to 2003.
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.

**Application 22-025**  
**John and Ngaire Duncan Radzin**  
**65 Cedar Lane**

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow a shed within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 65 Cedar Lane.

DATES OF HEARING: December 5 2022  
DATE OF DECISION: December 5, 2022

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow a shed within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 65 Cedar Lane.

VOTE:            To Grant:        5                            To Deny:        0

In favor

Byrnes, Bearden-Rettger, Fincham,  
Pastore, Seavy

Deny

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:

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, 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. Upzoning has created a hardship due to an undersized lot that justifies the grant of a variance in this case. The proposed shed complies with the setbacks for the appropriate down-zone, of 25 feet, and the house was built prior to 2003.
2. 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 Chairman adjourned the hearing at approximately 7:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
*Kelly Ryan*  
Administrator