

[NOTE: These minutes are made available to the public prior to Design Review Advisory Committee acceptance.]

MINUTES
DESIGN REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, June 6, 2007, 6:30 p.m.
Conference Room
Basement Level, Town Hall

1. **Call to Order** - Mr. Bockstael called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.
2. **Roll Call** - Members in attendance: Bruce Bockstael, Andrea Boyle, Jay Hallinan, Joe Hickey, Steve Hine and Tony Margiotta. Also present: Denise Bradley, Assistant Planner

Members absent: None.

3. **Public Comments** - There was no one from the public in attendance.
4. **Minutes** - [Minutes of the April 18, 2007 meeting](#). There were no other minutes to consider as there were no Committee meetings in May.

Mr. Bockstael asked if the DRAC members had corrections for the April 18, 2007 minutes. Mr. Hallinan said that the minutes should be corrected to show that he was not present at the April 18th meeting. Ms. Boyle noted some typographical errors.

Mr. Hallinan made a motion to approve the minutes as amended, Mr. Hickey seconded, and all members voted in favor of approval.

5. PROJECT REVIEWS

Mr. Bockstael suggested that the Committee go out of order to accommodate the need of applicant Phoenix Medical to get to an Inland Wetlands Commission meeting later that night.

- 5.3 APPLICATION NO. 85-2007 - Phoenix Medical - seeking review of a proposed addition and associated site work for property located at 1260 Silas Deane Highway (Hartford Hospital). Present on behalf of Phoenix Medical was Mike Panek, President; Kevin Johnson of Close, Jensen and Miller; and Mark Petrin, architect. Mr. Bockstael asked if clearance for the project had been given by Connecticut Light and Power. Mr. Johnson said their application to CL&P had received preliminary approval, but with some concerns. An example concern is the paving to be done around the base of the high tension line towers.

Mr. Petrin said the overall purpose of the project was to expand the building, as both tenants needed to expand. The front entrance would still face the street, but the side entrance would serve as the main entrance to the building. Employees would park behind the building and customers would park on the side near the main entrance. The exterior of the expansion would be brick, to match the existing building. A decorative edifice would be added to the entire building for a similar appearance to the 2 buildings on adjacent property also owned by Phoenix Medical. The Hartford Hospital sign is to be removed from the front of the building and likely placed on the side facing the side parking lot. A replacement sign in the front may be sought in the future.

Mr. Johnson said that the landscaping would include deciduous trees around the perimeter of the property, and native shrubs and wildflowers. The parking lot islands would have deciduous trees and low cover plantings. Mr. Johnson also said that there are several zoning waivers proposed for the

expansion project. Mr. Bockstael noted that the total area of landscaped coverage seemed to be low. Mr. Johnson confirmed that the proposed coverage is lower than is required. He said that he calculated coverage using only the directly-adjacent area of the adjacent CL&P parcel, not the whole parcel. Doing the calculation this way was consistent with guidance he previously received from Mr. Gillespie. Mr. Johnson said he agreed with the guidance, but wanted to point out that they were being up front about the low coverage, when they could have reasonably tried to do the calculation including the adjacent CL&P parcel. Mr. Johnson said that the existing exterior lighting on the building would remain, and some new fixtures would be added to the parking lot to match the existing ones in the parking lots of the adjacent Phoenix Medical property.

Mr. Hickey said that he felt the property provides a very important function for the town, and wants to see the project succeed. He also said that the building expansion, decorative edifice, and the landscaping all represented improvements to the property. Mr. Hickey noted that the project would include some filling of wetland area, although the wetland in this case is poor in quality. He asked if there are materials that could be used to mitigate the effects of filling, such as pervious pavement. Mr. Johnson said that such mitigation will be considered, and that the run-off controls include curbing and state of the art stormwater management devices.

The project was being presented before the Committee for preliminary feedback, so no vote was taken. Mr. Margiotta and Mr. Hallinan both said they had a positive reaction to the project as presented.

- 5.1 APPLICATION NO. 80-2007 - Mr. DeFillippo - seeking review of new construction proposed for property located at 1912 Berlin Turnpike. Ms. Bradley said that a revised site plan had been submitted since the last meeting. Mr. Bockstael said that more detail is needed on the planting around the trash collection area and the construction materials for its fence. Mr. Bockstael also noted that a generic diagram for a single-level building had been received, and asked how this was sufficient for a building proposed to have 2 levels. Mr. DeFillippo said that the design would essentially be a stacking of the single level design, so a 2-level diagram is not needed. Ms. Bradley said that a fully detailed diagram would be required for the building inspector's approval. Mr. Hallinan said that the minimum information needed for the application is clearly listed in the town ordinance, but the applicant appears not to have submitted enough information to approve or deny the application. Mr. Bockstael said that most of the information requested previously had been submitted, but there still was no cross-section of the building design. Ms. Bradley said that the applicant still needed to go through Planning and Zoning, for which a detailed building design would be required.

Mr. Hallinan made a motion to approve the site plan only. Mr. Hickey seconded the motion and emphasized by restating that the approval was subject to the condition that the construction detail be approved by the building inspector. All members voted in favor to approve.

- 5.2 APPLICATION NO. 84-2007 - Tweety Nails - seeking review of new signage proposed for 883 Silas Deane Highway. Ms. Bradley said that the proposal for a free standing sign is within all of the size limits, but included a telephone number that is not allowed on signage. Mr. Bockstael said that if there will be ground lighting, it should be installed to avoid creating a distraction for passing motor vehicle traffic. Mr. Bockstael also recommended ground cover to mask the lighting. Ms. Bradley reminded the applicant that there is a set back requirement of 5 feet that applies to the property line, not the street. The property line is set back from the street because the town owns the land adjacent to the street.

Mr. Hickey made a motion to approve the sign without the telephone number. Mr. Hallinan seconded, and the vote showed all in favor.

- 5.4 APPLICATION NO. 86-2007 - Paolo Mozzicato - seeking review of new exterior building signage proposed for 709 - 725 Silas Deane Highway. Mr. Bockstael asked questions about the construction and orientation of the sign, how it will be lighted, and whether the text on the sign will be relatively plain or include more complex things like corporate logos. For simplicity of appearance, plain text is

preferred. Mr. Mozzicato said that he would check with his tenants on whether plain text is acceptable or if they are seeking something more complex. The review of this application was preliminary, but a vote of conceptual approval was taken.

- 5.5 APPLICATION NO. 87-2007 - DiGiorgi Roofing and Siding, Inc. - Seeking review of new free standing signage proposed for 719 Silas Deane Highway. Ray Komorowski, of DiGiorgi Roofing and Siding described the signage proposal. He noted that the sign will be internally illuminated, and constructed of two separate panel boxes. The separate boxes will allow him to more easily make a partial name change on the sign in the future if needed. Ms. Bradley said that the proposal fell within the applicable size limits. Mr. Hickey made a motion to approve the sign as proposed. Mr. Hallinan seconded, and the vote showed all in favor.
6. **Other Business** - The next Committee meeting is on the regularly scheduled date of June 20th.
7. **Adjournment** - Mr. Bockstael made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:26 p.m. Mr. Hickey seconded and all members voted in favor to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin T. Sullivan
Committee Recording Secretary