

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD MEETING

April 1, 2008

Present: Michael Autuori
Peter Chipouras
Joseph Fossi
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz
Phil Mische
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Patrick Walsh, Vice Chairman
Lillian Willis

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Inland Wetlands Agent
Linda Caponetti, Recording Secretary

An Inland Wetlands public hearing was continued but then postponed to 4/15/08. A Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing was held prior to the meeting.

At 8:27 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2008-004-PR: (xr-95129-SR)** Plenary Ruling application for filling and grading of 690± of wetlands and disturbance within upland review areas in conjunction with construction of single family residence. Property located on **Lots 72-75 Third Lane** in the RA zone. Owners/Appls.: Wayne E. Wood and Charles F. Dean, Jr. Auth. Agent: John F. McCoy VII, PE. *Received 1/15/2008.35 days to close public hearing ends March 25, 2008. On 3/10/2008 granted a 30-day extension through 4/24/2008 to complete public hearing. Continued 4/1/08, and then postponed to 4/15/08.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the continuation of the public hearing had been postponed to 4/15/08, at the request of the applicant's agent.

2. **#2008-028-SR:** Summary Ruling application under Sec. 7.2 of the IWWR for mitigation/wetlands restoration planting plan approval on property located at **10 Kendra Court** in the RAA zone. Owners/Appls.: Angela Whitford and Stanley Madaloni. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara and Gustafson, P.C. *65-day action period ends 5/15/2008. Received 3/11/2008. For discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that responses had been received from both the City of New York (DEP) and Wetlands Inspector Aimee Pardee. She asked Agent Brosius to comment.

The Agent noted the extensive report prepared by Ms. Pardee. After meeting with the landscape designer several times, the Agent and the Wetlands Inspector agreed that the plan, combined with the conditions imposed by Ms. Pardee, represented “a workable and adequate mitigation plan.”

The Agent said that additional comments had been received from the NYC DEP, which has jurisdiction over the New York watershed area and, therefore, an interest in any Connecticut applications which fall within it. The Agent stated that, if the Board accepted the mitigation plan and conditions drafted by Mr. Pardee, she could begin to draft a resolution, possibly including some of the comments from the NYC DEP.

Mr. Katz felt that the NYC DEP report was “remarkable,” and that Ms. Pardee should incorporate some of its ideas and comments into her report. He added that Ms. Pardee’s comments need to reference this report. The Agent agreed.

There was some confusion about which recommendation to follow with regard to removal of (or not) of the 4” of topsoil. Ms. Pardee felt it would be more detrimental to remove it.

Dr. Autuori commented on the importance of inspections and follow-up. The five year establishment clause should also be used to ensure compliance, he said, by having staff visit once per year for five years. Dr. Gelfman agreed.

The Chairman confirmed that the Board would like this to be part of the draft language.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to request a draft approval of the mitigation plan, to incorporate comments made by Wetlands Inspector Aimee Pardee, and including recommendations made by the NYC DEP, which may be added at the discretion of the Wetlands Inspector. The motion passed, 9-0.

The resolution will be scheduled for final decision when it is completed.

3. **#2008-034-SR:** Summary Ruling application under Section 7.2 of the IWWR for disturbance in wetlands and upland review areas in conjunction with paving approximately 3800 LF of existing unpaved pedestrian trails on property located at **195 Danbury Road (Ridgefield Parks and Recreation)** in the CCF zone. Owner: Town of Ridgefield. Appl.: Paul Roche. *65-day action period ends May 22, 2008. Received 3/18/2008. Walk scheduled for 3/30/2008. For discussion/action.*

Dr. Gelfman felt that this was too large a project for the Board to consider, and suggested that the project be broken up into segments. Some of the requests should be accommodated, he thought, while others should not. He suggested that parts of the mile long trail be staked, so that the Board could see exactly what was planned for each section and make their determinations accordingly.

The Chairman asked if Dr. Gelfman would be willing to defer this conversation until after the Conservation Commission's comments are received on 4/15/08. He said that would be fine.

The Agent said that landscape architect, Jim DeLalla, would be doing a presentation on 4/15/08 to explain the plan in more detail.

Various commissioners expressed their desire to see the path width staked, the grass strips marked, the borders delineated, specific plantings/trees slated for removal identified, etc. Ms. Willis wondered if the bridges could support truckloads of asphalt.

Agent Brosius said that the large pipes at the crossings were put in as part of the original development, and they are sized for large vehicles.

Mr. Katz said that it appears on the plan that the proposed path takes a sharp turn to the left just before the pipes

There was universal confusion as to the direction the path would take, and Mr. Mische said that the path as shown on the map doesn't reflect the path as it is now. Everyone was surprised by the fact that the sharp turn of the path on the map would necessitate the removal of "the only big tree within 100 yards" of the path.

Dr. Gelfman noted that there are some extremely significant trees on the west side of the lot, and it was unclear as to whether or not they would be affected by the construction

Mr. Mische said that there were "choke points" along the proposed path where it was clear that a 6-foot wide path with 2-foot wide borders on either side could not be accommodated.

The consensus of the Board was to re-schedule a site walk for 4/13/08, provided that: (1) the applicant's consultant can attend the walk to explain the proposed work; (2) the applicant can mark certain critical sections of the trail where the path is to be widened and grass berms added; and (3) an invitation is extended to the Conservation Commission to attend the site walk so that observations are coordinated.

The item will be scheduled for further discussion on 4/15/08, following the site walk.

4. **#2008-036-SR:** Summary Ruling application under Section 7.2 of the IWR for disturbance in the upland review area in conjunction with construction of a 3 bedroom dwelling with a new septic system and driveway on property located at **31 Park Lane** in the RA zone. Owner/Apl.: Albert & Cynthia Blizzard. *65-day action period ends 5/29/2008. Received 3/25/2008, walk scheduled for 3/30/2008. For action.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the Conservation Commission would like to walk the property, and the item was scheduled for further discussion on 4/8/08. [Note: A

final decision on the application should be deferred until 4/15/08, to allow time for receipt of the Conservation Commission comments.]

NEW ITEMS

5. **#2008-039-SR:** Summary Ruling application under Section 7.2 of the IWWR for activities and disturbance in the wetlands and upland review areas in conjunction with filling and grading and installation of drainage pipes on property located at **122 Walnut Grove Road** in the RAA zone. Owner/Appl.: Francesco Giordano. *65-day action period ends 6/5/2008. For receipt and schedule walk.*

Chairman Mucchetti suggested 4/13/08 for a site walk for the application. Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to receive the application and to schedule a site walk, as recommended. The motion passed, 9-0.

BOARD WALKS

The following items were scheduled for a site walk on **April 13, 2008**, as noted above:

- **#2008-034-SR:** Summary Ruling, **195 Danbury Road (Ridgefield Parks & Recreation)**, Paul Roche
- **#2008-039-SR:** Summary Ruling **122 Walnut Grove Road**, Giordano

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

MINUTES

Mrs. Willis motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the minutes of 3/11/08. The motion passed, 9-0,

Mrs. Willis motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to approve the minutes of 3/18/08. The motion passed, 9-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

April 1, 2008

Present: Michael Autuori
Peter Chipouras
Joseph Fossi
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz
Phil Mische
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Patrick Walsh, Vice Chairman
Lillian Willis

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Director of Planning
Linda Caponetti, Recording Secretary

A public hearing was held prior to the meeting.

At 8:43 p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order. [Note: Item #7, 650 Danbury Road, was discussed following Item #4, to accommodate the applicant's consultants. The remaining agenda items were discussed in the order shown.]

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2008-009-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit required by Section 9.2.A.7.e. for exterior modifications to existing building located at **66 Grove Street** in the B-2 zone. Owner: 66 Grove Ridgefield, LLC. Auth. Agent: Madaket Beach Developers, LLC. *Received and Tabled 2/5/2008. 3/4/2008 tabled for revised drawings from applicant. 65-day action period ends 4/10/2008. For action.*

Chairman Mucchetti, reading from the minutes provided from the AAC meeting of the same evening, said that the applicant had agreed to remove all the gables and the cupola from the proposed hip roof construction. The AAC recommended that the roof shingles be slate-like, as opposed to the asphalt Timberline style. And they want to see a sample shingle before issuing the permit. They recommend a stone veneer and hardy plank for the exterior walls of the building.

Andy Toth (representing the applicant) displayed illustrations of the new design, which was well received by the Commission, as it had been by the AAC. Samples of the shingle and the color had been dropped off prior to the meeting by the project superintendent.

Dr. Gelfman motioned, seconded by Mrs. Willis, to approve the revised plans according to the recommendations of the AAC. The motion passed, 9-0.

2. **#2008-011-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit required by Section 9.2.A.7.e for a free-standing Subdivision sign on property located at **Lot #1, Bryon Avenue** in the SD-R20 zone. Owner: Country Club Development, LLC. Appl./Auth. Agent: Fred H. Whipple. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara and Gustafson, P.C. *65-day action period ends 4/17/2008. Received 2/12/2008 and tabled. Tabled 3/11/2008.3/18/2008 walk scheduled for 3/30/2008. For action.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked the Planner to address the matter of a petition that had been received requesting a public hearing on the application.

The Planner said that the petition had been signed by 22 people, representing 13 households in the neighborhoods surrounding Bryon Avenue, High Ridge, Greenfield Avenue, and Fairview Avenue. The petition requested a public hearing. After consultation with legal counsel, the Planner stated that the street sign falls within the purview of the Commission, as part of a Special Permit application. She stressed the fact that the sign would be essentially a temporary sign, with a cutoff date to be determined. She cautioned the Commission to carefully consider if a Public Hearing is actually needed, even though it would be permitted.

The Chairman added that this would typically be handled by the office administratively, but, it came to the Commission as a result of the applicant's request for a revision to the Special Permit. Before hearing any further discussion, she said that, if a Public Hearing is to be held, any discussion should be held until that time.

Dr. Autuori noted that the application had come to the Commission for a sign, not a temporary sign. He said that, because of the Special Permit, the applicant has benefited greatly. The process, however, does give the Commission "major discretion." with regard to what is approved, which includes the right to a public hearing where the neighbors can be heard.

Dr. Autuori made a motion in support of raising the application to a public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chipouras.

Mrs. Willis asked if the applicant had a new proposal regarding the sign.

The Chairman gave the floor to the applicant's representative, Attorney Robert Jewell.

Mr. Jewell read from the zoning regulation governing temporary street signs, Sec. 7.2 C.8, which he felt indicated that the temporary sign being applied for should be permitted until such time as 1) the new road will be conveyed to the homeowner's association or 2) a zoning permit is issued on the final lot, whereupon the sign will be removed. Mr. Jewell asked the Commission if these "events" would be preferable, or if they preferred a fixed time. Although the regulation pre-supposes a public road

where the road would be conveyed to the Town, he said, this application for a private road is analogous.

Mrs. Willis suggested using whichever “event” comes first. She asked if the nameplates designed for the pillars would be installed. Mr. Jewell said that they would be installed at the end of the project development.

Dr. Autuori read from the regulations governing Special Permits. He stated that the advisory committee, the AAC, has said they feel the sign is inappropriate, and that they preferred the brass nameplate plaques for the pillars.

Dr. Autuori further said that the regulation states that the application must satisfy the applicable special permit criteria in 9.2.A.5 of the regulations. Two of the special permit conditions he cited were: 5a.) Suitable Location, and 5b.) Appropriate Improvements. Dr. Autuori did not feel that the sign met either criteria, and he cited statements from Mr. Katz and from the AAC supporting that position.

Dr. Autuori described his observations during a recent visit to the site, noting that the sign is larger than stated, and also one of the first things you see entering Bryon Avenue. He also said that the position of the sign bisects the view of the neighbors directly across the street. He said that the “temporariness” could actually wind up to be several years. He suggested making the sign smaller and repositioning it, possibly behind the stone wall and on the other side of the driveway, if it is going to be temporarily installed.

Mr. Mische asked for the wording of the petition. The Planner explained that it was inappropriate to read the details of the petition at this point, but that a public hearing was requested. Mr. Mische said that was all he was concerned with. He was in favor of granting the public hearing.

Dr. Gelfman asked if the sign was illuminated. It was not.

Mr. Katz stated that his prior comments, which Dr. Autuori was referring to, were made prior to his knowing that this sign would be a temporary one.

The length of the temporary time period was discussed.

