

## **THE GLASTONBURY ARCHITECTURAL & SITE DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 2026**

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  
Ms. Amy Luzi, Secretary  
Mr. David Flinchum  
Mr. Jeff Kamm

#### **Commission Members Absent**

Mr. Michael Stankov  
*Vacancy*

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order at 5:13 P.M.

---

### **2. 586 NEW LONDON TURNPIKE – proposal for change of use from daycare to office – Planned Commerce Zone – Attorney Meghan A. Hope – Architect Jack Kemper – The Morrissey Limited Liability Company, applicant – Final Review**

Meghan Hope of Alter, Pearson & Hope presented the proposal and described the subject site as a 1.24-acre parcel located along New London Turnpike between the Route 17 overpasses, set back from the roadway due to a wide state right-of-way. She noted that a nearby Route 17 ramp and overpass are scheduled for removal as part of a DOT project, with completion anticipated in 2027, and that the site contains an existing one-story building with 17 parking spaces and a single curb cut.

Ms. Hope stated that the property was previously approved under a 1984 Special Permit with Design Review, with subsequent minor modifications, and that the existing building remains largely consistent with those approvals. She explained that the proposal consists primarily of interior renovations to convert the former daycare building to office use, with minimal exterior changes and no significant alteration to the building footprint. Ms. Hope added that the site slopes toward the rear, where wetlands and a watercourse are present, and noted that minor exterior revisions were made in response to subcommittee comments, including changes to dormers, additional divided lights at windows, removal of the transom at the front entry, and the addition of corbels on the building exterior.

Jack Kemper, project architect, reviewed the proposed architectural revisions and stated that, in response to subcommittee comments regarding the dormers appearing “tacked on,” he evaluated

alternatives including a shed roof dormer but found it too low given the 6:12 roof slope. He explained that the design instead proposes a larger gable dormer with an attic window, noting coordination with the contractor who expressed concern about modifying roof trusses. Mr. Kemper stated that the window would be non-functional and darkened, and that the design also seeks to balance the composition of the building by aligning with existing and expanded window elements.

Mr. Kemper added that the proposal includes projecting the gables slightly, replacing all siding, windows, and roofing, and introducing consistent vertical siding at the gables. He further stated that the entry is being strengthened with a gable treatment, new lighting fixtures are proposed throughout, and a simplified exterior palette is planned including gray-toned siding, white trim and windows, and weathered wood roofing shingles, with a possible accent color at the front door. He noted that remaining elevations are not being substantially altered in form but will receive new siding, windows, and roofing, and referenced proposed vinyl siding and PVC trim specifications. Mr. Kemper also noted revised frieze boards and fascia at the rakes and gables to align with the original design intent, which is shown on the sketch.

Mr. Kamm asked Ms. Hope to clarify the landscaping situation. Ms. Hope stated that a survey of the property has not yet been completed due to seasonal conditions at the time of purchase. She stated that detailed landscaping plans have not yet been developed and that the applicants intend to return with a foundation planting plan once base survey information is available. Ms. Hope added that additional coordination will be needed regarding the front yard area adjacent to the DOT right-of-way and noted that preliminary DOT plans indicate evergreen plantings in that area.

Mr. Davis stated that prior discussions included architectural trends and noted that corbels had been added, stating that he assumed they would be supported by a frieze board rather than applied directly to siding. He further questioned the condition at the soffit and window heads, suggesting that a continuous frieze board between windows and soffit would be a more traditional treatment and asking whether additional trim elements were being considered to resolve limited spacing between window heads and the roof crown. Mr. Kemper responded that such a frieze board treatment could be incorporated and noted that it had not been fully developed but could be accommodated, with window header sizing adjusted as needed.

Mr. Davis stated that larger-scale drawings should be provided to better illustrate these conditions and referenced the north (right) elevation, noting that the proposed corbels relate to a projecting box window and suggesting a similar treatment at the proposed gable end, including a projection, corbels, and coordinated frieze and trim elements to achieve greater visual balance. He further stated concerns with the use of vertical siding at the gable end, suggesting instead that horizontal siding or a simplified material change would be more appropriate, with greater emphasis on trim detailing. Mr. Kemper acknowledged the comments and stated he would review an alternative treatment consistent with the suggestions.

