

ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
AMENDED MINUTES OF THE MAY 17, 2022 REGULAR MEETING

The meeting commenced at 5:00 PM in the Academy Building Cafeteria and via Zoom.

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Brian Davis, Chairman, Debra DeVries-Dalton Vice Chairman, Mark Branse, Secretary, Jeff Kamm and Amy Luzi; Rebecca Augur, Director of Planning & Land Use Services, Gregory Foran, Parks Superintendent/Tree Warden and Jonathan E. Mullen, AICP, Planner

Excused: Robert Shipman

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 5pm.

1199 MANCHESTER ROAD – proposal for a “set-aside development” pursuant to CGS Section 8-30g regarding the construction of an apartment building containing 74 units, w/parking & other site improvements – Planned Business and Development Zone and Rural Residence Zone - Timothy S. Hollister, Esq. and Andrea L. Gomes Esq. Hinckley Allen, Wes Wentworth, P.E. Wentworth Civil Engineers, LLC - Manchester/Hebron Avenue, LLC (Richard Hayes, Jr.), applicant – FORMAL REVIEW

Attorney Andrea Gomes presented an overview of the application. Wes Wentworth, engineer for the project, stated soils on the site were dry sand and gravel and there were no wetlands. Mr. Wentworth then discussed the site plan. Alan Lamson, AIA from FLB Architecture explained that the proposed building would be 5 stories, however only 4 stories would be visible facing on the south elevation. He stated that the upper units have balconies, and the ground floor has patios. Mr. Lamson then stated that all elevations would have the same materials and design features. He added the main entrance to the building would be located on the north side of the building facing Hebron Avenue and would have a portico. John Alexopoulos, landscape architect for the project, presented the landscaping plan.

The Committee felt, that while they appreciated the fact that the building was built into the slope of the property, they still found it out of scale with the neighborhood. The Committee was not in favor of the pediments. They also recommended breaking up the flatness of the northern elevation by changing the floor plan, incorporating horizontal banding on the facades, using different materials on the balconies and using different colors on the facade. Specifically, the Committee recommended incorporating a frieze board with some brackets as an inexpensive way to reduce the scale of the building. They also recommended terracing and landscaping to soften the retaining walls. The Committee recommended street trees along Hebron Avenue and possibly removing some parking spaces to add landscaped islands to the parking lot. They directed the applicant to include the trash enclosure on the plans. Committee members reiterated that the building was out of scale with the neighborhood and recommended a maximum height of three or four stories.

The applicant requested an example of a frieze board and bracket through staff. The applicant then clarified that one neighbor will see the roofline, but not into the actual units.

The group agreed that the next steps would be to hold a special meeting to develop a formal recommendation.

2610 MAIN STREET – proposal to construct two multi-family townhomes (10 units total) incorporating existing multi-family house – Town Center and Town Center Village District Zones – Jack Kemper, Kemper Associates Architects, Jonathan Sczurek, P.E., Megson, Heagle & Friend, C.E. & L.S., LLC; Thomas Graceffa Landscape Architect, LLC – Attorney Joseph P. Jaconetta for Jays & Tee, LLC, applicant – INFORMAL REVIEW

Jonathan Sczurek, PE, gave an overview of the project. Landscape Architect Tom Graceffa reviewed the landscape plan. He stated that there would be columnar oaks on the Main Street side of the building. Screening along the back property line includes existing large oaks, a mixture of arborvitae and trellises. Islands in the parking area will also have landscaping. Mr. Graceffa added that there would be two patios facing Main Street.

Jack Kemper, AIA, addressed the architecture. He stated that the retained house is the prominent feature of the front building, with the additions stepped back. All the residents in the Main Street-facing building will have access to Main Street. Chairman Davis asked for a model of the rear building. Mr. Kemper explained that they were keeping the same architectural language for the rear building. He added that he tried to break up the rooflines for the rear building. He said that he added banding to the first floor to give the building a base. Mr. Kemper stated that all the units have balconies with garage doors underneath. He then pointed out the band of recessed panels at the top of both buildings to give the look of a frieze board.

The Committee praised the applicant's approach to the design of the project. They liked the way the project preserved and highlighted the original building. Members also liked the landscaping along Main Street, and the location of the parking lot between the two buildings out of view from the road. They felt that this project is the type of development the Town should be encouraging in the Town Center Village District (TCVD).

