



## ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 24, 2012

**APPLICANT:** 2 Island Hill Avenue/65 Danbury Road

Gas station

**MEETING LOCATION:** Town Hall Annex  
Back Lower Level Conference Room

**AAC MEMBERS:**

(Place check next to those who attended)

<input type="checkbox"/> W. Arthur	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S. Benton	<input type="checkbox"/> J. Clements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B. Corso
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> H. Dimos	<input type="checkbox"/> T. Dunphy	<input type="checkbox"/> P. Guzy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> J. Hupy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> J. Kinnear	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> G. Lounsbury		

**ALSO PRESENT:** Tim Onderko

**APPLICATION:**  Special Permit – *New Building*  Site Plan Approval  
 Special Permit – *Addition*  Sign  
 Exterior Renovation  Other: Canopy & kiosk

**ACTION:**  AAC recommends design approval as noted  
 AAC does not recommend design approval  
 Additional design studies/information requested  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

The AAC recommends that the applicant suggest to his client that the under-utilized property behind the Stop & Shop store, which is accessible from Copps Hill Road, be considered for this gasoline station. Developing the property on Danbury Road will be detrimental to the area for the following reasons:

- 1) Because of the slope of the property, the applicant proposes filling most of the land to a height of 12' at the north and west sides of the lot. This fill would be supported by a 12' retaining wall (at its highest point) essentially on the property line. The adjacent property has an apartment building which is about 15' from the proposed wall. To reduce the impact of a retaining wall, it should be terraced to create two levels instead of one vertical rise.

(cont'd)

- 2) Good development practice calls for balanced site improvements. In other words, to level a site one would use a cut and fill approach rather than bringing an enormous amount of fill to the property.
- 3) The site is on a curve, and site line calculations we expect are based on posted speed limits. A more realistic analysis would be based on average actual speed of cars passing the site, and in this case the site lines are most likely inadequate. Left-hand turns from this property would be very dangerous.
- 4) The plan calls for the demolition of the existing house on the corner of Route 35 and Island Hill Avenue, but the space occupied by the house is shown undeveloped. We question the need to remove the house, or would like to know what the proposed use of this portion of the lot would be.
- 5) The proposed canopy is 80' long which will be 15' above the grade, which will be at the top of the 12' high retaining wall. A canopy will be brightly lit as all gas station canopies are, and the underside of the canopy will be extremely visible from Danbury Road and all the adjoining properties, since the gas station will be on an elevated man-made platform.

Route 35 between Joe's Corner and the intersection of Route 35 & 7 has become the natural extension of Main Street, with all new development being retail, office, and residential. To have a huge gas station proposed on this site harks back to the 1950s when this section of town was known as gasoline alley. It was gasoline alley that prompted the Town to initiate the Planning & Zoning Commission. Fortunately six of the former gas stations and auto dealerships have been converted to retail establishments which for the area is the highest and best use of the property – there are still six gas stations and two auto dealerships along this section of Route 35 (not including this proposed gas station).

The AAC recommends reconsidering the use of this property as a gas station or reworking the site in a way that is less obtrusive to the site, Town and adjoining properties.

The AAC will comment on the design of the facility after the resolution of the site plan and/or site location.

<p><u>Vote</u></p> <p>For approval of recommendations: 6</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Against approval of recommendations: 0</p>
---

BY: John Kinnear



# ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**DATE:** January 24, 2012

**APPLICANT:** 28 Gilbert Street

Affordable Housing

**MEETING LOCATION:** Town Hall Annex  
Back Lower Level Conference Room

**AAC MEMBERS:**

(Place check next to those who attended)

- |  |  |                                      |  |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> W. Arthur             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S. Benton    | <input type="checkbox"/> J. Clements | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B. Corso |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> H. Dimos   | <input type="checkbox"/> T. Dunphy               | <input type="checkbox"/> P. Guzy     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> J. Hupy  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> J. Kinnear | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> G. Lounsbury |                                      |  |

