

VILLAGE DISTRICT
DESIGN ADVISORY
COMMITTEE/
ARCHITECTURAL
REVIEW BOARD



TOWN HALL ANNEX
238 Danbury Road
Wilton, Connecticut
06897
Telephone (203) 563-0185
Fax (203) 563-0284
www.wiltonct.or

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD/VILLAGE
DISTRICT DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR (ELECTRONIC) MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, March 7, 2024
5:00 PM**

PRESENT: Kathleen Poirier, AIA, Kevin Quinlan, AIA and John Doyle, AIA; notified intended absence: Samuel Gardner, AIA

ALSO PRESENT: Daphne White, Assistant Town Planner

I. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

- A. Call to Order – at 5:01 PM
- B. Roll Call
- C. Work Session

1. Fred Kaoud Real Estate, LLC, 27 Danbury Road

Proposed signage in advance of alternative signage application

Ms. Joanne Kaoud Simpson detailed the changes suggested at the January 4th meeting, including awning color, free standing sign/directory on Danbury Road, conformity of the font type of the window lettering, and the signage in the rear of buildings one and two.

After discussion, a motion was made to approve the application, which was approved unanimously with the following changes:

1. The wall-mounted signs on both buildings will have either an all-burgundy border, or a burgundy border with a ½” white trim.
2. The monument sign will be revised to enlarge the Kaoud name within the burgundy coloring background for that panel.

2. Fuller Development, LLC, 64 Danbury Road

Proposed signage

Ms. Kate Throckmorton detailed the location of four signs, two that are free-standing, made of wood and with landscape lighting, one directional sign, and one back-lit sign mounted on the club house building. She then detailed the appearance of the signs. All sign colors will be coordinated with building colors and the lettering will use the same font. Mr. Fuller stated that each building would have a sign.

After discussion, a motion was made to approve the signage as presented, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. AM Group US, LLC, 46 Danbury Road

Application review for convenience store expansion

Mr. Ramiz Khoda (Design Architect) described the goal of the renovation, removing three service bays (garages) and converting them to a larger convenience store area. He then detailed the installations to the interior of the convenience store, as well as the exterior features, such as color, material, and accessibility.

After discussion, a motion was made to approve the application, which was approved unanimously with the following changes:

1. Revise a portion of the canopy at the left corner, matching the white of the canopy at the right corner.
2. Take four inches out of each side-light around the front entrance to make the appearance more symmetrical.

II. VILLAGE DISTRICT DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- A. Call to Order – at 6:09 PM
- B. Roll Call
- C. Work Session

1. Glengate Company, 47 Old Ridgefield Road

Proposed rooftop screening

Mr. Sean Gerrity presented for Glengate. A rendering was shown of the proposed look of the screening, white to match the building trim, where no screening currently exists.

After discussion, a motion was made to approve the application, which was unanimously

approved with the following changes:

1. The screening color matches the fascia color (dover grey).
2. The height of the screening would be reduced to 4' to match the height of the units.

2. Vision Consultants of Wilton, 115 Old Ridgefield Road

Proposed signage

Dr. Jean-Mark Alling, the applicant, displayed renderings of the proposed placement of the signage, as well signage details, such as font and color.

After discussion, a motion was made to approve the application as presented, which was approved unanimously.

3. Wilton Campus 1691, LLC, 15-21 River Road

Pre-application review

Mr. Casey Healy detailed the objectives of application to redevelop the Wilton Campus site. The front building along River Road would be razed and be replaced by a building with retail on the exterior of the first floor, underground parking behind, and apartments above. There will also be a new, second building with underground parking along the southern boundary of the property which is currently parking and other paved areas.

Mr. Christopher Santoro began by presenting the site plan detailing access points, existing buildings, and proposed buildings (A along River Road and B on the southern border of the property behind building A).

Building A would consist of ~100 apartment units and 10,000 SF of retail space, and maxes out at four stories. Building B is a four and five story split project with ~72 apartment units. The Building A ground floor plan shows 84 parking spaces behind the retail space with two points of access. There would be a residential lobby with amenities along River Road, and retail space extending to the corner and down Village Drive. Building B will be residential with no retail space.

Mr. Matt Renauld discussed the open space components of the projects. The River Road streetscape would consist of the transition zone to the south, acting as gateway into the site and a connection to Building B. Emphasis is on a wide streetscape, incorporating elements such as benches, lighting, trees, and an active lobby that would animate the area. At the junction of River Road and Village Drive would be a corner plaza, and along Village Drive would be retail with an active streetscape and opportunities for outdoor dining.

Options for the signature corner plaza were presented, with Option A (Plaza) being hardscaped with buffering landscaping along River Road, and Option B (Lawn) which includes a lawn panel.

Building B would incorporate some of the same design elements from the River Road streetscape, welcoming residents and creating site circulation on the roadway and drop off areas. Landscaping would create a buffer from parking areas and office building and create a resident common space.

Committee comments:

- The orientation of Building A. It faces north, which will shade Village Drive and the shorter building on the other side of the street for much of the day. This could potentially affect the vibrancy of the area, and take away from the idea of community space. Mr. Brown addressed this concern, stating that as this is an infill project, they are limited in terms of configuration and orientation. He believes, however, that there is an opportunity to create a strong nightlife, which is a key guideline in the master plan.
- Could a perspective be provided that looks down Village Drive from River Road, which could provide context to the relationship between Building A and the building across Village Drive. A concern is that differing heights on each side of Village Drive would create an imbalance.
- It was asked how much taller the proposed Building A would be versus the existing building. Mr. Brown responded that in the bird's eye view rendering, the entire height of the building is visible, however, from a ground level perspective the view will be three stories, and the height above, allowable based on the form base code, is pulled back from view.
- A question was asked relating to what led to this architectural design, and that it didn't look residential or like Wilton. Mr. Brown commented that they had previously gone through many iterations during meetings with the PZC, and that this is where they ended up.
- Comments were made that the windows look commercial and that changes should be considered to give a more residential appearance.
- Consensus relating to preference of Option A (plaza) versus Option B (lawn) in the courtyard area of Building A.
- Regarding the scale and mass, Mr. Healy made a point that this would be a first project to take advantage of the new Wilton Center zoning opportunities, and a comment from The Committee was made that this is the ideal location. The location is at the south entry to the village, and the resulting density would attract younger professionals and older residents wanting to downsize which would drive Village restaurants and retail.
- A comment was made in support of the façade of the River Road section of Building A, as it has ins and outs creating shadow lines and verticality, as well as breaking up the length of the façade. Village Drive does not have that same façade surface delineation. A similar façade on Village Drive could make the appearance less dense by breaking up

the massing and it wouldn't appear so flat.

- The Committee asked if Appendix C was still applicable or if it was replaced by the Wilton Center from based code.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the minutes from the February 1, 2024 Regular Meeting was moved to the April 4th meeting

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

Next meeting: April 4, 2024

IV. ADJOURNMENT – 8:03 PM

Respectfully submitted by Rich Callahan – Recording Secretary

*MINUTES HAVE NOT BEEN REVIEWED BY THIS BOARD/COMMITTEE AND MAY BE SUBJECT TO REVISION IN FUTURE MINUTES. FULL AUDIO RECORDING OF MEETING IS AVAILABLE AT: [Village District Design Advisory Committee / Architectural Review Board Minutes & Agendas | wiltonct](#)