Mr. Flinchum stated that he had only been able to review the proposal materials available on the website and had not seen the full updated architectural package and asked whether the item would return for further review of landscaping and site plan elements but not additional

architectural review. Mr. Davis responded that the intent was to provide sufficient direction during the meeting to issue a positive recommendation with comments, so the applicant could proceed to the next level of review and noted that additional items could be included as conditions for consideration by the TPZ.

Mr. Flinchum questioned whether the one-way circulation around the triangular island would be maintained to allow for future planting. Ms. Hope responded that the site plan is not proposed to be changed and that the existing circulation pattern would remain, noting that all existing parking spaces are required to meet zoning code. Mr. Davis stated that the parking is angled and that the circulation around the island would need to remain in place. Mr. Flinchum clarified that while the front parking is angled, the side parking transitions to 90-degree spaces.

Mr. Kamm stated that light fixtures had been submitted but asked for clarification on their placement. Ms. Hope responded that the fixtures are shown on the elevations (slide 13) and are proposed under the gables. Mr. Kamm noted that the fixtures appear appropriately shielded and acceptable given the 7-foot door height and asked whether lighting is also proposed at the side door. Ms. Hope stated that side door lighting can be shown on the final elevations, and Jack Kemper confirmed that it will be included. Mr. Kamm further asked whether any flood lighting is proposed, and Ms. Hope stated that no flood lights are proposed and that existing flood lighting will be removed.

Mr. Davis referenced proposed paneling under certain windows, and Mr. Kemper stated the intent is to emphasize the window composition and confirmed the use of PVC trim and vinyl siding, with no J-channels proposed. It was noted that the applicant would return to the ASDRC to review the site/landscaping plan.

Mr. Davis asked Ms. Barbara Morrissey, applicant, planned landscaping intentions. Ms. Morrissey stated that detailed landscaping plans have not yet been fully developed but confirmed an intent to include foundation plantings and remove the existing railing and degraded sidewalk at the front entrance to create a more appropriate walkway. She stated that the remaining grassy triangular area has not yet been designed, though landscaping improvements will be addressed, noting that the applicants take pride in their property and intend to enhance the site once the final conditions are known.

Mr. Haynes and Ms. Luzi summarized the committee's comments as follows:

1. Adjust the gable ends to use horizontal siding and add a trim piece to accept the corbels.
2. Widen the proposed new gable by one foot on either side of the existing windows and add a frieze board and corbels to mimic the design of the existing gable end.
3. Eliminate J-channels in the siding to provide "stealth reveals".
4. Applicant will return to ASDRC for review of a revised landscaping plan by no later than Spring 2027.
5. Remove metal railing unnecessary for ADA requirements along front walk.

With those comments and conditions on the record, the Commission unanimously forwarded a favorable recommendation {5-0-0}.

**3. 240 OAKWOOD DRIVE – proposal for new contractor storage yard with a 4,625 square foot building – Planned Commerce Zone – Jerry Wilcox, Wilcox Excavating & Construction Company – 240 Oakwood Properties, LLC, applicant – Preliminary Review**

Jerry Wilcox of Wilcox Excavating & Construction Company presented the proposal and described the development as a 4,700 square foot one-story building with a mezzanine, including approximately 3,500 square feet of shop space and 1,100 square feet of office space with storage above. He stated that the site plan includes four overhead garage doors, customer parking in the front, employee parking to the rear side, and designated areas for equipment, trucks, and material storage, noting that plans are being revised to reflect staff comments regarding storage layout, including bins for mulch, firewood, and irrigation-related materials. Mr. Wilcox explained that the building is proposed as a pre-engineered metal structure with metal siding and a split-face CMU base, with office windows along the front, overhead doors, and a standing seam roof. He added that additional features include soffit and rake overhangs, gutters and downspouts, gooseneck lighting, and building signage.

