

The perceived practicality of providing additional outdoor dining coverage during any given rain event with a larger awning did not outweigh the loss of light and signage exposure to the main façade and as such, the applicant agreed to reduce the awning projection to approximately 18". The new awning would be "anchored" between the existing columns with decorative brackets. Additionally, the existing "Piccolo Pizza" fascia mounted sign would be eliminated in favor of the existing and redundant glass mounted sign.

Thank you.

BY: _____
Jeffrey D. Mose AIA



ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE VILLAGE DISTRICT CONSULTANT

REVIEW BY: AAC VDC

DATE: June 9, 2009

APPLICANT: Urstadt Biddle Properties
424R Main Street
Ridgefield, CT

MEETING LOCATION: Town Hall Annex
Back Lower Level Conference Room

AAC MEMBERS:

(Place check next to those who attended)

S. Benton

J. Kinnear

W. Arthur

P. Guzy

H. Dimos

J. Mose

S. Benson

G. Lounsbury

G. Smith

P. Esser

ALTERNATES:

ALSO PRESENT: _____

APPLICATION: Special Permit Revision Site Plan Approval Sign
 Exterior Renovation Other: _____

ACTION: AAC/VDC recommends design approval
 AAC/VDC does not recommend design approval
 Additional design studies/information requested
 Other:

COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

As a result of extensive fire damage, the applicant has elected to renovate their building, inclusive of a new second floor and roof design. We have asked the applicant to consider a more vernacular approach to the design which would strengthen its connection with the historical nature of the previous "buggy whip" building. Every attempt should be made to reduce the perceived scale of the rebuilt structure by lowering the fascia roof line elevation, articulating the building massing and allowing for a more gracious transition from the existing adjacent attached building.

The consideration of a stone skirt as proposed should be used judiciously and should represent a regional stone configuration given the village location. Exterior siding/trim configuration and scale, ie: corner boards, decorative window heads, soffit overhangs, fascia and crown moulding should be reviewed for continuity.

The window placement, proportion and frequency should be reviewed.

Consideration should be given to address a primary entrance element to establish pedestrian access and define the primary building façade. The applicant has represented that the second floor will be for office use. As such, a defined signage directory and street address should be incorporated into the design.

The applicant should provide a perimeter landscape plan and paving layout to separate and identify pedestrian and vehicular circulation for visual and safety considerations. On-site dumpsters should be screened.

BY: _____
Jeffrey D. Mose AIA



ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE VILLAGE DISTRICT CONSULTANT

REVIEW BY: AAC VDC

DATE: June 9, 2009

APPLICANT: Heritage Homes – Mr. Doug MacMillan
40 Grove Street
Ridgefield, CT

MEETING LOCATION: Town Hall Annex
Back Lower Level Conference Room

AAC MEMBERS:

(Place check next to those who attended)

S. Benton

J. Kinnear

W. Arthur

P. Guzy

H. Dimos

J. Mose

S. Benson

G. Lounsbury

G. Smith

P. Esser

ALTERNATES:

ALSO PRESENT: _____

APPLICATION: Special Permit Revision Site Plan Approval Sign
 Exterior Renovation Other: _____

ACTION: AAC/VDC recommends design approval
 AAC/VDC does not recommend design approval
 Additional design studies/information requested
 Other:

COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

The applicant has proposed the construction of an addition to complement the existing residentially scaled multi-use building.

Based on the submitted plans, we suggest that the applicant center the main entry door within the “infill” section of the addition.

Design consideration should be given to lower the infill roof and associated fascia between the main house and the garage roof to adjust the scale and transition between the two elements. This might include replacing the proposed double hung windows with smaller “shot gun” style casement units and additionally extending the intermediate shed roof to create a covered entry portico with support columns.

We would ask that the applicant submit a set of the final plans to the Planning and Zoning office for our review. Thank you.

BY: _____
Jeffrey D. Mose AIA



ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE VILLAGE DISTRICT CONSULTANT

REVIEW BY: AAC VDC

DATE: June 9, 2009

APPLICANT: 2 Car Garage – Santini Remodeling
62 Highview Road
Ridgefield, CT

MEETING LOCATION: Town Hall Annex
Back Lower Level Conference Room

AAC MEMBERS:

(Place check next to those who attended)

S. Benton

J. Kinnear

W. Arthur

P. Guzy

H. Dimos

J. Mose

S. Benson

G. Lounsbury

G. Smith

P. Esser

ALTERNATES:

ALSO PRESENT: _____

APPLICATION: Special Permit Revision Site Plan Approval Sign
 Exterior Renovation Other: _____

ACTION: AAC/VDC recommends design approval
 AAC/VDC does not recommend design approval
 Additional design studies/information requested
 Other:

COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

The applicant has proposed the construction of a detached two car garage to be placed in the front right quadrant of their property. The Owner has received a variance by the ZBA to construct the building. In reviewing the proposal, we strongly urged the Applicant and Owner to review the viability of relocating the garage and attaching it to the main house. The relocation would provide improved and protected ingress/egress, create an improved visual and audio buffer from the street and enhance the property value.

It is our understanding that this course of action would potentially require an additional variance to alter the location but that ultimately it would improve the value of the property while minimizing the streetscape impact.

Additionally, we requested photos of the existing residence as a basis for any aesthetic recommendations.

BY: _____
Jeffrey D. Mose AIA



ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE VILLAGE DISTRICT CONSULTANT

REVIEW BY: AAC VDC

DATE: June 9, 2009

APPLICANT: Little Pub – Mr. Kevin McHugh
59 Ethan Allen Highway
Ridgefield, CT

MEETING LOCATION: Town Hall Annex
Back Lower Level Conference Room

AAC MEMBERS:

(Place check next to those who attended)

S. Benton

J. Kinnear

W. Arthur

P. Guzy

H. Dimos

J. Mose

S. Benson

G. Lounsbury

G. Smith

P. Esser

ALTERNATES:

ALSO PRESENT: _____

APPLICATION: Special Permit Revision Site Plan Approval Sign
 Exterior Renovation Other: _____

ACTION: AAC/VDC recommends design approval
 AAC/VDC does not recommend design approval
 Additional design studies/information requested
 Other:

COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

The applicant has proposed a 5'-6" x 3'-6" painted oval sign to be mounted on the South facing façade of the rebuilt stucco chimney structure of the recently renovated building. Given the scale, location and iconic nature of the building, we asked the applicant to consider eliminating the mounted oval sign in lieu of a painted letter application, in an oval configuration to emulate the previous tenant signage. The lettering would be in a contrasting color and whitewashed to patina the image.

We suggested eliminating the building graphic on the sign due to readability.

Based on the applicant supplied photos of the building prior to renovation, we suggested the addition of two diamond shaped tiles and a horizontal band graphic on the chimney element to recapture the character of the original design.

The applicant also described an additional sign to be mounted on the street façade gable utilizing an existing mounting bracket. Due to the height of the mount, we suggested relocating the mount to just above the street facing door and utilizing a small oval sign to resemble the larger presented oval design.

BY: _____
Jeffrey D. Mose AIA