

Draft Minutes

TOWN OF GUILFORD Design Review Committee Minutes – 14th August, 2019

A regular meeting of the Design Review Committee was held on Wednesday 14th August, 2019 at 4:00p.m. in the Town Hall with Chairman William Thompson presiding.

Present: Robert Charney, John Cunningham, Shirley Girioni, David Rosenthal, William Thompson, Shavaun Towers and Walter Weissenborn. Also present Town Planner George Kral. Joining the meeting in progress were Philippe Campus (4:10p.m.) and Karin Patriquin (4:05p.m.). Excused: Mary Repetti.

The meeting was called to order at 4:00p.m.

REVIEW APPLICATIONS

Former Emerson Supply, 640 Boston Post Road, Map 48, Lot 25, Zone TS-2: Redevelopment of Property (architect Duo Dickenson): Duo Dickenson presented a model of the buildings and circulated copies of site plans and elevation drawings showing existing and proposed conditions. Mr. Dickenson said he would be going from a strange entry oddly located to the street to having 3 exits. There will be a slight grade change with a 4ft. retaining wall. The plumbing supply room on the west of the existing building will be moved to the east side of the building. Large openings will be created so one can see inside and can see the superstructure inside. The glass will pop out to create shadows. On the adjacent building, Mr. Dickenson was recommending removing the round top windows and replacing them with store-front windows. Siding will be Nucedar, possibly vertical in a gray color. Roof will also be gray. Mr. Dickenson said he would like to light the building just enough on the inside and outside so one could see in the windows. Site work at the western building would involve clearing out the area in front of the building to be replaced with simple grass and rhododendrons so it would look very simple and clean. Site lighting will be contained on site.

Mr. Charney recommended integrating the small building on the west into the line of the adjacent buildings. Ms. Towers thought the regulations required that trees be planted in the parking lot. Mr. Dickenson replied that he had not been told that but would be willing to work with the Committee. Ms. Towers said there was supposed to be a specific number of trees in relation to the number of parking spaces. She recommended a minimum of one tree but said 2-3 could be done. The trees should have a high canopy so they would not block the view. Mr. Cunningham suggested having a tree in front of the western building. Mr. Weissenborn queried lighting at the entrance. Mr. Dickenson replied that this would be up and down. Mr. Cunningham stated that rhododendrons were not a good choice as they would not grow and he suggested having a variety of Ilex instead – a lower type of evergreen plant. If color was required day lilies could be planted in between the Ilex.

Mr. Weissenborn thought the proposal was a vast improvement over existing conditions and that it was nice that parking was not in front. However, he felt the lighting would be very important. Mr. Thompson asked for information on the actual lighting fixtures to be used. Mr. Cunningham queried signage. Mr. Dickenson replied that he would come back for signage approval at a later date.

Mr. Charney mentioned redefining the profile of the canopy and unifying the edges of the buildings. He felt this was important because the scale of the building was being changed. He also recommended changing the scale of the corners of the building.

Mrs. Girioni made a motion that the Committee supported the general improvements with the following recommendations: 1) The applicant should develop detail ways to connect the main massing edge and look at the potential to strengthen the scale of these gestures. 2) Seven new trees should be planted – two on the road side and the remainder in the interior. 3) Plantings should be a variety of lower Ilex with blooming plants interspersed, if desired. 4) Lighting photo metrics and catalogue cuts and a signage plan should be submitted to the Committee for review. Ms. Patriquin seconded the motion and it was carried unanimously.

Boston Post Road West, Map 78, Lot 13, Zone TS-2: New commercial building (architect Robert Mangino): Robert Mangino showed a site plan of the property noting that there were slopes in the rear. The proposed building is 65' x 100' (6,500SF). There will be two tenants in the building, one selling pavers, etc., and one selling tractors. There may be a second, smaller building in the rear of the property – a commercial building for a third tenant. On the driveway side of the building will be an overhead door so people can come in to the showroom. Outside there will be pavers and concrete to illustrate the products being sold. Mr. Mangino said the building would be set back from the road and that there would be no parking in front. The septic system has to be installed in the rear of the property due to existing conditions.

