

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF RIDGEFIELD
MINUTES OF MEETING

JUNE 7, 2021

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 June 7, 2021. Copies of recordings of the meeting may be obtained from the Administrator at cost.

The Chairman called the web-based meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m. Sitting on the Board for the evening were: Carson Fincham (Chair), Sky Cole (Vice Chair), Mark Seavy, Joseph Pastore and Robert Byrnes.

ROTATION OF ALTERNATES

The rotation for the meeting was first, Mr. Lockwood; second, Mr. Stenko; third Mr. Byrne's. Mr. Byrnes continued to sit for Ms. Bearden-Rettger for the continued appeal and sat for Ms. Bearden-Rettger for the new applications. Thus, the rotation for the next meeting will be: first, Mr. Lockwood; second, Mr. Stenko; third Mr. Brynes.

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS:

Appeal No. 21-012
Nnennya Duke
22 Whitlock Lane

Rebecca Luraschi a representative for the pool company, Best in Backyards, appeared. New plans as suggested by the Board at the last hearing were not presented. Ms. Luraschi stated to the Board that after the first hearing, the applicants consulted A1 Septic Company and asked about moving their leaching fields to accommodate the proposed pool further away from the property setback. She stated the company advised that moving the field would require a pump to push up the grade on the lot and any changes to the system were therefore not recommended. A1 Septic stated to applicants that the current system was in good condition and could last over 10 years. Ms. Luraschi further stated that moving the pool to another location would result in it being closer to the wetlands.

The Board discussed if hardships were only financial or if the septic system would truly be damaged by relocating it for the pool construction. The Board asked Ms. Luraschi if she could obtain an explanation from the septic company detailing their recommendation concerning changing the fields on the property. She said she would get it in writing.

The applicants were granted a continuance until the June 21 meeting to submit a letter from the septic company.

Appeal No. 21-013
David and Angela Farabee
16 Clearview Terrace

The applicant David Farabee and contractor Patrick Farrell appeared for the continued hearing. The revised plans after the May 10 hearing did not match what was decided at the hearing, so the applicants appeared again to resubmit more detailed plans. The newly submitted plans confirmed the 5' width of the deck 14' in length. Plans also showed an 8" overhang with 4" inch gutters to cover the entire deck. These numbers brought the total size of the deck and overhang to 6'x14'. Setbacks were discussed as the location of house on undersized lot, house already within the setback and a slight reduction of setback.

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

Appeal No. 21-015
Austin Golankiewicz
18 Woodchuck Lane

Architect Glenn Smith appeared for the applicant who was also present. The submitted plans showed an addition of a garage bay with a bonus or family room above. A mudroom was also planned. The proposed plans would add 4.5 ft. to the right side 25 ft from the side setback. The house built in 1966 was originally in the RA zone but later upzoned to RAA. A setback variance was requested as the setback number for RAA was 35 ft. Mr. Smith listed hardships as the undersized lot, 1.141 acres in a 2-acre zone, the sloping topography and ledge on the lot and the location of the house on the lot. Mr. Smith also previously submitted letters from two neighbors in support of the application. The Board urged Mr. Smith to be cautious about the 25 ft setback if approved.

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

DECISIONS:

Appeal No. 21-013
David and Angela Farabee
16 Clearview Terrace

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to reconstruct a porch within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RA zone located at 16 Clearview Terrace.

DATES OF HEARING: May 10, 2021 and June 7, 2021
DATE OF DECISION: June 7, 2021

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to reconstruct a porch within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RA zone located at 16 Clearview Terrace.

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny:

In favor
Cole, Fincham,
Pastore, Seavy, Byrnes

Opposed

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 submitted to the Board 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.
2. The porch addition shall be no closer than the current porch at 8.3 ft from the south property line and no larger than 6 x 14 sq. ft. including the overhangs and gutters.

The Board voted this action for the following reasons:

1. The position of the house on the undersized lot, built prior to the enactment of zoning, creates an unusual hardship that justifies the grant of a variance in this case. The addition will decrease the nonconformity of the lot as the rebuilt porch will be reduced in size than the existing porch.
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.

Appeal No. 21-015
Austin Golankiewicz
18 Woodchuck Lane

REQUESTED: a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow construction of an addition to a single-family house within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 18 Woodchuck Lane.

DATES OF HEARING: June 7, 2021

DATE OF DECISION: June 7, 2021

VOTED: To Grant, a variance of Section 3.5.H., setbacks, to allow construction of an addition to a single-family house within the minimum yard setback; for property in the RAA zone located at 18 Woodchuck Lane.

VOTE: To Grant: 5 To Deny:

In favor
Cole, Fincham,
Pastore, Seavy, Byrnes

Opposed

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 undersized lot, 1.141 acres in the RAA zone, along with the location of the house on the lot and topography on the property, have created an unusual hardship that justifies the granting of a variance in this case. The approved addition conforms to the RA setback.
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 8:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Ryan
Administrator