

PLANNING & ZONING  
COMMISSION  
Telephone (203) 563-0185  
Fax (203) 563-0284



TOWN HALL ANNEX  
238 Danbury Road  
Wilton, Connecticut 06897

## WILTON PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES JULY 14, 2014 REGULAR MEETING

**PRESENT:** Chairman Christopher Hulse, Secretary Doris Knapp, Commissioners Lori Bufano, John Comiskey, Joe Fiteni, Bas Nabulsi, and Peter Shiue

**ABSENT:** Sally Poundstone and Franklin Wong (notified intended absence)

### ALSO

**PRESENT:** Robert Nerney, Town Planner; Daphne White, Assistant Town Planner; Lorraine Russo, Recording Secretary; members of the press; and interested residents.

### PUBLIC HEARINGS

**1. SP#391, Fairfield County Bank, 190 Old Ridgefield Road, To allow a second drive-in facility (ATM)**

Mr. Hulse called the Public Hearing to order at 7:15 P.M., seated members Bufano, Comiskey, Fiteni, Hulse, Knapp, and Shiue, and referred to Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-11, Conflict of Interest. Ms. Knapp read the legal notice dated June 30, 2014 and she referred for the record to a Planning and Zoning Staff Report dated June 26, 2014, with attached email communications.

Present were J. Casey Healy, attorney; John Doyle, architect; and Carol Johnson, Vice President, Fairfield County Bank.

Mr. Healy referenced a posted site plan, noting that the existing ATM location poses a safety issue because there is no parking dedicated to the ATM and, as a result, customers park anywhere, blocking other lanes as well as pedestrian walkways.

Mr. Nabulsi arrived and was seated at approximately 7:20 P.M.

Mr. Healy distributed a Planning and Zoning Staff Report response letter dated July 14, 2014 with attachments, including a revised Form B application and a “Drive-Thru ATM Concept Traffic Operations Plan”.

Mr. Healy reviewed in detail all comments/responses, noting in particular that:

- The ATM will not be internally illuminated;
- The color scheme was changed in compliance with a Village District Design Committee (VDDC) request;
- The architect (John Doyle) believes that a pitched roof design would be better than a flat roof, which he felt would give the drive-thru a service station canopy appearance;
- Coverages were revised to correctly reflect slight increases to existing percentages;
- A new island will be constructed just slightly north of the existing island in order to locate the ATM in compliance with the 10-foot front yard setback in the Center, with not more than a 1-foot projection into the setback as permitted by Section 29-4.E.2 of Zoning Regulations;
- The drive-thru ATM is not, in the opinion of the applicant, a bank window and therefore is not restricted by Section 29-8.B.5.b.(5) queuing requirements;
- It is Tighe & Bond’s opinion that the existing 9’6”-wide driveway is adequate to serve the ATM drive-thru lane as it is more analogous to a parking space and vehicles will be operating at a low rate of speed;
- The application was revised to reflect the addition of “Parcel A – 0.04 Acres”;
- No trees are proposed to be removed.

Several Commissioners expressed concern with the style of the ATM roof, questioning its pitch and orientation, and the possible implications of such upon customers during inclement weather. Mr. Doyle explained that the roof overhang is at least 2 feet from the base of the machine, allowing what he felt to be ample room to protect customers from the elements. He noted that the intent was to provide more of a small-town, train-station look as opposed to a gas station canopy appearance.

Mr. Doyle noted that a gutter could be added to direct drainage away, but he expressed concern with reorienting the roof in the opposite direction since he felt that such a modification would result in a roof that is too tall and would not look as good or be as appropriate for the area.

In response to a question from Mr. Nerney regarding signage compliance, Mr. Healy indicated that the applicant could double check the numbers and submit further details, noting that the intention is to have no net gain on signage square footage.

In response to further concerns expressed by Commissioners with respect to the proposed roof style/color (citing lack of protection from the rain and inconsistency of design with the rest of the building), Mr. Doyle stated that the roof color could be toned back a bit to a grey or grayish-brown and, although he preferred the proposed pitched roof, he indicated that they could take another look at other possible options, including possibly extending the original flat roof line over to the ATM canopy

Mr. Doyle also confirmed that recessed LED lighting, with no visible light source, would be utilized under the canopy.

Mr. Nabulsi requested clarification on the distinction cited by the applicant between a drive-up window and a drive-thru ATM, referencing in particular the applicant's contention that the ATM would be subject to different waiting/queuing space requirements as compared with a manned drive-up window.

Mr. Healy cited statistics submitted previously indicating that an ATM transaction time averages only 1 minute 30 seconds as compared to a face-to-face drive-up window transaction time of approximately 2 minutes 30 seconds, thus justifying a shorter ATM queuing space requirement.

Mr. Nabulsi questioned whether the library drive-thru for book pick-up/drop-off was bound by zoning regulations for a drive-up window, specifically with respect to the required 5 off-street queuing spaces.

Mr. Comiskey noted that he was working with Malcolm White during those site renovations and the feeling at that time was that there would not likely be many people waiting in line at any given time for a book drive-up window.

Mr. Nabulsi felt that if, in fact, the library drive-up window was not required to conform with queuing restrictions of Section 29-8.B.5.b.(5) of zoning regulations, it would provide a precedent (and thus some level of comfort) for not holding the ATM drive-thru to such restrictions.

Mr. Hulse asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak for or against the application.

It was the consensus of the Commission to continue the application until the next meeting on July 28<sup>th</sup> to give the applicant time to review the canopy design and to also research how the library drive-up window was addressed some years ago. Mr. Nabulsi requested that the applicant also address how water runoff from the ATM canopy will be handled regardless of which roof design is utilized. Ms. White requested that the applicant submit additional information pertaining to the proposed recessed lighting.

**P&Z Minutes – 07/14/14 – Page 4**

Mr. Nabulsi also requested that Section 29-8.B.5.b.(5) of zoning regulations, i.e. the issue of waiting spaces required in connection with drive-in windows, be specifically addressed in any resolution that may be prepared for the subject application.

There being no further comments from the Commission or the public, at approximately 7:52 P.M. the Public Hearing was continued until July 28, 2014.

**REGULAR MEETING**

A. Mr. Hulse called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:52 P.M., seated members Bufano, Comiskey, Fiteni, Hulse, Knapp, Nabulsi, and Shiue, and referred to Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-11, Conflict of Interest.

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**1. June 23, 2014 – Regular Meeting**

MOTION was made by Ms. Knapp, seconded by Mr. Comiskey, and carried (6-0-1) to approve the minutes of June 23, 2014 as amended. Mr. Shiue abstained.

**C. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW**

**D. ACCEPTANCE OF NEW APPLICATIONS**

**1. SP#392, Jackson, 111 Highfield Road, Accessory Dwelling Unit**

It was the consensus of the Commission to schedule a public hearing date for September 8, 2014.

**2. SDP, Wilton Historical Society, 140-150 Danbury Road, Signage Plan**

**3. SDP, Wilton Historical Society, 224 Danbury Road, Signage Plan**

**4. SDP, Wilton Historical Society, 414 Olmstead Hill Road, Signage Plan**

It was the consensus of the Commission to schedule discussion for the above SDP applications for Wilton Historical Society signage on July 28, 2014.

**E. PENDING APPLICATIONS**

- 1. SP#391, Fairfield County Bank, 190 Old Ridgefield Road, To allow a second drive-in facility (ATM)**

Tabled.

**F. COMMUNICATIONS**

**G. REPORT FROM CHAIRMAN**

**H. REPORT FROM PLANNER**

**I. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

- 1. SDP, Troup, 84 Old Driftway, Filling of land  
[Discussion – July 28, 2014]**

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION was made by Ms. Bufano, seconded by Mr. Fiteni, and carried unanimously (7-0) to adjourn at 7:56 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorraine Russo  
Recording Secretary