**ALSO PRESENT:** Douglas C. MacMillan

- APPLICATION:**
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special Permit – <i>New Building</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan Approval                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special Permit – <i>Addition</i>     | <input type="checkbox"/> Sign                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Exterior Renovation                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Affordable Hsg.</u> |

- ACTION:**
- AAC recommends design approval as noted
  - AAC does not recommend design approval
  - Additional design studies/information requested
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS**

The AAC recommends that the applicant review with the client reducing the number of units proposed for this 1/3 acre property. The 3-storey (12) unit building represents (36) units per acre. Casagmo and Fox Hill are the two densest multi-family developments in town, and they are (10) units per acre. Town multi-family regulations allow (8) units per acre as long as two are affordable. These regulations were developed to insure the health, safety and welfare of the people occupying these units by providing adequate parking, outdoor space (both private and public), and compatibility with the adjacent properties. The affordable housing state regulations permit the developer to ignore Town regulations. This is a detriment not only to the Town and the adjacent property owners, but also to the developer by allowing construction of under-market units compared to units that are built conforming to the Town regulations that provide for the above-mentioned features.

(cont'd)

Proposing (16) units on this 1/3 acre results in the following negative aspects:

- 1) The building is much larger and taller than any of the houses in the neighborhood, especially as seen from New Street where the building will be a full four storeys.
- 2) Parking is inadequate and unworkable, as parking spaces are shown in front of garage doors, making the garage spaces (which are included in the count) inaccessible when the space in front is occupied.
- 3) The parking lot is shown paved to the property line making screening from the neighbors impossible, and snow removal (without pushing snow on the neighbors' property) an issue.
- 4) Minimal building setbacks from the property line would hinder fire truck accessibility.
- 5) Having the drive relatively close to the intersection makes entering and exiting hazardous.
- 6) There is no outdoor space accessible to the tenants which creates a danger especially to children, with no play space other than the parking lot.

The AAC strongly recommends reducing the number of units proposed for this property.

The AAC will comment on the specifics of the building design when the size of the building is resolved.

<u>Vote</u>	
For approval of recommendations: 6	Against approval of recommendations: 0

BY: John Kinnear



# ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DATE: January 24, 2012

APPLICANT: 593 Main Street  
Affordable Housing

MEETING LOCATION: Town Hall Annex  
Back Lower Level Conference Room

**AAC MEMBERS:**

(Place check next to those who attended)

- |  |  |                                      |  |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> W. Arthur             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S. Benton    | <input type="checkbox"/> J. Clements | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B. Corso |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> H. Dimos   | <input type="checkbox"/> T. Dunphy               | <input type="checkbox"/> P. Guzy     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> J. Hupy  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> J. Kinnear | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> G. Lounsbury |                                      |  |

ALSO PRESENT: Patrick Downend

- APPLICATION:
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special Permit – <i>New Building</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan Approval                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special Permit – <i>Addition</i>     | <input type="checkbox"/> Sign                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Exterior Renovation                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Affordable Hsg.</u> |

- ACTION:
- AAC recommends design approval as noted
  - AAC does not recommend design approval
  - Additional design studies/information requested
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

The applicant submitted revised elevations for his proposed 16-unit development at 593 Main Street. The applicant has redesigned the building to appear to be a single-family house, similar to many of the existing Main St. residences. The building will be located facing Main Street, with the parking behind the building.

The AAC had the following comments on the elevations submitted:

- 1) The scheme with the pitched and flat roof on the two wings is preferred.
- 2) We recommend that the bay windows on the wings be on the 1<sup>st</sup> Fl. only.
- 3) The exterior walls on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Fl. should be pitched to create a gambrel roof, which is a style often found in Ridgefield houses, from the Hawley house to the present.

The AAC looks forward to seeing refinements to these plans.

Vote	
For approval of recommendations: 6	Against approval of recommendations: 0

BY: John Kinnear