

**THE GLASTONBURY ARCHITECTURAL & SITE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2023**

The Glastonbury Architectural and Site Design Review Committee, with Shelley Caltagirone, Director of Planning and Land Use Services and Gary Haynes, 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
Ms. Debra DeVries-Dalton, Vice Chairman
Mr. Mark Branse, Secretary {participated via Zoom video conferencing}
Mr. Jeff Kamm
Mr. Robert Shipman
Mr. David Flinchum {participated via Zoom video conferencing}
Ms. Amy Luzi

Commission Members Absent

None

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 5:07 P.M.

-
- 2. 769 HEBRON AVENUE** – proposal for installation of a solar canopy over existing parking – Planned Employment & Flood Zones – Jonathan Sczurek, Megson, Heagle & Friend C.E. & L.S., LLC – Rob Liflander, Peregrine Renewable Energy, LLC, applicant

Tabled

- 3. 2941 MAIN STREET** – proposal of Chick-fil-A for drive-thru modifications & existing parking changes – Planned Business & Development Zone – Nick Dewhurst & Joey Fonseca, Bohler Engineering

Mr. Branse noted that the lighting still has 40 footcandle lighting. At the last meeting, the committee was told that this was a mistake. Nick Dewhurst of Bohler Engineering explained that they decreased the light levels underneath both canopies to under 30 footcandles. Gideon Lee of JLL, the Project Manager on behalf of Chick-fil-A, explained that their vendor’s canopy standard is 35-40 footcandles. They propose a dimmer which could set the footcandle to the maximum required. Mr. Branse stated that the zoning regulations do not have a fixed maximum or minimum. He is uncomfortable with the proposed lighting, which is at a level that has likely never been approved before in this town. Mr. Davis stated that if there are dimmers, the maximum setting should be far below 30 footcandles. The intent is to have an inviting light level. Mr. Kamm asked what the IES recommended level is for drive up canopies. Mr. Lee does not

have that information. Mr. Kamm thinks it might be 15 footcandles. Reducing the number of fixtures to lower the light level will not work because the canopy will then require brighter lighting. Instead, the applicant should lower the lumen output of the fixtures. He asked, why the applicant proposes the use of a dimmer rather than a lower output fixture. Mr. Lee explained that it is the standard from their vendor.

Mr. Davis noted that the left-hand canopy (above the food delivery window) projects out from the face of the building, so the design becomes disassociated from the building mass itself. The length of the canopy should relate to the building geometry, and the column should relate to the rhythm of the building pilasters. The columns could be made of the same materials as the pilasters. Ms. Luzi disagreed. If it is painted black, then it visually will go away more than stone. She liked the veneer. Ms. Dalton suggested the same color as the vertical panels on the building, to blend in more. Mr. Lee stated that they will look into painting it the same color as the face of the stone. Ms. Luzi asked if the columns are tube steel. Mr. Dewhurst stated yes.

Mr. Branse asked if the unauthorized lighting would be coming down. Mr. Dewhurst stated that it would. Ms. Luzi asked if the main entrance overhang has lighting cans on it. Mr. Dewhurst replied yes, it has a can or two but that is not modeled. He asked if there is a particular footcandle that the committee would feel comfortable with. Mr. Davis suggested a maximum of 15-footcandles and dimming it down from there. He would prefer to see a warmer temperature on the lights. Mr. Kamm asked if the lights go off when the business closes. Mr. Lee replied yes, on the canopies. Mr. Kamm noted that it does not say that. It should be put on the drawings.

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the applicant will revise the design and return for, hopefully, a positive recommendation. She will talk to the zoning enforcement officer about the outstanding light violation. At this point, they have been holding off on fines because the applicant was working with them on the application. She will check in with the enforcement officer on whether that is still appropriate. Mr. Branse hopes that the applicant will return to wow the committee. Otherwise, he would rather they not have canopies at all. He told the applicant to expect that this committee's concerns will be brought up again by other towns. Mr. Flinchum asked about the lot coverage. Mr. Haynes explained that the current lot coverage is 17.2%, and with the additional canopies, it is up to 18.5%.