Mr. Jewell stressed that landscaping will make the sign more appealing. He also stated that wood fencing to be installed on top of the stone wall will contribute to making the sign not appear so large. He noted that three trees block the view of the sign from Bryon Ave. “until you get past the intersection of Bryon and Greenfield Avenues. Mr. Jewell was strongly in opposition to a public hearing for this application, saying that the applicant has already spent approximately two years on the zone change, the wetlands application, the subdivision application, the special permit application, etc. He felt a temporary sign does not warrant a public hearing.

The Chairman asked that the Commission determine whether or not this application required a public hearing. She called the question, noting that a motion to hold a public hearing had already been made and seconded.

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to schedule a public hearing on the application. The motion failed, 2-7, with Autuori and Chipouras voting in favor and all others against.

Mr. Katz questioned the logic that a 12' high sign will enhance sales of the homes in the development.

Mr. Jewell said that there was not a great deal of thought behind the choice of sign. The applicant went to the sign maker who created the Arnold's Way sign and asked for the same sign for this development.

Some discussion continued, with Dr. Autuori speaking on behalf of the people who signed the petition.

Mrs. Willis said that the difference between this situation and the Arnold's Way location is that the Arnold's Way sign is needed to direct people to the subdivision, which is hidden behind other houses. On Bryon Ave., it is very clear where the subdivision is, Mrs. Willis said, adding that she felt very "disappointed" that the sign was proposed, because it isn't necessary and the neighbors are clearly unhappy.

Mr. Mische suggested a 6 month time limit and/or a smaller sign.

Discussion continued. Mr. Katz said that what's good for Main Street is not necessarily good for other neighborhoods. He felt that the special permit process gave the Commission the power to insist that the sign be more in keeping with the neighborhood. As it is, "it doesn't fit," he said.

Dr. Gelfman motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the sign (as constructed and installed) as a "temporary street sign," to be posted for a period of 12 months, beginning on 4/1/08 and ending on 3/31/09; and, as per the suggestion of Mr. Fossi, to require that all real estate signs for the homes in the development be placed on the individual lots within the subdivision (and not on Bryon Avenue or in front of the entry wall).

The motion passed by a vote of 5-4, with Mucchetti, Walsh, Fossi, Mische and Gelfman in favor, and Katz, Chipouras, Autuori and Willis against.

3. **#2008-013-REZ:** petition to rezone, pursuant to Sec. 9.2.C. of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations. Property located on a portion of the north side of **Sunset Lane**, from R-20 to R-7.5 and **30 Grove Street** from R-20 to B-2. Owners/Apppls.: Gary and Chester Zawacki. Auth. Agent: Matthew Ranelli, Esq. *Received 2/19/2008. Walked 3/9/2008.*

Public hearing commenced 4/1/2008. 65-day action period ends 6/5/2008. For action.

[Note: Mr. Katz recused himself from participation and action on the application.]

Dr. Gelfman motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to request a draft approval of the request for the rezone, stating that the proposed change is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan for the area and with the recommendations of the Plan of Conservation and Development, and it is in harmony with the existing development in the neighborhood. The motion passed, 7-1-1, with Mr. Walsh voting against and Mr. Katz recused.

4. **#2008-022-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit application required by Section 9.2.A.7.e to permit the conversion of two parking spaces to outside dining on property located at **107-109 Danbury Road (Southwest Café)** in the B-1 zone. Owner/Appl.: Copps Hill Common LLC. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara and Gustafson, P.C. *65- day action period ends 5/15/2008. Received 3/11/2008, walk scheduled for 3/30/2008. For action.*

Mr. Jewell, agent for the applicant, explained that the applicant is Copps Hill Common, LLC, owner of the complex commonly known as 107-109 Danbury Rd., with 103 Danbury Rd. sharing the same parking area. Mr. Jewell said that there is an easement agreement with neighboring property owner, Kohl's, to share parking within the entire area. Additionally, a 2002 variance which permitted the construction of the Talbots building relaxed the parking requirements, with no defined number of spaces required.

In light of the relaxed requirements, Mr. Jewell calculated a number of spaces based on raw square footage and came up with what the requiring parking would have been. Based on these calculations, there would be a need for the Commission further to relax the parking requirements on this application, to allow for the conversion of two spaces for outdoor dining. Mr. Jewell said that if this property were in the CBD zone it would allow a significant reduction, and all of the factors that play into the standards which allow that in the CBD zone, apply here, as well. Losing 2 spaces to a non-coincidental use, Mr. Jewell felt, should not have any impact whatsoever on the parking in the area.

Dr. Autuori asked where, specifically, the spaces would be. Mr. Jewell said that they are the two spaces directly in front of Southwest Café. Dr. Autuori wanted more information with regard to "noise, light, hours of operation."

Barbara Nevins, owner of Southwest Café, said the restaurant closes at 10:00 pm.

Steve Zemo, the property owner, said that there are currently tables in front of the restaurant. They had gotten permission in 1993 to have tables outside, but, they are applying for permission to shift them into the parking space area, so that they are not

in front of the new organic market. The market hopes to have produce stands in front of their store, he said.

Mrs. Willis asked if there would be enough spaces there at night.

Planner Brosius said that she believes the busiest time will be at lunchtime. She has visited the site at that time, and has found there to be generally about 5 – 6 extra spaces available. At night, most of the other businesses are closed, she said, so there is less of a problem. The Planner also described the revision to the special permit that was granted by P & Z in 1993, (referred to by Mr. Zemo). It allowed for 300 s.f. of outdoor dining in front of the two stores. The actual seating in the two parking spaces would probably be less than that, she said. If the approval is granted, the Planner said there would need to be a condition stating that the application meets the requirements of the Health Dept. and the WPCA.

Mr. Katz questioned the parking estimate, (a total of 186.5 required spaces), arrived at by Mr. Jewell, saying that the numbers given in the regulation became irrelevant when the Board of Appeals granted a variance, which then supplanted the regulation and its numbers.

The Planner explained that the standards allowing the 25% allowable reduction to the required spaces in the CBD could apply in this similar situation, with shared uses and shared parking areas, and many businesses in close proximity to one another. This, combined with the variance allowing 16 spaces less for Talbot's, would bring the number of spaces required to 124.

Mr. Jewell was confused as to what he had been asked to calculate.

Mr. Katz said the 124 spaces seems to be a more legitimate number than the 186.5. These spaces would be on site. Considering the coincidental uses plus the easements, Mr. Katz felt that parking was "a non-issue."

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Gelfman, to approve the application as presented. The motion passed, 9-0.

There were some further questions having to do with the materials and specific dimensions of the wall and the planters surrounding the patio area. Mr. Zemo gave full detail. He described the patio perimeter planters and the configuration. Mr. Mische questioned him on the safety of sitting out on the patio. Mr. Zemo said that it is tucked into the patio area for the carpet store.

Mr. Mische was concerned about a glut of restaurants applying for more space in the form of outdoor dining. The Planner explained that this question does not typically concern the Commission, which does not regulate outdoor dining. This particular application came before the Commission because it had been previously approved

under a Special Permit, which needed revision. Also, the applicants are asking to change the parking lot itself, she said.

The Chairman added for clarity that this dining area is “in place of, not in addition to, what is already there.”

5. **#2008-030-VDC:** Village District Application under Section 8.3 for signs to be installed at the **Hudson City Savings Bank** located at **2 Prospect Street** in the CBD zone. Owner: Charles Knoche. Appl./Auth. Agent: Michael Santoliquido. *35 days to receive VDC report ends 4/22/2008. Received and referred to VDC 3/18/2008. For review of VDC report/action.*

Planner Brosius explained that there had been miscommunication between the sign company and the bank. The bank refuted the approval of changes to the sign on the end of the building. The changes that were authorized and agreed to by the bank’s representative were the following: 1) the moving of the Hudson City Bank lettering over the double doors facing the parking from the brick face into the clapboard area above it, 2) the adding of a sign for the bank’s hours of operation, and 3) the changing of the sign over the kiosk from an interior fluorescent illuminated sign to LED lighting. These changes have been reviewed and approved by the Architectural Advisory Committee, acting as the Village District Consultant.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Mische, to approve the application according to the changes described by the Planner. The motion passed, 9-0.

6. **#2008-029-SPA:** Site Plan Application for Farmer’s Market located on **Green Space east of Early Bird Café** (between 88-90 Danbury Road) *Distributed 3/18/2008. For comment.*

The Commission had no comments on the proposed Farmer’s Market application, and the Planner will work to issue an administrative approval of the Site Plan as soon as possible.

