







elements in the City, in addition to the places that you could walk to. She explained that this site is being capped off and the specific paving detail has been presented to DEP for their approval. Outside of the utility easement areas, they can replace soil and have plantings. She said many of the on-site trees are pretty mature. She passed out a detail sheet of the proposed lighting, fencing and wall details, which will be definitely identifiable to downtown Danbury. She said the main event for her as a Landscape Architect is the plaza level because it is a green roof. It is exciting because it will reduce the impervious surface and mitigate the current condition of an urban heat island. This intensive green roof will be designed to encourage human interaction. It is only shown conceptually because the design has to be evolving with the mechanical and structural design of the building. She said this architecture represents what Danbury was and what it could be in the future.

Jim Harris, Principal at CH2K Architects, discussed the movement through the site. Norm Goldman, another Architect also spoke and described the entrance, pedestrian areas and also parking circulation. He said the parking garages were designed to accommodate volume of residential component that is above them. They increased the floor to floor height because it is such a long building. They are considering color coding the garages to the dwelling units above. Visitors will enter roundabout security office there, and they will be directed to whichever quadrant they are going to visit. They tried to reduce the walking distance by dispersing elevators throughout the floors. Mr. Goldman explained that the first access from Main St. is for retail, then the second entrance for residents. Mr. Keller asked about the service entrance on Kennedy Ave. Mr. Goldman said it will also have security access. Mr. Blaszk asked about the Rose St. building since it is not joined to Main St. Dan Bertram said Ingersoll Rand did analysis for all security on the site and they suggested pedestrian key card access on different locations on site. The Rose St. building will be key card accessed. Mr. Urice asked if the parking is secured on Rose St. building. Mr. Bertram said there will be a gate that will be card controlled. Mr. Urice asked if only exits from garage are into circle. Mr. Goldman said there are other exits, as well as emergency exits, too. Mrs. Emminger asked how people will access Rose St. if there is no security checkpoint. Mr. Bertram said this will be final building done so the Main St. information center will be in place, they may use call boxes. He added that because it is a smaller building, it does not require human interaction like the main complex does. He added that many of the amenities, as well as pool house, will be on the third level of the complex, which they did. Mr. Keller asked them to point out the stair wells and elevators which they did. Mr. Keller asked if the skyways are completely enclosed. Paul Harris said the one to the Rose St. building is open because it is at the plaza level. He reviewed the basic schematics on the layouts of unit types. Mr. Blaszk asked if they plan to have an emergency help system within parking garage. Mr. Bertram said it is in the recommendation from Ingersoll-Rand but they have not designed it yet. Mr. Goldman then discussed the garage design, saying what is a good module for residential is not complimentary to parking module. He said they may possibly use a steel frame for upper levels, as they are trying to avoid using a crane because this will be an ongoing construction. Mr. Manuel asked about size of elevators being able to accommodate stretchers. Mr. Bertram said they designed these with same criteria as the Crosby St. elevators. Using renderings, Paul Harris tried to describe what buildings will look like. Mr. Bertram said they plan to use same structural system as the Crosby St. project since they are trying to enhance and mimic the historical manufacturing structures. Mr. Keller asked how they decided on the green for the color of the roof. Paul Harris said it was chosen from a historical palette of colors, found in nature and it will blend with the growing trees. He

added that they liked the combination of older looking brick with green. And it is less noticeable when it requires maintenance.

Rich Howard, PE from Carroccio-Covill said he prepared the existing conditions map, the Utilities Plan and Stormwater Management Plan. He said the site is essentially either paved or has slabs from buildings that were recently removed. The storm drainage goes into series of catch basins. The outlet for the Blind Brook culvert is along Kennedy Ave., but you would never know it is there. They are looking at providing access to that. He spoke about the water lines and said they need a new water main. They are proposing to reconstruct and install a new sewer line at the rear of the site. They have applied to Common Counsel for water and sewer extensions.