Mr. Mangino showed an elevation of the front of the building noting that the front area would extend out 2ft. so it did not look like one long blank building. There will be a canopy over the entrance door.

The Committee discussed the following:

- Mr. Charney asked why the 30ft. height was needed. Mr. Mangino replied in order to be able to store material inside.
- Ms. Towers said the Committee would need information on how the grades would be handled.
- Mr. Thompson felt the building needed more articulation, perhaps by wrapping the roof edge around the side.
- Mr. Weissenborn asked how far the gable ends projected out. Mr. Mangino replied 2ft.
- Ms. Patriquin felt the door almost wanted to be centered.
- Mr. Charney asked why the door was in front. Mr. Mangino replied that his client liked the idea of having a front entrance.
- Mr. Charney recommended more windows on the street façade. He said if the front was retail it should be more attractive.
- Ms. Towers thought it was confusing to have so much paving without identifying what was the retail space and that an actual design of the patio was needed. She also felt there was too much paving area.
- Mr. Cunningham suggested having trees among the paving.
- Mr. Charney suggested having the entrance on the corner and getting rid of all the paving in front.

- Mr. Thompson said the building was an industrial shell and the applicant was trying to mask this. He felt there was a real problem at present and that the proposal would not work here. Perhaps only part of the building needed to be so tall and some of it could be shorter as pallets would not be stacked everywhere.
- Mr. Charney agreed saying the façade should be scaled properly and clear on what was private and what was public. The proposed gables and stucco were no good. Each opening should relate to the others. He recommended making the building better rather than trying to hide it.
- Ms. Towers said she did not understand how the building was going to work on this site.
- Ms. Patriquin suggested having the smaller building at the front and the larger building in the rear.
- Mr. Cunningham recommended the applicant look at the elevations to make sure the two buildings would work on site.
- Ms. Towers said approximately 90% of the surface was impervious and asked what would be done with all the water.
- Mr. Cunningham said a proper landscape plan was needed as the proposed varieties and sizes were wrong.
- Mr. Thompson stated that he personally had a lot of concerns about the building and where it was located on the site.
- Mr. Campus pointed out that if the smaller building was in front one would still be able to see the larger building in the rear and suggested turning both buildings 90°.
- Ms. Patriquin felt it would be good to know where the adjacent buildings were in relation to this property.
- Mr. Cunningham said he would like to see a section of the façade of the property so one could see the grade change.

Public Forum: There were no members of the public present.

Approval of Bills: Mr. Campus made a motion to approve the following bill: Katharine Stewart, secretarial services. Mr. Charney seconded the motion and it was carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes: Mrs. Girioni made a motion to accept the Minutes of 8th May, 2019. Ms. Towers seconded the motion and it was carried with 6 votes in favor. Thompson, Towers and Weissenborn abstained since they were not present at the May meeting.

Other Business: 1) Bishop’s Orchard Farm Market & Winery, 1355 Boston Post Road, Map 52, Lot 7, Zone PV: Site plan review – ice cream stand and outdoor seating: Mrs. Girioni asked Mr. Kral why the ice cream area did not include the planting area that the Committee had requested. Mr. Kral replied that he did not remember the details of this application and did not know if the planting area had been included in PZC’s approval. Mrs. Girioni said she was concerned that the recommendation was not incorporated and asked if the Committee should speak to PZC about this. Mr. Kral suggested reviewing the PZC meeting minutes and the video of the meeting on YouTube.

2) Panera Bread, 1919 Boston Post Road, Map 79, Lot 35, Zone SCW: Sign package: Mr. Rosenthal said it appeared as though Panera Bread had followed all the Committee’s recommendations regarding the signage very carefully.

Mr. Cunningham made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:05p.m. Mr. Campus seconded the motion and it was carried unanimously.

The next meeting of the Design Review Committee will be held on Wednesday 9th October, 2019 at 4:00p.m. in the Guilford Community Center.

Respectfully submitted,

Katharine Stewart
Recording Secretary