







Dainius Virbickas, Artel Engineering, said they would pick up where they left off at the last meeting. He said they are still working on the response to the Staff comments, but they have the architectural rendering this evening. He said this was done by a New York firm who used the site plan, elevations and photos to put this together. He said when you look at it you are looking to the west. He pointed out the reduced grade coming into site and the landscape berm which was designed to help hide the vehicles parked in front of the existing home. He said they also used plantings from the landscape plan so this is a fairly good representation of how it will look when you drive by. He said he also had the cross section of the property that the Commission had requested. They have a plan view to line up with the profile view. The deepest cut is 8 ft. for the building and it also has a detail of the retaining wall. He submitted a letter from the consulting engineer regarding this information. This was designated Exhibit E. Regarding the snow storage questions, he showed them a plan with areas highlighted that they could store snow in once it is removed from the parking lot. None of these locations would interfere with sight distances. The sidewalk must be maintained so that is not an issue. He added that they are still working with the manufacturer on the lighting plan. He said both Staff and the public had made comments regarding modifying the landscaping in the rear to create a screen. He showed them a plan they did after the most recent meeting with neighbors. He referred to a photograph of the home as it exists now and said the applicant really wants to maintain its architectural features down to the stained glass windows. This was designated Exhibit F. He said it is nice to have a client who respects older buildings and wants to preserve some of Danbury. Mr. Urice asked about the patios and Mr. Virbickas said they will be on the ground level. Mrs. Emminger asked what the proposed finish is for the retaining walls. Mr. Virbickas said the finish shown in rendering can be applied. Mr. Bruno said they had been planning to use a "uni-lock" type of wall with a textured finish, but they could change that. Mr. Urice asked if the rendering was being submitted. Attorney Collins then submitted a reduced copy. This was designated Exhibit G. Attorney Collins said that Mr. Virbickas still has to do some revisions to the plans, but he wanted to remind everyone that they could just tear down the house and build ten units on the site without a special exception.

Chairman Finaldi asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition

Robin Howell, 29 Pleasant St., said she is still opposed for same reasons: the more they live with the concept of it, the more invasive it will be. She said because of its height, the residents in the new building will be able to see into their neighbor's windows and vice versa. She questioned why the property looks so flat on the rendering and said the character of the proposed rear building is not the same as the existing neighborhood. She also pointed out the retaining walls should have some sort of finish to them since there are so many of them.

Deirdre Klepacz, 28 Pleasant St., said she also feels the rendering is misleading. She said she walks by the site everyday and it is at a much higher grade than it appears in the rendering. She asked if this lot will end up lower than the surrounding properties. And she added that the rear building does not seem in character with the area.

Romolo DiGrazia said he owns 38 Division St., and read a letter into record. He said when he looked at these plans, several problems came to mind. First, he opposes high density; only a minimal development should be done on this site. Second he said there are a lot of people, including kids, who walk this area daily, so the Commission should take that into consideration. He urged the Commission members to walk this site so they can see the steepness and depth of the property. He added that there are water problems here and certain areas freeze. This could cause the residents to not be able to get up their driveway, so they will end up parking on the street. He said he is in agreement with the other letters in opposition that are in this file. This letter was designated Exhibit I.

Julius Klepacz, 28 Pleasant St., said he is highly suspicious that this development will bring the character of neighborhood down. He said first there was the disaster with them cutting down all of the trees and then there is the fact that this new structure will block the beautiful skies.