Mike Galante, the Traffic Engineer from Frederick Clark Associates summarized the Traffic Report which was done in November 2005. He said they did both manual and machine counts for Main St. and Kennedy Ave. over a three day period. They also included traffic from the proposed city parking garage and the Crosby St. units that are currently under construction. He said they used 600 units/5000 sq.ft. because they round up. They did not take credit for any pedestrian traffic. They have to decide where and how traffic arrives and leaves the site in order to do this. The Main St. driveway will only serve commercial space. The benefit of this type of development is access to four streets. 45% of the site traffic will use Main St. to access the site; the remaining 55% is split among several streets. He said they have to summarize the impacts and decide how to mitigate them. Currently the City Traffic Engineer is reviewing their proposals to mitigate. There are bigger issues on Main St. at the Franklin St. intersection because there is the railroad crossing. They recommend customizing the traffic signal with no physical improvements; all controls will be thru signalization. They need to fine-tune the traffic signal at West and Liberty Sts. At Rose St. and Kennedy Ave., they recommend changing to an all way stop sign control. This traffic report has to go to State Traffic Commission as they are seeking a certificate from them but cannot get it until they get their approval from the Commission. He said they are working with Abdul Mohammed on the intersection of Kennedy Ave. with Elm, New and Spring Sts., to see what can be done. It works although it may not be ideal. Mr. Urice questioned the estimated trip generation. Mr. Galante said it is based on the number of units with number of bedrooms. He said traffic analysis is based on one hour periods, usually most people do not leave at same time so that is why it is a lesser number, analysis focuses on peak 60 min and everyone does not come or go at same time. This is based on ITE calculations. Single family homes are calculated differently than multi-family housing. Mr. Keller asked about Rose and Beaver Sts. intersection where the bridge is. Mr. Galante said you don't want to put traffic signals everywhere. The State is planning to put one a signal at Main St. and Library Pl. in approx 2008. He said they will customize the traffic signals at Garamella Blvd. and Main St., but that too is complicated because of the two separate signals and the railroad crossing. There were no further questions for Mr. Galante at this time.

Attorney Jaber then said that was it for tonight's presentation, they would wait for the opposition's comments to add anything else.

At 10:10 PM, Mr. Keller made a motion to take a five-minute recess. Mr. Blaszkowski seconded the motion. Chairman Finaldi called the meeting back to order at 10:19 PM. He then asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition and several people came forward. He reminded the opposition that this is not the forum for any taxation issues, so there should be no discussion of that issue.

Jehad Sabbagh, 98 Deer Hill Ave, said he is concerned about traffic impact. He has seen an increase over the past few years and this will only add to it.

Corinne Silvert, 103 Deer Hill Ave., said she agrees with all the comments of the previous speaker. She is concerned about the potential impact because people always use Deer Hill Ave. as a shortcut since it runs parallel to Main St. She then questioned the concept of “community” versus being a part of Danbury.

Lynn Taborsak, 110 Hayestown Rd., said she doesn't like this project as it is too dense. She compared this to Kimberly Place and Danbury Towers, both located at the other end of Main St. and said imagining lining up several of them, saying that is what this will be like. She said she does not like the concept that the people who buy here will be protected from the residents who live here now. She said this is too big, too dense and too secure and she does not like that there will be no public access to all of these wonderful amenities they are proposing.

Paul Rotello, 13 Linden Pl., said this is a huge structure, a major building. We do need housing, we definitely need high density housing, but he is not sure if this is the answer. He asked that they pay particular attention to the access/egress from Spring St. and also Rose Hill since many people use these roads to get to the highway. He expressed concern about being able to traverse the project without exiting the structures, saying there is no gentle flow in and out of project.

Ken Gucker, 89 Padanaram Rd., said he has a number of concerns. The first is the sheer massive volume of the project. The bottom line is that standing on street, this will look like a massive wall of buildings. A 105 ft tall building surrounded by two story buildings will create a large visual mass which we do not need. He questioned the traffic counts saying we don't need any more traffic. He said Padanaram Rd. has traffic issues and this will cause the same type of issues on Main St. We don't need any more cars on Main St., even ten more cars. This project could have a ripple effect on the entire city. He also mentioned the potential impact on the sewer and water systems.

Christine Halfar, 16 Settlers Hill Rd., said this is a large poorly thought out project. She said it appears to be a fortress and questioned how it will do any good for Danbury.

Michael Kallas, 99 Chambers Rd., said he admires Dan Bertram's courage. Everything about this project is too much, it is too big, too tall, too many people, too much of a burden on utilities and too much traffic. He said the traffic study is incomplete, it does not include Spring St., Farview Ave., and all of the shortcuts to Exit 5. He said if this was a smaller scale, he could support it.

Chairman Finaldi asked if there was anyone else to speak in opposition to this application and there was no one. He then asked Attorney Jaber if he wanted to speak in rebuttal to the opposition's comments.

Attorney Jaber asked Chairman Finaldi if he could ask if there was anyone else to speak in favor of this. Chairman Finaldi asked if there was anyone else to speak in favor of this before Attorney Jaber rebuts the opposition's comments.