The Committee noted that the windows on the north and south elevations seem very small compared to the east and west elevations. They recommended substituting the grass on the driveway side with some type of shrub. Some Committee members expressed concern that the rear building would overshadow the townhouses to the east. The Committee also had questions about the proposed pole height for the site lighting. Committee members also commended the applicant for the porches along Main Street and the interconnected driveway access with the property to the north. They recommended having ornamentation in at least some of the pediments, either louvres or windows.

52 NATIONAL DRIVE – proposed building addition – Planned Employment and Flood Zones; Dutton Associates, New England Traffic Solutions, applicant – INFORMAL REVIEW

Jim Dutton presented the application. Chairman Davis stated that it was easy to tell the addition from the original building. He recommended treating the corner of the addition to resemble the corner on the front of the existing building. Mr. Davis also recommended that the applicant prepare renderings for the next iteration of plans.

The Committee recommended relocating the existing large window on the back of the building to the southwest corner of the addition. The Committee also felt the addition could be better integrated with the main building. They recommended that the applicant prepare elevation drawings of all sides of the building and accurate color renderings. It was also suggested adding more landscaping to the east side of the building to match the west side and adding more shade trees.

**121 KREIGER LANE – proposal for construction services yard – Planned Commerce/
GW-1 Zone – Mark W. Friend, P.E., Soil Scientist, LEED AP – General Landscaping,
LLC, applicant – INFORMAL REVIEW**

Mark Friend, PE made a presentation for the proposal.

Members of the Committee observed trees stumps from recent cutting in the rear of the property, and wondered if that cutting had cleared the area shown as wooded on the site plan (which shows a tree line). If so, then those cleared areas must be re-landscaped to provide a buffer to the adjoining properties. The Committee also asked for more information about adjoining uses and topography to determine what kind/height of buffering will be needed.

The height of material bunkers was not known at this time. The design engineer thought perhaps 8-10 feet in height, in which case buffering would have to account for that height of structure. The bunkers will be constructed of so-called “mafia blocks,” which are typical for bunkers of this kind, but are not attractive and need to be screened.

The consensus was that the front landscaping could use some additional thought. This is an opportunity for a reputable landscape company to “show off” what they can do. Members suggested alternative plant materials.

There was concern about the use of chain link fence and chain link gates. While this is an industrial zone, something more attractive would be preferred. Vinyl slats in chain link fencing provide visual screening, but a more attractive option should be explored. The design engineer noted that the site plan submitted was wrong: It shows the chain link fence in front of the landscaping when, in fact, it is proposed to be behind it (like the property across the street owned by the same company). The designers will explore enclosure alternatives.

**2533-2577 MAIN STREET and Lot W-38A MAIN STREET – proposal for building
addition, parking lot expansion and reconfigured parking at St. Paul’s Church – Town
Center, Town Center Village District and Flood Zones – Alter & Pearson, LLC,
Community of Saints Isidore and Maria, applicant – INFORMAL REVIEW**

Attorney Meghan Hope made a presentation for the proposal.

The Committee was unanimous and emphatic that demolition of the existing parish house, and the substitution of a parking area/driveway, is not acceptable. Expansion of the handicapped parking area and the provision of a loading area for the kitchen (as proposed) are possible while retaining the existing building.

There was no particular use that the Committee proposed for the existing parish house. It could be a Church-related use or rented as an income-producing office or retail store, but this was left to the needs and desires of the Church. What was important was that the solid-to-void ratio and rhythm of the street be preserved.

There was concern about the extension of the "drop off" driveway parallel to Main Street, partly because it requires demolition of the existing parish house, and partly because of the increase in pavement along Main Street. It was also noted that shifting the southerly two-way driveway closer to the Main Street/Welles Street intersection would increase the probability that the driveway will be unusable as traffic on Main Street backs up at the light and blocks that driveway. The curb cut should be retained in its current location.

The Committee suggested that more handicapped spaces could be shifted and/or located to the rear of the building because the new addition will have an elevator that will bring visitors from the parking lot level to the sanctuary level.

The use of hip roof element versus a peaked roof element was discussed at length. Both rooflines are now used on the existing building, and there appear to be pros and cons to using one or the other for the addition.

The rooftop air handling above the proposed/expanded kitchen area should be screened in a manner that utilizes whatever roofline is used, rather than what amounts to a rooftop fence.

There was discussion of the adequacy of the parking lot landscaping, especially with regard to the islands that double as stormwater management systems.

There was discussion of the bay window elements on the new addition. The project architect felt that they needed additional thought, and some suggestions were made.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan E. Mullen, AICP
Planner