

MAYOR  
**Caroline Simmons**



DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS  
**Matthew Quiñones**

LAND USE BUREAU CHIEF  
**Ralph Blessing**

HPAC CHAIR  
**David W. Woods, AIA**

**CITY OF STAMFORD**  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION**

888 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD  
STAMFORD, CT 06904 -2152

**To:** Vineeta Mathur, Principal Planner  
Land Use Bureau

**From:** David W. Woods, AIA, NCARB, LEED-AP

**Subject:** **HPAC Resolution**  
**ZB Application #224-02 - 31 Maple Tree Avenue**  
**Special Permit Application**

**Date:** March 7, 2024

At HPAC's Regular Meeting held Tuesday, March 5, 2024, the Commission was presented with the design concept for renovation/restoration of a residential structure at 31 Maple Tree Avenue, including a residential addition. It is understood that two (2) units within the historic structure will be renovated, the exterior will be restored, and a small addition will be placed at the back. The project has been submitted for consideration under Section 7.3 of the Zoning Regulations. The following is a record of the Commission's discussion:

The Commission would like to commend the owner for filing a Section 7.3 application to save this important structure. By unanimous vote, the Commission supports the concept plans presented with these important issues to be included in the design, as agreed to by the owner.

1. The small addition at the back of the historic structure is approved with the understanding that the siding, new windows, new columns at the side porch and the roof line and materials will match existing historic details.
2. The Commission requested that the turn around/service access pad at the front yard be deleted from the site plan. The Commission further requests that landscape planting be provided in lieu of asphalt paving or any other hard surface that can facilitate parking.
3. The owner has agreed to use Hardie board siding that will match the siding that is used on the historic structure (in color and scale). The color was indicated to be white on the rendering. The Commission assumes the siding will all be the same "white color" on both buildings.
4. After considerable discussion about the height of the four (4) unit addition, the owner has agreed to revise and simplify a number of details and massing of the roof. They include: **[a]** the dormers on the 4th floor roof; **[b]** removal of the small, shed roof at the first residential ceiling line; and **[c]** the "bay frame" details at the windows of the second residential floor. They also agreed the base will be brick on the driveway side only. The base will be Hardie siding on the other three (3) sides. It was noted that the historic structure is simple in design, and the new building should try to match that simple colonial character.

5. The Commission defers to the Zoning Board to resolve the height issues [four (4) stories] as noted under the Special Permit request. The Commission generally agrees the new structure appears too tall.
6. The Commission had considerable discussion about the Text Change request that relates to on-site parking and setback requirements. (The chart in Table 12.6 - "Minimum Distances of Parking Areas from lot lines and buildings.") The Commission prefers that no Text Changes be allowed to Section 7.3 of the Regulations. It is believed that Section 7.3, the historic section of the Regulations, should not be altered and any adjustments to parking standards can be handled through the "Special Permit" application process for individual projects going forward.

The Commission requests that the development team return with progress plans and details for final review. The new plans and corrections can be submitted to the Land Use Bureau for Commission review and can be done online (electronically) for a final approval. If the owner wishes to take exception to the notes provided, they have the option to return to the Commission for a public presentation and a vote.

In granting support for the project design, the Commission understands that the owners have submitted the project to the City's Cultural Resources Inventory. That approval is provided under a separate Resolution.

HPAC understands the Land Use Boards may have other considerations for review that are beyond the scope of HPAC recommendations. Those may include bonuses, setbacks, parking, and landscape improvements that are normally under the Zoning Regulations and are not a part of HPAC review. Those include the Special Permit items that were noted in this presentation to the Commission.

- Permit a total of six (6) homes in lieu of four (4) allowed.
- Permission for one (1) parking space per household.
- Revision of parking setback from lot lines or building structure.
- Permit total building height of four (4) stories in lieu of three (3) stories permitted.
- Permit rear yard setback of 26.3 feet in lieu of 30 feet.
- Permit side yard setback of 10.1 feet in lieu of 15 feet.
- Permit adjustment to the light & air requirements at the south side property line.

Once again, we thank the owner for their presentation to the Commission.

David W. Woods, AIA, NCARB  
Chair, Historic Preservation Advisory Commission