4. Appointments to Town Center Planning Subcommittee

Ms. Caltagirone explained that the Town is interested in developing a master plan for the Green. She, Mr. Pennington, and Ms. Zerio are collaborating on this initiative. They felt it prudent to do some pre-work with Town Staff, the TPZ, and the ASDRC in developing the vision before hiring a professional consultant to execute the plan. She asked for volunteers from the ASDRC to serve on this subcommittee, which would entail a site visit and a couple follow-up meetings over the next 6-9 months. The initiative would both develop a concept and also consider a vision to work towards in future phases.

Mr. Kamm suggested a special meeting instead, with the full ASDRC, rather than a couple of members. Ms. Caltagirone stated that it would be logistically difficult to schedule. Mr. Davis

suggested scheduling an open meeting and inviting all interested members to walk around the Green and conduct a site sketch. Ms. Caltagirone will discuss the idea of a big design walkthrough group with Mr. Pennington and Ms. Zerio. She will also reach out to committee members via email about possible dates.

Mr. Shipman left the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

5. Discussion and Review of ASDRC Procedures

Ms. Caltagirone explained that Mr. Branse has expressed concern about the review process and how things progress once applications leave the committee. Now that the design guidelines have been published, she and Mr. Haynes continue to think about process. Mr. Branse asked if the design guidelines will be reviewed tonight. Ms. Caltagirone replied no, she wanted to give the committee more time to review them. Mr. Kamm votes to hold a formal meeting to discuss it. Ms. Caltagirone asked about the ASDRC meeting having a public component. Mr. Davis would like to orchestrate that. The committee agreed. Ms. Caltagirone will likely organize that in September.

Mr. Branse felt that what happened with the Fox Run Mall recommendation was deeply troubling. The committee needs to have an idea of who their advocate is before the TPZ as a counterweight to the applicant's advocate, which is their attorney. Attorney Hope said that when the ASDRC drafted their motion, they thought that the clock on the clock tower was gone, which is untrue and should have been corrected by Ms. Caltagirone or Mr. Haynes. At that TPZ meeting, it was clear that no one was speaking for the ASDRC. Additionally, it was pointed out that the three architects were not present at the ASDRC's meeting, which suggested that their recommendation did not matter. Healthy trees were cut down and Mr. Haynes said that the applicant will replace them with 3.5-inch calipers. He finds all of these points to be extremely inappropriate.

Mr. Davis stated that their documents are their best advocate. He suggested having a one-page document for the TPZ to remind them of the ASDRC's recommendations in a clear, concise way. This will enable them to more effectively advocate for the ASDRC. Ms. Caltagirone pointed out that the TPZ had the ASDRC's motion in front of them. They just disagreed with it. At these meetings, she is often taking notes while listening, so she did not pick up on Attorney Hope's comments. Mr. Haynes added that they were trying to provide a motion on the fly. They sent Mr. Branse's motion verbatim to the commission regarding the recommendations. Ms. Caltagirone also noted that her role is not to serve as an advocate for the committee but to be neutral. She tells the TPZ what the code is and what the ASDRC decided, but she does not have the authority to agree or disagree with the committee's recommendations.

Mr. Branse philosophically disagrees, believing that the town planner should be their advocate. If the ASDRC's recommendations are going to be ignored, then he believes that they may as well just disband the committee. Mr. Davis explained that, by that logic, then the TPZ would be hearing from the Historic District Commission, the Conservation Commission, and other town bodies that do not advocated for themselves during TPZ meetings. If there are times when the

ASDRC is particularly concerned about an issue, then they should show up to the meeting themselves. Mr. Haynes agreed with Mr. Davis about having concise motions and agreed with Mr. Branse that staff could perhaps take on more of an advocate role. Mr. Davis commented that they have to get used to the idea that some of their recommendations are going to be rejected.

With no further comments or questions, Chairman Davis adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk