



## ARCHITECTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**DATE:** April 25, 2023

**APPLICANT:** 901 Ethan Allen Highway

Multi Family Development – Thirteen buildings

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

**AAC MEMBERS:**

(Place check next to those who attended)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M. Ascher	<input type="checkbox"/> S. Benton	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> J. Goldfluss	<input type="checkbox"/> J. Heyman
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> J. Kinnear	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> G. Lounsbury	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> P. Maggi	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S. Schrager

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mr. Stein, Architect; Jason Williams, Landscape Architect

**APPLICATION:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Special Permit – <i>New Building</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Site Plan Approval
<input type="checkbox"/> Special Permit – <i>Addition</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Sign
<input type="checkbox"/> Exterior Renovation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**ACTION:**

<input type="checkbox"/> AAC recommends design approval as noted
<input type="checkbox"/> AAC does not recommend design approval
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Additional design studies/information requested
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

### COMMENTS, EXCEPTIONS AND/OR RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

*2<sup>nd</sup> Review*

The applicant submitted written responses to our comments from the March 28<sup>th</sup> AAC meeting. (see attached and revised drawings and renderings)

The AAC has the following comments on the presentation at the meeting:

- 1) The revisions to apartment building #9 are an improvement. We suggest a dark gray rather than absolute black for the bays and details. The revisions to the dormers are better than submitted before.
- 2) The color of the precast concrete retaining walls was discussed, and a photo of the product with a brown rather than gray color was preferred.

RECEIVED

APR 27 2023

(cont'd)

PLANNING & ZONING  
COMMISSION

- 3) The view of the complex from Route 7 across the pond was portrayed in a rendering. Even with trees "in leaf", the northeastern retaining walls will be visible; evergreen planting in this area may be appropriate, as well as climbing or hanging plantings at the walls.
- 4) Site signage will be a later submission by the applicant.
- 5) A gated entry to the property is proposed. This would be the first in Ridgefield.
- 6) Architectural site details such as railings at retaining walls, roadway railings, pool fencing should be presented at a future meeting.

### Site Plan Comments

Jason Williams (the Landscape Architect) made a comprehensive presentation of the site plan and landscaping.

### AAC comments:

- 1) Parking: although meeting Town regulations seems lacking in guest parking, the applicant stated that a parking area east of the entry bridge will be available to residents. It's a climb up to the units.
- 2) A 40'x90' grass play area will be provided west of the entry drive. We recommended an area for children to play outdoors, and would like to see a grading plan of this area.
- 3) We would like to see sidewalks further developed on the site especially in the courtyard spaces where the garages are. The sidewalk material should be flush with the bituminous paving.
- 4) Curbs should not be bituminous material.
- 5) Are there trees on the site which can be saved?
- 7) The planting of primarily native species is encouraged with a few comments: eliminate boxwoods, introduce some additional evergreen species.
- 7) We suggest that tree calipers be 2½" rather than 4". The survival rate will increase with the reduced size at planting, and growth rate will increase. The applicant stated that they will keep the tree budget the same and purchase more trees.
- 8) More trees east of the buildings above the retaining walls are recommended.
- 9) We are concerned about the long dead-end drives throughout the site, especially for delivery trucks having to make T-turns or back out.
- 10) Specific planting and tree locations were questioned; notes were given to the applicant.
- 11) There are areas of steep grades up to 10% on the site. Determine if there are any ways to reduce these.

### Vote

For approval of recommendations: 6

Against approval of recommendations: 0

BY: John Kinnear

4.24.23

Town of Ridgefield  
Architectural Advisory Committee  
Mr. John Kinnear  
400 Main Street  
Ridgefield, CT 06877

**RE: 901 Ethan Allen Highway – Multi-family Development  
Ridgefield, CT**

Mr. Kinnear,

In response to your Comments, Exceptions and / or Recommendations letter dated March 28, 2023, Stein Troost architecture offers the following:

C1. Parking provided seems insufficient, especially for guest parking.

**R1. See SLR responses.**

C2. (71) 3-Bedroom units will lead to children living there. Provisions should be made for grass play areas.

**R2. See SLR response.**

C3. There are elevations of some buildings which require further study of fenestration details dormers, and material selections, especially Building 9.

**R3. We have modified the elevation of Building 9 to incorporate the AAC comments by expanding the size and number of windows in the center brick section of the building to good effect. Additionally, we extended the soldier brick course base to the clapboard sided wings on either side of the brick center. We have also modified all the dormer trim details throughout the project by introducing 5-1/2" crown moldings at the rake faces. We have also modified the small shed dormer on the type A units by shallowing the pitch, which mitigates the acute angle on the dormer side, making it more visually pleasing and easier to construct. See drawing A-5.1 and revised rendering P-4, dated 4.24.23,**



AAC comment responses

Page 2

C4. There are many retaining walls called for at an average height of 10'. We would like to see an elevation of the project from Route 7 across the pond to the development. It may appear to be a walled city. Landscaping to be reviewed at the next meeting.

**R4. See SLR site section. See a new rendering of the site taken from Route 7. Note that both existing and proposed landscape treatments will significantly soften the appearance of site retaining walls.**

Michael Stein, RA, LEED AP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M82' with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Stein | Troost architecture



April 21, 2023

Town of Ridgefield  
Architectural Advisory Committee  
Mr. John Kinnear  
400 Main Street  
Ridgefield, CT 06877

**Re: 901 Ethan Allen Highway – Multi-family Development  
Ridgefield, Connecticut  
SLR# 141.20539.00002**

Mr. John Kinnear,

Per your Comments, Exceptions and/or Recommendations letter dated March 28, 2023, SLR International Corporation (SLR) offers the following responses:

- C1. Parking provided seems insufficient, especially for guest parking
- R1. **Parking standards were developed based on the Town of Ridgefield Zoning Regulations - Section 7.3 Parking – B. Number of Parking Spaces. Under Item. 4 - Residential Uses for "Visitor parking at a multi-family development" parking is identified "As determined by the Commission".**

Thus, in developing a design criteria for parking onsite we used Item 2. Building or group of buildings containing three or more dwellings, which require: *"One (1) space per efficiency unit or one-bedroom unit, two (2) spaces for each other type of unit"*. Thus:

**Project Unit Count (92 Total Units)**

**A. Apartment Buildings**

**Building #3**

- **Eight one-bedroom units – Requires eight parking spaces**
- **Three two-bedroom units – Requires six parking spaces**

**Parking Spaces Required = 14**

**Parking Spaces provided = 21**

**Building #9**

- Four one-bedroom units – Requires four parking spaces
- Five two-bedroom units – Requires ten parking spaces
- One three-bedroom unit – Requires two parking spaces

Parking Spaces Required = 16

Parking Spaces provided = 16

**B. Townhouses**

**Buildings #1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13**

- Seventy-one three-bedroom units – Requires (142) parking spaces

Parking Spaces Required = 142

Parking Spaces provided = 109 (Exterior) + 109 (Garage) = 218

**C. Meeting House**

- Eleven Visitor Parking Spaces

C2. (71) 3-bedroom units will lead to children living there. Provisions should be made for grass play areas.

R2. While an abundance of local recreational facilities exist in town, we have examined the submitted site plan to address the above comment. Enclosed please find plan PA-1, which identifies the location of a 90' x 40' open lawn play space.

C3. There are elevations of some of the buildings which require further study of fenestration details, dormers, and material selections, especially Building 9.

R3. To be addressed by the Architect

C4. There are many retaining walls called for at an average height of 10'. We would like to see an elevation of the project from Route 7 across the pond to the development. It may appear to be a walled city. Landscaping to be reviewed at the next meeting.

R4. Please see enclosed Section A – A'

April 20, 2023  
Mr. John Kinnear  
Page 3



Sincerely,

**SLR International Corporation**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jason Williams", written over a horizontal line.

Jason Williams, PLA, NCI  
Principal Landscape Architect

20539.00002.a2023.ltr.docx

### 7.3. **Parking**

#### A. **PURPOSE**

These parking regulations are adopted for the purpose of providing for adequate parking facilities to serve existing and proposed uses.

#### B. **NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES**

Unless modified as provided in this Section, off-street parking spaces shall be established and maintained for every use of land, buildings or structures based upon the following schedule of minimum requirements:

##### **Residential Uses**

1.	One-family and two-family structures	Two (2) parking spaces for each dwelling
2.	Building or group of buildings containing three (3) or more dwellings	One (1) space per efficiency unit or one-bedroom unit <sup>4</sup> ; two (2) spaces for each other type of unit
3.	Home occupation, service or profession	One (1) space for the home occupation, service or profession plus one (1) space per non-resident employee in addition to the parking spaces for the dwelling unit
4.	Visitor parking at a multi-family development	As determined by the Commission

##### **Retail / Service Uses**

5.	Retail stores, banks, service establishment	4.25 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area on the first floor plus 3.4 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area on each upper floor
6.	Restaurants, taverns, bars, nightclubs, dance halls	15.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area
7.	Motels, hotels, inns and similar places for transient living	One (1) space for each guest room plus one (1) space for each employee
8.	Auto or other motor vehicle sales	5.0 spaces for each repair or service bay plus additional spaces for display, employees, visitors, and other purposes as determined by the Commission
9.	Gasoline filling station, motor vehicle repair or service station	1.5 spaces per gas pump, plus 5.0 spaces for each repair or service bay, plus additional spaces for retail sales, employees, visitors, and other purposes as determined by the Commission

<sup>4</sup> A-21-6 amended effective 11/05/2021 to reduce 1.5 spaces to 1 space per PA 21-29