

THE GLASTONBURY ARCHITECTURAL & SITE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2024

The Glastonbury Architectural and Site Design Review Committee, with 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

Mr. Mark Branse, Secretary

Mr. David Flinchum {*participated via Zoom video conferencing*}

Mr. Jeff Kamm

Ms. Amy Luzi

Mr. Michael Stankov {*participated via Zoom video conferencing*}

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

2. 2277-2289, 2327-2333, 2341-2345 & 2389 MAIN STREET – proposal for redevelopment to include residential and retail with new parking – Town Center Zone – Alter & Pearson, LLC – Peter J. Christian for HB Nitkin, representing the applicants

Meghan Hope of Alter, Pearson, & Hope LLC reviewed the changes to the site plan that have been made since the last meeting. The next step is a preliminary joint meeting with the Town Council and the Town Plan and Zoning Commission (TPZ) for a Planned Area Development (PAD) application. She explained that her applicants would like to get a sense of how their plan is proceeding.

Ryan Deane of Benesch reviewed the concept, walking through the site changes. Blake Krevolin of JKRP Architects explained the changes that have been made to this plan from the previous “Apple Plan.” Mr. Krevolin noted that this plan combines a lot of elements into one, rather than the separate buildings of the original look. The concept is to peel away parts of the old warehouse building to make it functional as a public and private space. He explained that the central monumental clock tower is now the bakery element, which has been moved forward a little.

Mr. Davis suggested reinforcing the site to look like individual buildings because he would like less interpretation and more reproduction of historic buildings. Mr. Kamm finds the application of the shutters strange because they appear to be random. Mr. Krevolin agreed to look into it. Mr. Davis stated that when the eave line bumps into the gable end, it gives away that it is a monolithic structure. He suggested tweaking that. He added that shutters, when used well, could be an advantage.

Ms. Luzi does not mind the white color for the shutters but finds the brown for the building color to be too dark. Mr. Kamm asked about the lack of trees in the courtyard. Mr. Deane replied that the courtyard will be shady, so adding more trees would cast more shadow. Mr. Davis worried that the dining plaza would become dead space in the winter months. He encouraged zero setback lines or having something more structural there. Mr. Branse agreed, noting that the gray modern planters were out of character, and felt that a brick planter wall would tie the space together.

Ms. Luzi loved the original “Apple Plan” and asked why there is such a strong departure now from that. Mr. Krevolin responded that the changes are fairly consistent with that plan, but elements were combined to streamline the design into one large residential building, which makes the site more efficient. He said that they had originally proposed a larger restaurant on the corner, but their client’s vision evolved, so they no longer need the second story. Ms. Luzi loved the original clock tower and the rooftop deck, as it would activate the space in the winter months. She asked to think of a creative way to make this work. She liked the red ribbon design proposed by Mr. Deane, as well as the arch in the back.

Mr. Davis had mentioned that he liked the tower being offset rather than at the center of the building. Mr. Krevolin explained that they had misunderstood, thinking that the ASDRC wanted it in the middle. Ms. Luzi felt that the tower was too tall. Mr. Krevolin explained that when they brought it down, it started to look squat, but agreed to look into it. Mr. Davis liked that this plan looks like two different buildings which were built at different times.

Mr. Stankov understood why they did not do tree plantings in the courtyard, given the natural plethora of shading. Mr. Flinchum agreed that trees would be challenging. He thought that the second design seemed to have too much open space and setback from the road, which is a waste. He agreed with Mr. Davis that it would look strange in the wintertime. Instead of the “G” monument sign, Mr. Flinchum would rather see something more historical and reflective of the town.

Mr. Haynes agreed that the rooftop dining would help bridge the lack of use/emptiness in the winter months for the front setback area. He asked if that could still be considered by the applicant. Ms. Luzi stated that the scale of the center bay (the brown building) seems large. Mr. Kamm had a problem with the proportion for all the gables. Mr. Branse noted that the shed dormer section is no longer a shed dormer but a third story, which is a step backward. He felt that the original “Apple Plan” looked like separate buildings coming together, rather than what is now, with one big building. He suggested returning to some of the elements in the original “Apple Plan.”

Ms. Hope invited the ASDRC to their upcoming joint informal preliminary PAD meeting with the Council and the TPZ. She noted that, after that meeting, they will return to the ASDRC for further review and comment.

3. 330 NAUBUC AVENUE – proposal to change approved plan to allow vinyl siding and site modifications – Planned Area Development & Flood Zone – Mary Damato, applicant

The applicant, Mary Damato, explained the changes to the site, which includes adding a dormer and overhangs to the windows; centering the columns on the existing column and shrinking them by 6 inches; and proposing a new 5-foot walkway from the main entrance. She explained that several experts recommended that their siding be vinyl rather than hardieplank because of issues with mold. She also intends to eliminate the patio but the rain garden would stay. They also recommend a smaller tree that would not block so much of their front building, as well as decorative stone instead of mulch. Another suggestion was to remove the green trees in the bottom right along the fence because a line of street trees will go in.

Ms. Damato explained that she would like to give her neighbor on the east side a couple of feet to park his construction vehicles. To do this, she proposed removing the majority of the plants from the east elevation and placing foundation plantings or shrubs to screen the condensers. She also proposed removing the parking island and using it as a parking space because they anticipate being very busy.

Mr. Davis did not support removing the island. He supported the columns, as well as the vinyl siding, which he stated does not set any precedent because it is one-story with stealth detailing and lots of shade. He believed that the foundation plantings were heavy to begin with. He asked what the plan is for the vinyl fence in the back. Ms. Damato replied that there is a silt fence, with a 4-foot discrepancy from where the foundation ends to where the neighbor's yard is, horizontally. She would like to build up the grade by using the decorative concrete blocks. She explained that the fence is 6 feet, and two blocks make 4 feet, so they could get away with one block, but the retaining wall makes it 8 feet on one side, and then the grade drops.

Mr. Davis does not think that any screening from the neighbor's side should exceed 6 feet. Mr. Haynes said that vinyl fencing is prohibited everywhere, as per the design guidelines. Mr. Davis believed that an exception should be made in this instance. Ms. Luzi expressed support for the changes but is concerned about the siding because it conflicts with their regulations. She added that she has hardieplank siding on her house and it has not posed any issues.

Ms. Damato asked for a positive recommendation on the adjustment of the column size and placement, widening the walkway to 5 feet, relocation of the air condensers, the bike rack shift, and the vinyl siding as minor changes, and agreed to return for the rest of the items.

Motion by: Mr. Branse

Seconded by: Ms. Dalton

Moved that the Glastonbury Architectural and Site Review Design Committee forwards a favorable recommendation to the Glastonbury Town Plan and Zoning Commission, on the adjustment of the column size and placement, widening the walkway to 5 feet, relocation of the air condensers, the bike rack shift, and the vinyl siding, as minor changes.

Result: Motion passed {5-1-1}, with Mr. Kamm abstaining and Mr. Stankov voting against.

4. 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

Ms. Hope showed the revised site plan, noting that the big change is to eliminate the parking drive aisle and the parking spaces on the north side of the building, which would lower the parking count from 84 to 76 spaces. She included a cut sheet of the proposed retaining wall, noting that the area has been regraded from 12 feet down to about 6 to 8 feet, and the roof line has been broken up in the proposed building to look more organic, as if it was built as a series of additions over time.

Mr. Davis stated that they have gone backwards on the elevations. He liked that there was more variety before, and now everything seems to be absolutely symmetrical. Mr. Branse agreed, as he loved the original building. Ms. Luzi concurred. She appreciated that they brought down the roof height in the new proposal, and that they conducted the balloon study. Ms. Dalton liked the landscaping plan.

5. Staff Report - None

6. General Discussion

Mr. Branse stated that Mr. Monaco spoke before the Council, and Mr. Davis provided a great response to his comment. After that, Mr. Branse called Mr. Monaco and left a message, apologizing, as there was no intention to offend or upset him.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan

Recording Clerk