

## **THE GLASTONBURY ARCHITECTURAL & SITE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2022**

The Glastonbury Architectural and Site Design Review Committee and Jonathan E. Mullen, AICP, Planner, with Greg Foran, Tree Warden, in attendance held a Regular Meeting at 5:00 P.M in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street.

### **1. ROLL CALL**

#### **Commission Members Present**

Ms. Debra DeVries-Dalton, Vice Chairman  
Mr. David Flinchum  
Mr. Jeff Kamm  
Ms. Amy Luzi  
Mr. Robert Shipman

#### **Commission Members Absent**

Mr. Brian Davis, Chairman  
Mr. Mark Branse, Secretary

Vice Chairman Dalton called the meeting to order at 5:08 P.M.

---

### **2. 52 NATIONAL DRIVE – 3,000 square foot addition to building with parking modifications and water quality enhancements – Planned Employment and Flood Zones – Dutton Associates, LLC – Claudio Vecchiarino, New England Traffic Solutions, applicant – FORMAL REVIEW**

Jim Dutton of Dutton Associates, LLC reviewed the changes that have been proposed since the last meeting. The proposed addition will be warehouse space only. He presented images of the existing rooftop units on the building, which are only visible from certain angles. Ms. Dalton liked the selection of trees and their placements. While understanding the rapid flow from the drainage pipe along the narrow ledge, she would like to see more ground cover on the west side. Mr. Dutton worries about potential drainage issues, explaining that the building was built very low, so placing lots of plantings against it will hold the water. Ms. Dalton suggested leaving a foot of gravel. Mr. Dutton stated that perhaps they could do something around the trees.

Mr. Kamm is bothered that no architectural drawing was provided for this application; because he does not see the trees matching, it makes him not trust the building matching. He asked about matching the existing brick. The applicant, Mr. Vecchiarino, explained that the original brick is from the 1970s, which they have unsuccessfully tried to match. However, they have done their best to carry the colors and the window look to offset the difference.

Ms. Luzi would like to see more green cover. She suggested planting a cover bed to break up the building with a green buffer. She also noted that the renderings show nothing on the back side, and she is concerned about the lack of windows. She suggested reusing the windows that the applicant already has, which would allow light into the warehouse. Ms. Luzi would also like to see the brick matched as a tribute to the original building. She has no problem with the rooftop units. She asked if the warehouse would have air conditioning. Mr. Dutton replied no, it will not. Mr. Vecchiarino stated that they cannot reuse those windows on this type of building, but he is not opposed to adding windows on the top. However, he is opposed to matching the brick, stating that they have done their due diligence on that. He also fears that the suggested plantings will cause potential water seepage. Ms. Luzi noted that an awning over the exit door would also help break up

the surface. She would like the trash enclosure to not be a chain link fence, and the Committee must also discuss signage. The applicant had no objections to these conditions.

Mr. Flinchum shared Mr. Kamm's concern, adding that the renderings should have been checked before they were submitted. He asked about flexibility on the parking spaces since there are very few visitors to the site. Mr. Mullen noted that the parking is calculated at one space per every 2,500 square feet. Mr. Shipman noted that there is a lot of gravel in the front. He suggested that the applicant shrink up the stone area and put two ornamental trees off each corner, and in front of the Eversource utility box, use something lower than evergreen to soften it. The immense parking lot next door bothers him. He would also like to see more trees in larger groupings. Ms. Dalton concurred, stating that more trees would lessen the heat island effect on both parking lots.

**Motion by:** Ms. Luzi

**Seconded by:** Ms. Dalton

The Glastonbury Architectural and Site Design Review Committee forwards a favorable recommendation to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission on the architectural and site design, as shown on the plans, subject to the following conditions:

1. Convert the two parking spaces and proposed sidewalk in front of the addition at the southwest corner to a landscape bed and redirect the sidewalk with a minimum of two trees and gravel along the foundation.
2. Reduce the size of the stone beds to an average of five feet off the building, with bump outs at the northeast and northwest corners and at the transformer location.
3. Change arborvitae to pink berry to screen the Eversource transformer.
4. Plant trees in grove-like groupings of deciduous and evergreen species along the eastern and western property lines.
5. Add windows to the second floor in the same pattern as the original building on the eastern and southern sides of the addition.
6. Add a canopy over the southeast door of the addition.
7. Show trash enclosure materials. Materials not to be a chain link fence. Suggest use of PVC to coordinate with the building.
8. Signs shall comply with the zoning regulations.
9. Coordinate architectural drawings ensuring that the accent band and awning are preserved as depicted in the submitted renderings, as well as in the fenestration patterns.

**Result:** Motion passed unanimously {5-0-0}.

### **3. Other Business - None**

With no further comments or questions, the meeting adjourned at 6:55 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

**Lilly Torosyan**

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk