

THE GLASTONBURY ARCHITECTURAL & SITE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2024

The Glastonbury Architectural and Site Design Review Committee, with Gary Haynes, Planner, 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

Ms. Debra DeVries-Dalton, Vice Chair

Mr. Mark Branse, Secretary {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

Mr. Jeff Kamm

Ms. Amy Luzi

Mr. David Flinchum {joined at 6:10 P.M.}

Commission Members Absent

Mr. Brian Davis, Chairman

Mr. Michael Stankov

Vice Chair Dalton called the meeting to order at 5:05 P.M.

2. 121 PRATT STREET – proposal for an addition with 3 exam rooms & accessible bathroom and interior renovations – Glastonbury Veterinary Hospital – Town Center Mixed Use Zone – Tony Mathews, D’Angelo Building Company, applicant - FINAL REVIEW

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC represented the property owners, who are seeking to construct an 895-square foot addition. She explained that the main purpose of this application is to provide handicapped accessibility to the building and to re-work the floor plan to bring the practice into current times. While a significant portion of the site is in the Flood Zone, both the existing building and the proposed addition will be located outside of the Flood Zone. The parking spaces will be re-stripped, and a four-foot wide concrete sidewalk will be installed, along with a handicapped accessible bathroom.

Ms. Hope explained that the existing mechanical units will be relocated from the east side, to be tucked into the back. The existing concrete pad for the dumpster will be enclosed with a gray vinyl fence. She reviewed the existing materials on-site, noting that both doors are used by clients and will continue to be used. On the front facade, they propose removing the spotlights on the top and changing out a couple of decorative lights.

Ms. Hope then reviewed the proposed north elevations. The vinyl siding on the second floor will stay, and the brick on the second story will be painted white. The roof will be metal black standing seam, with brackets to support the canopy. They propose to carry the vinyl on the

second story over to the addition. She noted that the ASDRC subcommittee felt it appropriate to use a vinyl siding because of the surrounding buildings and small size of the addition; which is why they propose a minimum of a four-inch PVC trim.

On the east elevation, Ms. Hope explained that the tree will be removed, and the addition will be located here. There is an existing painted cinder block on the first floor of the new addition, most of which will be screened. Because the vinyl siding on the east and front elevations are not the same size, they have decided to carry the vinyl siding down from the top to the first floor and replace all the vinyl siding on this side of the building. The shed will be removed, and the HVAC units will be tucked behind the building.

On the west side of the building, Ms. Hope explained that they propose to take down the four-inch PVC vinyl siding and carry new vinyl siding down to the first floor. There are two dogwood trees on the northeast and northwest corners, and additional foundational plantings are proposed. She noted that there are two decorative lights on each corner of the front facade. Ms. Luzi asked how far the canopy projects. Ms. Hope stated that it projects 3 feet, 6 inches. Ms. Luzi asked if the gutters were white. Ms. Hope replied yes. Ms. Luzi asked where the shake was going. Ms. Hope responded that the vinyl siding they propose looks like shakes.

Mr. Kamm stated that Mr. Davis' sketch attempted to add more presence to the entry. He visited the property today, and did not like the handicapped-only door, which the ADA states treats its users as second-class citizens. Griffin Havier of the veterinary hospital clarified that it is not only for handicapped people, but also for clients who are having their animals euthanized, so they do not have to go through the waiting room. Mr. Kamm asked if the elevation is the same on the addition. Ms. Hope explained that while the finished floor will be equal, there is a grade, so there will be a step. Mr. Kamm suggested creating a better sense of entry and adding more foundation plantings to frame the entrance. He noted that the foot candles are 500% above the limit on the eastern corner. He then spoke to improving the landscaping, to which Ms. Hope replied that they have concerns about animals peeing on anything they may add.

Ms. Dalton would like to better define 'street trees.' This area has a dearth of trees, so she recommended switching out the dogwoods for an oak or a maple and placing them closer to the boundary line. She noted that they are trying to get as much native material as possible, so while she appreciated the flowers on the hibiscus, shagbark/serviceberry is a better option. Mr. Kamm asked if they are doing away with the kennels completely. Ms. Hope replied yes.

Ms. Luzi noted that the existing building has a projection over the front, but the elevations do not show that projection. She would like for the roof to have the same overhang, to match the setback on the first floor, providing a shadow line on the addition. Mr. Kamm noted that that would give a more modern look. Ms. Luzi asked if the front will be repaved. Ms. Hope stated that the parking lot will not be repaved because it was done recently, but it will be re-stripped. She agreed to confirm with the civil engineer, Jim Dutton. Mr. Kamm suggested changing the door so that it gives a visual clue that it is not the entrance door. He stated that he does not see how the overhang will help there.

Mr. Branse agreed with Ms. Dalton about the street trees. He did not think that the TPZ had approved gravel without shrubs. He noted that the design guidelines state that the parking has to be either on the side or in the rear. He did not think that front parking was ever there. With side parking, he did not think that it should be striped at all. However, if that is pursued, then it should be screened from the street. He supported Mr. Davis' concept on the overhang. He stated that if the client would like for this to be a cheap-looking veterinarian hospital, then he will be okay with the siding.

Mr. Haynes remarked that the client may need the front parking spaces in order to meet the parking calculations. Mr. Branse responded that, if they do, then they need a hedge or a stone wall to screen it from the street. Ms. Hope explained that they had intentionally not put landscaping on the front circle because they were worried about having options for the animals to urinate on, but they will look into it. Mr. Branse stated that that has nothing to do with the screening of the front parking, and he found that the gravel beds looked terrible. Ms. Dalton suggested an evergreen ground cover. She believed that there is a great opportunity to add more street trees.

Ms. Hope asked if the front entry canopy is a dealbreaker. Mr. Branse stated that this is their recommendation; the ASDRC not here to make deals. If the applicant wishes to come to Glastonbury to cash in on the local market, then he believes that they need to step it up and meet Glastonbury standards.

Motion by: Mr. Kamm

Seconded by: Mr. Branse

MOVED that the Glastonbury Architectural and Site Design Review Committee forwards a favorable recommendation to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission with regards to architectural and landscape design for a property located at 121 Pratt Street, with the following comments and recommendations in the ASDRC Committee Report dated 8/20/24.

- Revise lighting plan to comply with IES standards, recommend lighting level between 1-4 foot candles.
- Add pitch to the proposed entry canopy to give more prominence. Canopy should be 7 feet 4 inches high and stay 6 to 8 inches below second story windows.
- Add note to building elevations brick will be painted white.
- Revise building elevations to show garrison projection on the front of the building.
- Revise landscape plan:
 - Provide 4 street trees along frontage. Potential street tree recommendations: oak, maple, linden, elm and liquid amber. Proposed location of street trees should be moved back so as not to interfere with overhead utilities.
 - Relocate two proposed dogwood trees to the back end of the landscape island at the edge of building to frame building.
 - Add vegetative buffer approximately 4 feet high to be planted in between two proposed dogwood trees to provide a visual barrier to the front parking area.
 - Ensure foundation plantings are native species and add more foundation plantings

(per Brain Davis sketch) to the front of the building. Potential foundation planting recommendations: serviceberry, viburnum, and fothergilla.

- Replace gravel bed with vegetative ground cover. Potential vegetative ground cover recommendations: barren strawberry, pachysandra, and blue rug juniper.

Result: Motion passed unanimously {4-0-0}.

3. 140 GLASTONBURY BOULEVARD – proposal for window replacement for rear office area – Planned Area Development – Michele Aponte & Joseph Szerejko for Somerset Square LLC, applicant - FINAL REVIEW

Mr. Flinchum officially joined the meeting.

Attorney Joseph Szerejko of Murtha and Cullina represented the applicant, Somerset Square LLC. Mr. Kamm stated that the applicant has done a fantastic job. Mr. Haynes noted that Mr. Davis has applauded the applicant for their revisions. There were no other comments.

Motion by: Mr. Branse

Seconded by: Mr. Kamm

MOVED that the Glastonbury Architectural and Site Design Review Committee forwards a favorable recommendation to the Town Plan and Zoning Commission for the proposed window replacement for the rear office area located at 140 Glastonbury Boulevard.

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

4. 140 GLASTONBURY BOULEVARD – proposal to change existing patio pavers and fencing around outdoor patio area at Bareburger – Planned Area Development – Jesus Verastegui, O'Neil Langan Architects - John Simeonidis, applicant - FINAL REVIEW

Samantha Goldman explained that the proposal is to replace the existing pavers and install a new fence. The proposed pavers are almost black in color, and the proposed fence will be black PVC. Mr. Kamm asked if the fence is split rail or farm rail. Ms. Goldman stated that there are three horizontals. Mr. Kamm believed that it was an estate rail fence. Mr. Kamm asked how high the proposed fence will be. Ms. Goldman replied 36 inches. Mr. Kamm struggled to see how this application is in keeping with the existing aesthetic at Somerset Square.

Mr. Branse agreed. While this is a final review, he found it hard to figure out what exactly the applicant was proposing. Mr. Kamm explained that this is an amendment to an approved application. He had serious concerns about the proposed lighting, which is using a tree to support a lighting fixture. He recommended installing a pole instead. He did not see how one would place a table on the patio, as the existing pavers are a roller coaster right now. He also noted that there are barren landscaping beds, which conflicts with the drawings.

Mr. Branse asked whether this is a major or minor change. While he understood that Bareburger wants to have their standard furniture, Glastonbury has its own standards. He believes that the

applicant failed to address how this application fits into the context of Somerset Square. At the moment, he recommends that this is a major amendment. Mr. Haynes explained that Town staff considered it a minor amendment because the existing patio is not changing, though the materials are changing. Mr. Kamm countered that the applicant is changing the existing patio by getting rid of existing plantings. Mr. Haynes noted that Mr. Davis found the design to be okay.

Ms. Luzi stated that Bareburger is an individual tenant, so their look should not be the guiding one for Somerset Square. Within the complex, there is a uniform look, so she believes that the patio needs to be redone to match the overall design continuity of Somerset Square. She felt similarly about the fence. Mr. Branse had no issue with the proposed patio furniture, but he agreed with Ms. Luzi that they are trying to make this fit within the context of Somerset Square. Mr. Haynes explained that the proposed fencing and paver materials are not in the overall concept of Somerset Square plaza. Ensuring that the exterior lighting is hooked up to poles rather than trees is something that they would add, as well. Mr. Flinchum that he would like to see a landscape plan.

The applicant agreed to return before the ASDRC.

5. Staff Report

Mr. Haynes stated that the design checklist has been posted on the Town website, which they hope will become a better application tool.

6. General Discussion

Mr. Branse explained that, at the subcommittee, the architect for the veterinarian hospital kept asking, what is the least that they have to do to get a positive recommendation. He kept saying that they are trying to maintain a certain character. Today, the applicant asked again, and he did not have the patience anymore. He explained that Glastonbury is a good market because generations of people have sacrificed to make it so. Businesses have gone the extra mile, and he believes that they should, too.

Mr. Kamm noted that an architect is not required by CT statute for a building of that size, so their representative was not an architect, but rather, a builder from a design build firm. Mr. Haynes pointed out that applicants generally wish to accommodate the design review board. While he agreed with Mr. Branse, he remarked that the subcommittee process worked well in that application. Mr. Kamm agreed, stating that the subcommittee was beneficial for a less informed owner of the process to get to where they have to go.

With no further comments or questions, Vice Chair Dalton adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan
Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk