

TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION/TOWN COUNCIL
JOINT PAD SUBCOMMITTEE
MINUTES OF JANUARY 26, 2024 MEETING

The meeting commenced at 8:00 AM in Meeting Room A, 2nd Floor Town Hall.

Present: Town Plan and Zoning Commission Subcommittee Member Corey Turner;
Architecture Site Design Review Committee Subcommittee Member Brian Davis;
Glastonbury Town Council Subcommittee Members: Lawrence Niland, Mary LaChance, and
Thomas Gullotta; Shelley Caltagirone, Director of Community Development and Gary
Haynes, Planner

330 NAUBUC AVENUE – Discussion to determine whether the project should be reviewed as a Minor Change to the Somerset Square Final Development Plan, per Section 4.12.8, or as a new Development plan requiring a new Change of Zone application

The site is part of the original PAD approval for the 72-acre Somerset Square Final Development Plan. The site is 1.25 acres and was previously approved in 1989 as a daycare facility with 24 parking spaces and in 2013 as a church with an expanded parking area. The current proposal is to use the 6,100 square foot building for chiropractic/massage therapy office and to build a 2,920 square foot addition for a hydro-spa area. Existing parking will be re-striped and all but 2 of the compact parking spaces will be eliminated. No structural improvements are being proposed in the wetlands or floodplain. There is a prominent beech tree that will be preserved and protected with all proposed improvements being removed outside of the trees dripline to protect the shallow root system.

The applicant went over revisions to the elevations after their recent initial meeting with the ASDRC. Brian Davis made the following comments on the revisions: the long, low building is difficult to fit into the character of the neighborhood; the applicant needs to add more traditional details to break up the long, low massing of the building; provide better consistency with alignment and dormer placement; move the proposed dormers higher up from the eaves; match the roof pitch of the addition to the existing roof pitches; consider using pilasters and sconces to break up proposed blank east façade; the use of vinyl siding is prohibited so the applicant should change to a hardi-plank or wood siding. The applicant asked for reconsideration of the proposed vinyl siding as other materials are more than double the cost. The committee pointed out that to meet the newly proposed Design Guidelines the use of vinyl siding would not be allowed. The committee supported the use of multi-paned, SDL vinyl-framed windows. Corey Turner asked the client to minimize the use of louvre dormers or use a high quality louvre.

The applicant asked the subcommittee their thoughts on whether this would be considered a minor change or would require full PAD approval of a new Development Plan. Subcommittee members agreed the changes being proposed would require full PAD approval of a new Development Plan but indicated that the project does not need to go for joint meeting of the TPZ/TC for review. The applicant could file for PAD with Final Development Plan after receiving their ASDRC recommendation.

Wintergreen Glen Phase III – Review of Final Development Plan, application filed June 2021

The applicant reviewed the history of the Wintergreen Glen Development. Phase 1 of the development was approved in 1991 for 14 lots, and Phase 2 was approved in 2002 for 3 lots. Now the applicant is proposing Phase 3 to create 4 lots to be served by an improved 20-foot wide driveway from Manchester Road. All proposed lots are over 80,000 square feet, and the furthest lot is 2,130 feet from the driveway

entrance onto Manchester Road. The applicant plans to submit the proposal for Administrative Review in February. The engineer has re-evaluated the floodplain map since the dam broke and lowered the adjacent floodplain elevations. The applicant proposes to install a cistern for fire protection. The proposed homes will be served by well/septic. New test pits have been completed and the applicant will be proposing the septic system design to support 4-bedroom homes.

The previously considered back access connection to Lazy Valley Road is not being proposed as it would require work within a wetland area for the crossing. Therefore, the applicant is proposing Phase III be served by its own homeowners' association. The applicant has moved the proposed improved driveway as far south as feasible and proposes clearing brush along the roadway to improve sight line issues. They have hired a traffic engineer and are working with the State on installing a 3-way stop sign to improve traffic safety concerns.

The applicant asked, because this is PAD development, if they will be required to have it reviewed by ASDRC. Subcommittee members agreed that, because this is a proposed development of 4 single family homes, the size and scale of the development does not warrant ASDRC review. The applicant then asked if it was necessary for the proposed application to go for preliminary review for PAD development and the Town Council subcommittee members said they would consult with Town Council members to see if this would be a requirement.

Meeting Adjourned: 9:39 am.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary Haynes
Planner