

THE GLASTONBURY ARCHITECTURAL & SITE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE (ASDRC) REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2022

The Glastonbury Architectural and Site Design Review Committee with Jonathan E. Mullen, AICP, Planner, in attendance, held a Regular Meeting at 5:00 P.M in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street with an option for Zoom video conferencing. The video was broadcast in real time and via a live video stream.

1. ROLL CALL

Commission Members Present

Mr. Brian Davis, Chairman
Mr. Mark Branse, Secretary
Mr. David Flinchum
Ms. Amy Luzi
Mr. Jeff Kamm
Mr. Robert Shipman

Commission Members Absent

Ms. Debra DeVries-Dalton, Vice Chairman

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 5:01 P.M.

2. 2951 MAIN STREET - Proposed architectural changes for Shops on Main Building 3 - Planned Business and Development Zone - Alter & Pearson, LLC - Shops on Main LLC, applicant

Attorney Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC explained that two meetings ago, they discussed an architectural change at Building 3. There was a change in tenants. The two main concerns expressed by the Commission at the last meeting were to make slight changes to the colors and to remove the signage on the southeast corner of Building 3, which has been done. Tom Scott, the project architect, explained that they had created a minor modification to the approved elevation of the building. They have also created a more monotone effect, changing some of the colors back to a more neutral range. No changes have been made to the windows because the tenant seeks glass.

Ms. Hope then reviewed the landscaping plans in lieu of the Landscape Architect, who was unable to attend tonight's meeting. They have created a seating area with tables, benches, and umbrellas. Two types of permeable pavers are used to create the patio and a connection to the existing sidewalk network. Shade trees are proposed, as well as lots of shrubbery to frame this newly activated area. Light bollards are located throughout the plan. This layout is also replicated on the south side of Building 2.

Mr. Shipman said that the landscaping changes make the site more attractive. His only concern is to ensure that there is irrigation in the free-standing planters. He also suggested changing the paperbark maple on the north patio to a fern leaf maple, which will provide more impact.

Mr. Branse visited the site yesterday. There are now five mounted flood lights on Building 1, which are not allowed and must be removed. His guess is that perhaps a tenant added it and stuck them on with a conduit. Ms. Hope will check with Chick-fil-A. Mr. Branse reiterated his concern with too much glass on buildings, stating that it creates a problem with excess signs on windows. On Main Street, the character they strive for is to have defined windows as opposed to glass walls.

Mr. Kamm stated that the lighting on the north side of this building is not shown. He asked if the plaza lighting was an addition. Ms. Hope replied yes because they did not have any bollards in these areas previously. Mr. Kamm asked for the lumen output of those fixtures. Mr. Scott stated that they are shielded, so they do not emit a lot of light. Mr. Kamm asked if these are public spaces not attached to a tenant. Ms. Hope replied that is correct. Mr. Kamm asked who will maintain the space. Ms. Hope responded it will be the landlord, not a tenant.

Mr. Mullen pointed out that these outdoor seats may now push the applicant over their parking count. Mr. Davis stated that because the seats were a public amenity and not associated with a particular use they should not affect the parking count for the site.. Ms. Luzi is happy with what she is seeing, however, she asked for a different umbrella color which would be uniform on both sides. Mr. Davis disagreed. He does not wish to control the applicant's colors. They are trying to activate the retail space, so he encouraged multiple colors. Ms. Luzi does not like the idea of the proposed yellow because it reminds her of one of the tenant's branding colors. She would be open to another color.

Mr. Flinchum agreed with Mr. Davis regarding the umbrella colors. He finds that the two plazas will benefit not only the tenant but employees on-site. He inquired about surplus parking. Ms. Hope explained that, with the change in uses, they have built out fewer restaurants than what was approved. The parking requirement is 199 spaces, and they currently have 213 spaces. However, they are nervous about reducing parking because if one of the tenants switches back to a food tenant, then that surplus will simply go away.

Mr. Flinchum has been concerned about the three radial parking spaces. He recommended the applicant remove the spaces to create more greenspace for a safer intersection. He then asked if the number of outdoor seats a particular establishment can have is affected by the number of parking spaces available. Mr. Mullen explained that outdoor seats are counted the same way that indoor seats are counted. Mr. Flinchum stated that these are publicly accessible spaces, so their use should be encouraged at no penalty to the developer. He asked if the developer is going to convert them for a future tenant. Ms. Hope replied no, and if they did decide to do that, then they would have to return to the TPZ for a parking increase.

Ms. Luzi suggested placing a bar in the middle of the benches to prevent people from sleeping there. Mr. Mullen noted that there is no design standard in town to enforce putting a bar in the

middle. Mr. Flinchum suggested that if that becomes a problem, then they can add it. Mr. Davis is very happy with the approach that the applicant has taken, having incorporated the commentary from the ASDRC. He hopes that the TPZ will not take issue with the outdoor seating because it is not associated with any particular use.

Mr. Davis strongly encouraged looking at replacing the three radial spaces and increasing the size of the island. David Taglianetti, representative of Carpionato Group, asked what if they designate those as employee-only spaces. Mr. Davis explained that this committee's issue is really the aesthetic purview. They would just like to get the recommendation put in front of the Town Plan and Zoning Commission. While the ASDRC is happy with what the applicant has done with the plazas, he remarked that the next development that comes in must have architecture more reflective of the town.

Motion by: Mr. Branse

Seconded by: Ms. Luzi

The ASDRC forwards a favorable recommendation for the said plans, with the following recommended design guidance:

1. Widen the pilasters in line with the demising walls of the center space, extending the feature color to the ground, in accordance with the attached sketch.
2. Strongly encourage replacement of the three radial parking spaces with green space at the center island.
3. Remove the flood lights from Building 1.
4. Avoid tenant-associated colors for the public space umbrellas.
5. Change the paperbark maples to fern leaf maples.

As a note, the Committee appreciates and recognizes the applicant's efforts to enhance the site landscape features and public amenities and is in full support of the project.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {6-0-0}.

3. Other Business

Mr. Mullen discussed how to streamline and incorporate insignificant changes into the Committee's recommendations. He reviewed various examples of an insignificant change and proposed using a method similar to Section 12.10 Insignificant Change found in the Building-Zone Regulations. This would entail the ASDRC Chair reviewing and administratively forwarding recommendations to the TPZ Chair/Commission and creating a set list of items for which the Chair is authorized to forward recommendations. In this streamlined process, the ASDRC Chair could review a change and decide if it should be reviewed by the whole committee. Insignificant changes will then be signed by the TPZ Chair.

Mr. Shipman stated that the Beautification Committee often used a similar process to the one proposed. Mr. Branse finds that this administrative procedure makes sense. Ms. Luzi agreed. Mr.

Flinchum is fine with Mr. Davis and Ms. Dalton making those administrative decisions, and it gives the developer time and Mr. Mullen protection.

Mr. Branse asked if there are by-laws for the ASDRC. Mr. Mullen stated that some were drafted, but not voted on. Mr. Branse asked for the draft by-laws, and he will use them and also draft something. He would like to ensure that the Building Official is checking that the plans he receives for construction are the same as what the TPZ approved. Mr. Mullen explained that the Town now has two inspectors who focus on Erosion and Sediment Control and compliance with approved plans.

With no further comments or questions, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 6:32 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk