

## **THE GLASTONBURY ARCHITECTURAL & SITE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2024**

The Glastonbury Architectural and Site Design Review Committee, with Shelley Caltagirone, Director of Community Development, and Gary Haynes, Planner, 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

Ms. Debra DeVries-Dalton, Vice Chair {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

Mr. Mark Branse, Secretary

Mr. David Flinchum {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

Ms. Amy Luzi

Mr. Michael Stankov {participated via Zoom video conferencing}

#### **Commission Members Absent**

Mr. Jeff Kamm

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 5:03 P.M.

---

### **2. 36 HOPEWELL ROAD – proposal per CGS 8-30g, to add a 3.5 story, 42-unit, multi-family building to site with existing 6-unit multi-family, plus parking – Village Residential Zone – Attorney Meghan A. Hope – Rose Tiso & Company – Landscape Architect Biff Schechinger – Morello Realty LLC, applicant**

Attorney Meghan Hope of Alter & Pearson, LLC representing the applicant, explained that this is a preliminary review of the 2.34-acre site, which consists of a six-family house, whose exterior facade will be renovated, with a building to be constructed. Last week, the ASDRC Subcommittee provided feedback. As a result, Ms. Hope created an outline of changes to make to the plan. Mr. Branse asked how many affordable units are proposed. Ms. Hope said 15 units, in both the existing house and the proposed building. She then showed a photo of what the house looked like in 1923 versus what was changed in the 1950s.

Ms. Hope explained that they propose replacing the existing aluminum siding with a non-textured vinyl siding, and are open to color suggestions. They propose installing vinyl windows to mimic the original window, as well as adding shutters back onto the building. She noted that the front door has already been reconstructed, and they will search for an antique door to replace it. She explained that all windows are proposed to be replaced. There are different window muntins and grille patterns on-site, so she seeks feedback from the ASDRC as to which direction to proceed. At the subcommittee, there was a comment to replace the chimneys. She explained that only one out of the five chimneys is operable right now. The proposal is to remove chimney #4, which is not in use; all other chimneys would be retained.

Mr. Davis asked about the material of the siding. Ms. Hope stated that it is wood. Mr. Davis suggested adding trims to mimic the cornice because the closer that they can match the details of the original

building, the better. For the building color, he suggested an earth-toned color, which would complement the dark window frames nicely. Ms. Luzi asked to refer to the historic color palette. Mr. Davis pointed out that vinyl siding limits the color selection. He explained that while vinyl siding is not allowed in the village district, he finds it acceptable here, with the caveat that there would be no J-molding.

Mr. Branse agreed with Mr. Davis on returning the building to its original state as much as possible. He suggested consulting the Historical Society to gather more information on buildings of that time period, to discern which facets to incorporate into the project. Ms. Luzi agreed with Mr. Davis on the 6-over-1 for the windows and the banding across the top with the cornice. Mr. Davis added that anything to re-enforce the horizontal would be helpful.

Ms. Hope reviewed the rendering of the proposed building, noting that, at the subcommittee, Mr. Davis had commented about removing some of the symmetry to make it more organic. Mr. Davis suggested a cost-neutral way of changing the entrance element so that it is not so predictable.

He then suggested going onto the site from Main Street with balloons to represent the proposed height of the roof and taking pictures to demonstrate how visible the building will be from public area. Ms. Luzi agreed with Mr. Davis and noted that the HVAC grilles are not illustrated in the rendering. She would like to see that because it would change the whole look of the site. She commented that this is a very urban structure which is being placed into a rural area.

Ms. Hope noted that, at the subcommittee meeting, Ms. Dalton had provided comments on the landscaping plan, which have already been incorporated. Ms. Hope stated that they are awaiting comments from the Fire Chief on which plantings he would like on the west side of the building. Mr. Branse disagreed with the comment to remove the gas grill. He urged the applicant to keep it, as a way to activate the space.

Mr. Stankov objected to the elimination of so many trees, the lack of screening, and the placing of amenities far away from residents. Mr. Davis stated that the building is grossly out of scale for this section of town, so they need to reduce the impact of the building mass as much as possible. He believed that setting it back, away from Hopewell Road, would work to everyone's advantage, and having that amenity space to break up the scale of the mass when viewed from Hopewell Road is what that feature was intended to do. Mr. Stankov disagreed; he would rather have the trees there. Mr. Branse agreed with the idea of screening the mass of the building, but asked, from where? He believed that the mass from Main Street could be reduced by shifting it north and agreed that having the amenity area between the two buildings would make it more accessible.

Mr. Stankov found the parking scale too massive and suggested eliminating the front parking. Ms. Hope explained that, in this zone, the parking requires one space per dwelling unit. While she agreed that they could reduce the spaces, the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (TPZ) would then deem the parking insufficient, which is why she did not propose any reductions. She also pointed out that this is a CGS 8-30g application, so they are exempt from local zoning. Mr. Haynes suggested eliminating the parking out front, which is only five spaces, and shifting the amenity closer to the building. Mr. Stankov supported that suggestion. Ms. Hope noted that they have looked at options to lower the light poles, which are at 18 feet. Mr. Davis suggested that, while it does not change the building massing, bringing

the eave line down itself would reduce the sense of the building mass. Ms. Hope stated that they will look into it.

Because of connectivity issues, Mr. Flinchum's written comments would be incorporated into the record at a later date. Mr. Branse stated that this proposal is far better than most CGS 8-30g applications he has seen. Mr. Davis agreed that the ASDRC is pleased with the architecture, but he reiterated that it is a big building, so anything to reduce its mass would be appreciated.

**3. 141 NEW LONDON TURNPIKE – proposal for façade and landscaping enhancements, an addition and outdoor dining terraces at the former Gallery – Town Center Zone – Attorney Meghan A. Hope – Architect Mark S. Blair, AIA, Curious Projects, Inc. – Elias Hawli for the Market Hospitality Group, applicant**

Ryan Deane, landscape architect at Benesch, explained that the disturbance on the lot for site work is fairly minimal. Six trees would be added into the existing lot and additional shade trees are proposed on New London Turnpike. He reviewed the proposed palette options, which carries on the intent that was positively received previously. He noted that the dumpster location would remain the same, the stones would be upgraded, and the walls would be rebuilt along the ADA ramp. He noted that the building is built into the slope, and many of the plantings are mature and able to be saved.

Mr. Branse stated that he likes the direction this application is heading in. *[He then exited the meeting at 6:27 p.m.]* Ms. Dalton suggested replacing the red sunset with another red maple type and replacing the miscanthus because it is an invasive species. Mr. Davis believed that the level of sensitivity and sophistication that this application has shown to the architecture and the presentation to New London Turnpike would be an amenity to the town. He believed that the half private restaurant and half public space format would work out well.

Ms. Luzi asked if lights are being attached to the big oak tree. Mr. Deane replied no. Ms. Luzi asked about the semi-circular paved area at the north edge of the building. Mr. Deane stated that it is just some existing stone where the gas meter is, and that it would likely go away. Ms. Luzi is excited about this project and commended the applicant. Mr. Davis would like to have Mr. Kamm review the lighting plan. Mr. Haynes pointed out that Mr. Kamm emailed comments, stating that the site looked a little bright on one side. Mr. Davis found this to be a very creative, sophisticated approach to a site which is a focal point.

The ASDRC unanimously favored a positive recommendation to the TPZ, with the aforementioned comments incorporated into the record {4-0-0}. *Mr. Flinchum was offline for this agenda item, and Mr. Branse had left the meeting prior to voting.*

**4. 2533-2577 MAIN STREET – proposal for modifications to approved plan for an addition – Town Center Zone - Attorney Meghan A. Hope – Mark Friend, Megson, Heagle & Friend Civil Engineers & Land Surveyors, LLC – Ernest Nepomeceno, Tecton Architects, PC – Thomas Graceffa, Landscape Architect – Saints Isidore & Maria Parish Corporation, applicant**

Attorney Hope, representing the applicant, explained that Father Mark tweaked the approved plan, so they are presenting modifications for the approved building. She noted that they still propose to reconfigure the parking lot to provide additional handicapped parking spaces. Ms. Hope then reviewed the approved landscape plan versus the proposed landscape plan, where the drop-off loop portion of the driveway will get a little longer. Because the church would like to maintain the outdoor handicapped parking area as a space for small events, they propose moving the Virgin Mary statue toward the rear of the grass area. She explained that the generator would be fully enclosed with a vinyl fence, proximate to the mechanical units.

Ernest Nepomeceno of Tecton Architects explained Father Mark seeks to mimic the existing character of the church, so they went with the three-tiered window system that more closely matches the existing windows. Instead of the taller parapet, there would be a standing seam, pitched roof and a composite frieze. He explained that they have kept the verticality of the windows at the rotunda but added the brick pilasters that would frame out the windows. He stated that the trim would be white PVC, and the bay windows would be removed. He concluded that, overall, this is a simplified architecture, in character with the existing architecture.

Ms. Luzi would like the cornice to project out more on the rotunda, similar to the adjacent cornice. She also would like to keep the grass in the front. Ms. Hope added that this plan lost 2,000 square feet of impervious space. Ms. Luzi asked if some of the upfront parking spaces could be taken away. Ms. Hope agreed to discuss that with the TPZ. Mr. Davis preferred the prior plan, which elevated the rotunda as a special part of the building. Ms. Hope stated that Father Mark liked the traditional look of the rest of the building. Mr. Davis believed that this plan is a nice project, but the prior rendition was much better. Mr. Nepomeceno agreed, but noted that their client wanted to speak to the language of the existing architecture.

Mr. Davis suggested for the windows one horizontal mullion near the bottom or the top and two vertical mullion, as opposed to a tripartite system. Mr. Nepomeceno stated that that would be a tough sell with his client but agreed to pitch it. Mr. Davis stated that the windows bother him more than the roof; a fenestration configuration would go a long way to making it more reflective of the use of the building and those spaces. He would also like a reconfiguration of the primary mullions away from the traditional grid pattern.

The ASDRC unanimously favored a positive recommendation to the TPZ, with the aforementioned comments incorporated into the record {4-0-0}. *Mr. Flinchum and Mr. Branse had exited the meeting.*

## **5. Staff Report - None**

## **6. General Discussion - None**

With no further comments or questions, Chairman Davis adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

**Lilly Torosyan**  
Lilly Torosyan  
Recording Clerk