7. **#2008-035-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e. as required by Section 5.3.D.1 of the zoning regulations to revise parking and landscaping layout and to make additions and alterations to building located at **650 Danbury Road** in the B-2 zone. Auth. Agent/App.: Doyle Coffin Architecture. Owner: Matthew C. Schimenti. *65-day action period ends 05/29/2008. Received 3/25/2008, walk scheduled for 3/30/2008. For action.*

John Doyle, of Doyle Coffin Architecture, gave a brief description of the property, describing the owner’s desire to give the building a new look and to improve the existing parking lot. There would be an addition to the building of approximately 970 sq. ft., created by filling in covered porch and colonnade areas. The proposed parking lot would increase the number of spaces from 60 to 66 conforming spaces.

Rod Cameron, the landscape architect, said that they would also be replacing a wooden retaining wall with something more substantial and attractive. “By reorganizing the parking spaces to make the parking lot more efficient,” he said, they will be able to bring in new plantings to improve the overall appearance of the facility. There will also be some minor drainage changes. They will add an additional catch basin to improve the handling of storm water on the site. Mrs. Willis asked if they would be treating the storm water. Mr. Cameron said that they would only be collecting it.

Dr. Autuori asked about the lighting on the site. The existing lights are not in conformance, he said, suggesting that final approval be withheld until there is a lighting plan.

Mr. Doyle said that they would be upgrading the lighting to be in compliance.

The Planner asked if Dr. Autuori would be agreeable to a condition having the lighting plan be part of the application for a zoning permit. “Absolutely,” he said.

Mr. Mische asked if there were any response to the AAC’s request for the application of brick to the façade.

Mr. Doyle said that their proposal was to use a material called Brick-It.

The Chairman explained that the AAC had expressed concern about the durability and reliability of this product, and had requested insurances and warranties be obtained before proceeding with the product. She asked if the company had any experience with the product in climate similar to Ridgefield. Mr. Doyle had not, but said that the product is used in New Jersey and New York. He said that they wanted the look of brick, but without the expense.

Mr. Chipouras said that his experience with that kind of material is that there is risk of delaminating and popping, and also environmental problems, such as moisture, causing mildew and mold which can infiltrate through the walls. What kind of warranty does the company give, he asked, and how did they plan to install the product?

Mr. Doyle described the installation.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Mische, to request a draft resolution of approval for the application. Dr. Autuori requested a condition requiring that all exterior lighting be brought into conformance with the zoning regulations. The motion passed, 9-0.

NEW ITEMS

8. **#2008-037-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit required by Section 9.2.A.7.e to omit cupola on the main building located at **41 Governor Street (Boys and Girls Club of Ridgefield)** in the RA zone. Owner: Boys and Girls Club of Ridgefield. Appl./Auth. Agent: Jeff Mose. *65-day action period ends 6/5/2008. For receipt.*

At the request of the AAC Chairman, John Kinnear, the request for change in the architectural design of the building, (specifically, the removal of the cupola), was referred to the AAC for comment, to be added to its 4/8/08 scheduled meeting.

9. **#2008-040-VDC:** Village District Application under Section 8.3 for restoration of Webster Bank Prospect Street façade and three floor addition to library located on property at **472 Main Street and 25 Prospect Street** in the CBD zone. Owner/App.: The Ridgefield Library Association, Inc. Auth. Agent: Herbert S. Newman & Partners. *35 days to receive VDC report ends 5/6/2008. For receipt and refer to VDC.*

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to receive the application and to refer it to the Village District Consultant for review. The motion passed, 9-0.

COMMISSION WALKS

There were no site walks scheduled.

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out the following correspondence:

- Letter dated 3/31/08 from Commission Counsel Thomas Beecher to the Board of Selectmen, re the proposed Citation Ordinance.
- Memorandum from Ben Oko, Chairman of the Conservation Commission, reiterating his conversation with the owner of 6 Water's Edge Way (Costigan) and stating his denial of Mr. Costigan's request to prune and cut trees in the Conservation Easement area.
- Various minutes for applications reviewed by the AAC/VDC.
- Copy of a report from the State's Office of Legislative Research, requested of OLR by Representative John Frey, re sewer districts and responsibilities and jurisdiction of water pollution control authorities.

MINUTES

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to approve the minutes of 3/11/08. The motion passed, 9-0.

Mr. Fossi motioned, seconded by Mr. Katz, to approve the minutes of 3/18/08. The motion passed, 9-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary