

## Approved Minutes

### TOWN OF GUILFORD Design Review Committee Minutes – 9<sup>th</sup> September, 2015

A regular meeting of the Design Review Committee was held on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> September, 2015 at 4:00p.m. in the Guilford Community Center with Acting Chairman Philippe Campus presiding.

Present: Philippe Campus, Robert Charney and Mary Repetti. Zoning Enforcement Officer Regina Reid joined the meeting in progress (4:15p.m.). Excused: Shirley Girioni. Karin Patriquin, Shavaun Towers and Walter Weissborn.

The meeting was called to order at 4:10p.m. The Minutes of 10<sup>th</sup> June, 2015 were accepted as presented.

#### **REVIEW APPLICATIONS**

**Guilford Commons (Andrew Iarussi), 1919 Boston Post Road, Map 79, Lots 34, 35 & 36A, Zone SCW: Revision to Master Sign Design Plan to allow internally illuminated signs on the Tower:** Andrew Iarussi, Development Manager for Diversified Development Realty Corporation, introduced himself and circulated photographs of the proposed lighting on the tower. Mr. Iarussi also showed a rendering of the stores and said his request was twofold: 1) there is a desire on the part of several anchor tenants to have internally illuminated signage on the tower; 2) To correct a sort of oversight, DDR would like to have the shopping center's name "Guilford Commons" also on the tower. Mr. Iarussi stated that the current regulations prohibited internally illuminated letters but allowed external illumination which would feature gooseneck fixtures. He added that the tower would be visible as one looked up from Parkview Plaza. Mr. Iarussi noted that it would be an either/or situation so that if a tenant had illuminated signage on the tower they would not have signage on their building as well. He also thought having "Guilford Commons" was a worthy addition. Mr. Iarussi mentioned that the signage would not be visible from the residential neighborhoods.

The Committee discussed the following:-

- Mr. Charney asked if the proposed change would be town-wide. Mr. Campus replied no, that it would just be for the Guilford Commons. Mrs. Reid noted that there were not supposed to be illuminated signs on the tower or monument signs. Mr. Charney queried the reason for this restriction. Mr. Iarussi replied that PZC had felt it was a sensitive area and so illumination should be restricted.
- Mrs. Repetti stated that internally illuminated signs did not have a village feel but that gooseneck fixtures did. Internally illuminated signs were a different look.
- Mr. Campus asked if this was a zoning or a signage issue. Mrs. Reid replied that the proposal was for a change to the sign regulations for this zone to allow internally illuminated signs on the tower so it was a zoning amendment. Mr. Campus felt this had a much broader scope. However, Mr. Iarussi pointed out that the ordinance was

represented by a sign diagram which had to be followed and so every change to this had to be approved by PZC.

- Mr. Charney wondered if the lighting would be turned down automatically or was this something the Committee could request. He felt LED lighting should be used so it could be turned down. Mrs. Repetti mentioned the Dark Skies initiative.
- Mr. Campus pointed out that the size of the area to be illuminated would make a difference and he asked if the area of signage on the tower was fixed. Mr. Iarussi replied yes. He also mentioned that one store front sign would be 6'H x 23'W but if this was replaced with a sign on the tower this would be 4'W x 3'H.
- Mr. Campus asked if the number of signs on the tower would be limited to three. Mr. Iarussi replied yes. Should there be a vacant space on the tower this would be offered to another tenant.
- Mrs. Repetti asked if the signs were not internally illuminated what would be done. Mr. Iarussi replied that currently there were three gooseneck fixtures. Mr. Charney asked why retain the gooseneck fixtures. Mr. Iarussi replied that they were an architectural element which would provide a glow. Mr. Campus felt the lighting should be one or the other but not both. He also felt the lighting should not be visible from a long distance. Mrs. Repetti asked if any other fixtures had been considered. Mr. Iarussi replied no, because the gooseneck fixtures were decorative.
- Mrs. Repetti said again that internally illuminated signs would not have the village look that DDR had wanted from the beginning.
- Mr. Charney pointed out that this signage was more vehicular orientated and that he would be more concerned about signage for the pedestrian side of the shopping center.
- Mr. Campus queried the lettering for "Guilford Commons". Mr. Iarussi replied 2'. Mrs. Repetti felt this would be dwarfed by the larger signage below.
- Mr. Charney said he did not have a problem with the signage since it was a shopping center beside an interstate road. He added that the whole wall was barren so it would be good to have some interest in the corner.
- Mr. Campus suggested having a maximum of 13.5 watts per square foot and Mr. Iarussi agreed.
- Mrs. Repetti asked when the lighting would be turned off. Mrs. Reid replied that there was no stipulation about this in the regulations.
- Mr. Campus asked how the "Guilford Commons" signage would be dealt with since it was added later and it was not store signage. He wondered if this needed additional approval since it was in a different category. Mr. Iarussi replied that there wasn't a common signage rule in the regulations so he could draft language to cover common signage on the tower. He added that initially he wouldn't change the language but could show the change on the sign diagram.
- Mr. Campus agreed with Mr. Charney's earlier comment, that if the lighting was at an acceptable level, this proposal would be better than a blank wall.

Mr. Campus made a motion that the Design Review Committee recommended PZC approve this revision to the sign guidelines with the stipulation that the sign illumination not exceed 13.5 watts per square foot, that the lighting be LED dimmable lighting. The gooseneck fixtures should use decorative dimmable LED lighting only. Mrs. Repetti seconded the motion and it was carried unanimously. The Committee further recommended that in the spirit of the Dark

Skies initiative, that DDR should make a proposal acceptable to DDR that would either reduce the brightness or turn off the lighting at night and address this matter in its submission to PZC.

Mr. Charney queried the landscaping to be installed on the Route One side of the shopping center. Mr. Iarussi replied that this would be installed according to the approved landscaping plan. This will be done before opening day as it is a condition of approval.

Mrs. Reid left the meeting at 4:50p.m.

**Tower Motel (Dirck Goss), 320 Boston Post Road, Map 49, Lot 6, Zone TS: Proposal for an addition to the owner's residential suite:** Present were Mark Young (Waldo & Associates) and architect Sudhakar Nagardeolekar. Mr. Young showed a site plan indicating an existing sun room. He said the owner wished to add on in an area that was currently a concrete patio in order to provide more living space. The 2-story addition would be approximately 20' x 47' and would be a large living room with a high ceiling. However, this will not be higher than the existing roof. Mr. Nagard- eolekar showed an elevation drawing and said the plan was to match all existing materials. Mr. Charney queried the existing one-story section. Mr. Nagardeolekar replied that it was a storage shed which would remain and be connected. Mrs. Repetti asked if the same siding would be used. Mr. Nagardeolekar replied that the siding material was no longer available but it would be matched very closely and would be the same color. Mr. Young showed photographs of the area. Mr. Charney asked if air-conditioning units would be outside. Mr. Nagardeolekar replied no, nor would there be any on the roof. Mrs. Repetti queried landscaping. Mr. Young replied that the existing screening would be maintained at the front and the back had open lawn. Mrs. Rep-etti asked about exterior lighting. Mr. Nagardeolekar replied lighting would be only what was required by code – at the entrance and over the French doors but nothing else. Mr. Charney noted that there was a blank wall in one area. Mr. Young replied that it faced the parking lot and one would not want to look at that, plus it accommodated interior usage. Mr. Campus asked if there were any zoning issues such as setbacks. Mr. Young replied none that he was aware of. Mrs. Repetti asked if there were any changes to the parking and Mr. Young replied no.

Mrs. Repetti made a motion that the Design Review Committee recommended PZC approve this application as shown. Mr. Charney seconded the motion and it was carried unanimously.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05p.m.

The next meeting of the Design Review Committee will be held on Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> October, 2015 at 4:00p.m. in the Guilford Community Center.

Respectfully submitted,

Katharine Stewart

Recording Secretary