

THE GLASTONBURY ARCHITECTURAL & SITE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2022

The Glastonbury Architectural and Site Design Review Committee (ASDRC) with Jonathan E. Mullen, AICP, Planner, in attendance, held a Special 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 {arrived at 5:26 P.M.}
Mr. David Flinchum
Mr. Jeff Kamm
Mr. Robert Shipman
Ms. Amy Luzi {arrived at 5:56 P.M.}

Commission Members Absent

Ms. Debra DeVries-Dalton, Vice Chairman

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 5:21 P.M.

2. 240 OAKWOOD DRIVE – Review of modified proposal for a construction yard with a material processing stockpile area – Planned Commerce Zone – Jim Dutton, Dutton Associates – Alter & Pearson, LLC – Thor Norgaard, Mjolinir Construction, applicant

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC represented the applicant and reviewed the changes made since the last meeting. A six-foot-tall, black, chain link fence will be installed. Ms. DeVries-Dalton had asked to incorporate additional greens, which they have done by adding Vanderwolf pines. Mr. Branse had asked to have the scale house look like a cottage. They used the link that he sent to come up with their own cottage plan, which will be barn red with a cupola and white trim. Mr. Branse also asked to indicate the maximum pile height on the plans, which they have done, at 40 feet. Ms. Hope noted that though the lighting plan uses dark sky compliant fixtures, the poles are wooden telephone poles. The Plans Review Subcommittee asked if the ASDRC would like the applicant to paint the poles. After some discussion, the ASDRC elected to keep the natural look of the wood instead. Ms. Hope also stated that Mr. Kaputa of the Conservation Commission asked to take off the hemlock, so they have increased the other plantings.

Ms. Hope reviewed the main issue, which is the location of the fence. There have been a couple intrusions onto the property. Their insurance company would prefer to have the fence closer to the street to prevent people from coming into the site. It will be less visible tucked behind the evergreens versus moving it further back and a little higher. Mr. Branse thinks that the police reports work against the applicant because people backed into the site from the street. Hitting the

fence coming off the street seems to indicate that having the fence closer to the road is worse. He asked if the trailer's gate location would change. Mr. Norgaard, the applicant, replied no. The trailer was left between the existing fence and the road. Mr. Branse stated that no insurance company is going to persuade him on a design. There will be a gate either way, so people hitting the fence is less likely if the fence is located behind the detention pond rather than in front of it.

Mr. Kamm stated that the fence is behind the row of shrubbery. If the fence is behind the big tree, then it would actually be more exposed. Mr. Davis remarked that because this is in an industrial zone, they should do whatever they can to make it not look so industrial. The current proposal of two rows of evergreen along the street is good, but it misses an opportunity to enhance the site and the zone. He would like instead to wrap around the evergreens on the other side of the detention pond and some other plants in front. Mr. Dutton stated that the 2:1 slope of the detention pond makes it difficult for plantings. The trees along the road will help to keep any vehicle that is too fast from winding up in the basin. Mr. Branse finds that a single row of evergreens, set back from the road, with a detention pond set as a foreground would be perfectly fine. If it is set back, he does not think that the double row is needed. Mr. Shipman suggested that instead of planting all evergreens by the street, to also include a couple smaller native trees at the end of the power lines. The effect overall would be more attractive than a wall of green.

Mr. Davis pointed out that the ASDRC's purpose is to try to elevate the design. In this case, it is obvious that the design intent was utilitarian, so they have been struggling in guiding the applicant into a more aesthetic solution. Mr. Kamm expressed concern about the lack of screening from the sides. Mr. Davis stated that the idea is to make the detention basin more like a front yard, which will become the foreground for the utilitarian construction area in the background. The screening should happen at the backend. Mr. Kamm asked about the light levels, as there is a bit of spillover on the sign. Ms. Hope will check.

Ms. Hope summarized that they would keep the six deciduous trees and add evergreens between them, perforating the wall to make it more organic-looking. They will also find some type of narrow shrub to place behind the sign to obscure the fence. Mr. Shipman likes the fence where it is now. Mr. Branse and Mr. Davis would like it on the back side. Ms. Hope stated that they have filed their TPZ application and if there is any design guidance the ASDRC would like to provide tonight, the applicant will incorporate the guidance into their plans. Mr. Branse added that this will go to the TPZ and not return to the ASDRC. He complimented the applicant for a great project.

Motion by: Mr. Branse

Seconded by: Mr. Kamm

The Glastonbury Architectural and Site Design Review Committee forwards a favorable recommendation to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission for the said plans, with the following recommended design guidance:

1. locate the fence to the east of the retention basin
2. incorporate native deciduous trees with the evergreens along the Oakwood Drive frontage, so as to not have a solid barrier

3. provide screened shrubbery at the southwest corner of the site. Species could be either viburnum alleghany, rhododendron maximum, or a similar variety
4. add evergreens between the deciduous trees. Species could be either holly, rhododendron, or a similar variety
5. add rhododendron in the frontage

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

3. **51 KREIGER LANE – Site plan approval pursuant to CGS Section 8-30g concerning the construction of an apartment building containing 48 units, with parking and other site improvements -- Planned Commerce & Groundwater Protection Zone 1 – Alter & Pearson, LLC - VESSEL RE HOLDINGS, LLC, applicant** **POSTPONED**

4. Other Business

Mr. Mullen stated that Mr. Branse has revised the by-laws, which will be sent out. The two examples he reviewed at the last meeting of an insignificant change were forwarded to Mr. Zanolungo, the Chairman of the TPZ. Mr. Mullen will brief the new land use director on this procedure so that they can keep things moving as quickly as possible. He also noted that there will be a special meeting, likely in January, with the developer of the property at Main Street and Hebron Avenue. This will be an opportunity for the ASDRC to have a preliminary discussion with the developer's architects on what that project should look like. Mr. Mullen also noted that his last day is this Friday. Next week, he will begin a new position with the Town of Waterford. He stated that this committee has come a long way since its inception, and it keeps getting better at each meeting.

With no further comments or questions, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 6:35 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk