





Mr. Manuel made a motion to approve the resolution as written and deny this application for the following reasons (from the resolution):

- 1) The proposal does not comply with Chapter 4.B.12 of the Subdivision Regulations, which states all lots shall be served by a driveway located on the subject lot and owned in fee simple.
- 2) The proposal includes a joint or common driveway for the three lots. The City of Danbury Engineering Department has stated that a private driveway serving three lots is unacceptable to the Public Works Department.
- 3) Deer Hill Avenue is a collector road in the City. Although the posted speed limit for Deer Hill Avenue is 25 mph, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile vehicle operating speed southbound along the street is approximately 40 mph per the Traffic Impact Report prepared by Barkan and Mess Associates, Inc., requiring an intersection sight distance of 445 feet according to the Connecticut Department of Transportation guidelines. The sight line to the north from the proposed driveway is less than 445 feet and poses a potential traffic hazard.
- 4) The applicant's engineer failed to adequately address the comments outlined in the Highway Department's letter dated September 20, 2005 and the Engineering Department's letters dated July 28, 2005 and September 27, 2005.
- 5) There are several large trees on the adjacent property to the north near to the shared boundary. The Bartlett Tree Experts report indicated that construction on the subject property will be detrimental to the trees on the adjacent property to the north, including the largest magnolia tree in the state of Connecticut.
- 6) The Bartlett Tree Experts report indicated that the construction on the subject property will be detrimental to the health of two large sugar maple trees on the property. The applicant's engineer acknowledged that a tree on the subject property would be lost as a result of construction.
- 7) The existing neighborhood on Deer Hill Avenue between Southern Boulevard and West Wooster Street consists almost exclusively of one single family home per lot and is notable for its historically and architecturally significant structures. The streetscape is a significant element of the neighborhood.
- 8) The proposed subdivision would place two new dwellings in front of the existing dwelling, creating the appearance of three dwellings on one lot. The front and rear yard areas of the new houses and the front yard of the existing house would appear to be squeezed and is not in keeping with the other lots in the neighborhood.
- 9) The appearance of the lots would detract from the streetscape and is inconsistent with the goal of the Danbury Plan of Conservation and Development, effective March 1, 2002, to preserve and enhance important historical and archaeological resources.

Mr. Blaszkowski seconded this motion and it was passed unanimously with three AYES. Mr. Manuel specified that as discussed previously, the entire resolution is to be incorporated into the minutes of tonight's meeting (copy attached).

Chairman Finaldi returned to the meeting at this time. Mr. Keller made a motion to take a five minute recess. Mr. Blaszkowski seconded the motion. Chairman Finaldi called to meeting back to order at 8:40 PM.