Mr. Flinchum stated that the site plan, landscape plan, and building elevations do not appear to be consistent, and noted the proposed use involves landscaping and irrigation storage. Mr. Wilcox confirmed that the occupant is an irrigation and landscaping business. Mr. Davis stated that the submitted drawings need to be reconciled, noting discrepancies between the site plan and renderings, particularly with respect to parking layout, and indicated that revised drawings would be required for proper review.

Mr. Kamm noted that the proposed building sign exceeds the current 15-foot height limitation. Mr. Haynes stated that this regulation is scheduled to be removed as of July 1 but is currently still in effect. Mr. Davis noted that the proposal does not meet current regulations, though the requirement is expected to change. Mr. Kamm recommended removing the sign from the current drawings and submitting it separately. Mr. Davis commented that the building design is attractive and that landscaping would be addressed separately. Mr. Kamm further noted that exterior lighting details were not specified and requested that all proposed fixtures be clearly shown. He also questioned the lack of sidewalks to the accessory doors, to which Mr. Wilcox responded that there is only a narrow strip in that area at the rear of the building.

Mr. Davis stated that he like the proposed natural/neutral colors for the building. Ms. Luzi raised comments regarding lighting details, including the need to show escutcheon plates at wall-mounted fixtures, and expressed concern that the attic windows appear too small relative to the building and are lost in the elevation. Mr. Wilcox clarified that the mezzanine windows have an overhead height of approximately 7 feet. Mr. Davis noted that the upper windows function as accent elements and cautioned that increasing their size too much could diminish that effect. Mr. Kamm and Ms. Luzi suggested increasing the window size modestly, by approximately 3 to 6 inches. Mr. Wilcox indicated the windows could be increased from approximately 3'-0" by 3'-0" to 3'-6" by 3'-6", and Mr. Davis recommended coordinating further with the project architect for consideration.

Ms. DeVries-Dalton recommended increasing landscaping throughout the site, including additional trees between the parking area and the detention basin and enhanced foundation planting along the building. She stated that the building could be set back further to allow a wider planting buffer between the building, sidewalk, and parking area, suggesting approximately a five-foot planting strip to accommodate foundation landscaping. She noted that even for industrial uses, perimeter landscaping is beneficial for long-term site flexibility and appearance and can improve potential future adaptability and resale value.

Ms. DeVries-Dalton also recommended incorporating native and ornamental plantings and advised against the use of white pines for screening, noting that they grow to a large mature size and tend to lose their lower branches over time, reducing their effectiveness as a long-term visual buffer. Mr. Wilcox acknowledged prior suggestions regarding plantings and inquired about species selection. Mr. Davis referenced recommended street tree guidance in the Town's plan.

Mr. Haynes noted that a similar proposal had been reviewed in prior years and suggested that the applicant review that earlier plan as a reference point, particularly regarding landscape design principles previously discussed by the Committee.

Mr. Davis stated that he would incorporate the recommendation of a minimum five-foot planting bed between the parking area and the building into the landscape design, noting that this would help soften the front of the building and that there is good opportunity for enhanced landscaping in that area.

Mr. Kamm raised questions regarding the rear gravel area, noting that it appears generally flat with limited pitch and asking whether the area would become prone to standing water or mud conditions, particularly given the adjacent sloped hillside and lack of planting in that area. Mr. Wilcox responded that the area is intended to be cut back into the slope and that drainage has been designed to direct runoff to two existing drains on either side of the rear area. He stated that a hydrodynamic and stormwater management analysis has been completed, that the system accounts for site soils, slopes, and a larger drainage area, and that the drainage infrastructure has been sized to handle the expected flow conditions. Mr. Kamm reiterated concerns regarding grading and potential flooding, and Mr. Wilcox confirmed that the system is designed to manage runoff from the surrounding watershed and that revisions are being made based on administrative review comments.

Mr. Kamm stated that the rear drainage conditions are not clearly reflected in the plans. Mr. Wilcox reiterated that the rear area is designed to drain toward the two proposed drains and that the system has been engineered and calculated, including a 12-inch pipe intended to accommodate the anticipated hydrodynamic load. He added that soil conditions in the area are sandy, which also assists with infiltration. Mr. Kamm noted that sandy soils can be affected by freezing conditions in New England, referencing ice impacts on drainage performance.

Mr. Flinchum stated that he would like to see a revised plan with greater detail than what is currently provided. Mr. Davis stated that the proposal is generally moving in the right direction, particularly if additional planting areas and site plan details are incorporated. He clarified that the Committee's review focus is on site layout and aesthetics rather than engineering details such as

drainage, and requested clearer information regarding building placement, parking layout, potential islands or peninsulas, and overall landscape character to better understand the design intent.

Mr. Kamm stated that Ms. Luzi had asked whether a lighting plan had been provided, noting that while lighting fixtures are shown in the materials, a detailed lighting plan has not yet been submitted and is understood to be in development. Mr. Davis stated that the Committee will want to review specific light fixture details as well as a photometric plan. Ms. DeVries-Dalton requested information on neighboring buildings on adjacent properties, including a clear depiction of their locations in relation to the proposed building. Mr. Wilcox stated that the site is primarily bordered by wooded areas and a hillside, with limited nearby development. Ms. DeVries-Dalton reiterated the need to show any neighboring structures in relation to the site, and Mr. Davis suggested including an aerial or Google Maps image to help illustrate the building's surrounding context.

#### **4. Draft Native Plant Policy for Conservation Commission and ASDRC**

Mr. Kamm referenced prior discussion on compliance post-development and feedback received from Mr. Haynes. Mr. Davis stated that he had reviewed the draft from a policy standpoint and found it well prepared and appropriate, noting that it was improved with technical edits. Ms. DeVries-Dalton recommended removing specific tree examples to avoid limiting species selection and cautioned that street tree selection is context-dependent, particularly in relation to overhead utilities and site conditions. Mr. Kamm agreed that examples should be removed from the definitions and questioned whether reference databases were included; Ms. DeVries-Dalton noted that the draft appropriately references available nursery and native plant databases and resources.

Mr. Haynes clarified that examples should be removed while retaining descriptive definitions, and Ms. DeVries-Dalton concurred, extending that approach to other categories such as shade trees. Mr. Davis suggested integrating height and width ranges directly into narrative paragraphs rather than listing them as separate bullet points. Ms. DeVries-Dalton recommended referencing overhead utilities in an appendix, while Mr. Davis and Mr. Kamm cautioned against overcomplicating the document with excessive technical constraints, suggesting reliance on external resources where appropriate. Mr. Haynes noted that additional technical detail could be expanded through future regulation updates and appendices.

Discussion followed regarding organization and structure of the document, with Ms. DeVries-Dalton recommending that the glossary be moved to the end and clearly labeled, and that reference material be separated from the main policy narrative. Mr. Davis stated that the intent should remain focused on native plant guidance without introducing broader zoning criteria that could dilute the purpose of the document. Mr. Kamm suggested adding a general statement encouraging plant diversity, and Ms. DeVries-Dalton supported inclusion of a reference to diversity principles without overcomplicating requirements.

Mr. Flinchum stated support for the draft overall but expressed concern regarding minimum requirements and noted that non-native species may sometimes be appropriate depending on context. He also requested clarification that governmental, institutional, and public buildings are

included within the applicability of the policy. Mr. Davis and Mr. Kamm confirmed that such uses should be included, and Mr. Haynes clarified that these categories were intended to be captured within the framework and distinguished from individual residential or small-scale projects.

Mr. Kamm raised a question regarding compliance post-development, and Mr. Haynes stated that compliance is typically included as a standard condition of approval and is generally complaint-driven, with enforcement occurring as needed. Mr. Davis noted that compliance should be tied to approved plans. Mr. Kamm asked whether the Town could better communicate post-approval expectations, and Mr. Haynes responded that the goal is to clearly establish expectations at the outset.

Mr. Davis reiterated that removing examples was appropriate, though noted they had been helpful for clarity. Ms. DeVries-Dalton suggested expanding examples in some areas for clarity between tree types while maintaining flexibility. Mr. Haynes stated that he will forward the comments to the Conservation Commission so they can review and discuss any recommended changes prior to finalization.

#### **5. Staff Report – NONE**

With no further comments or questions, Chairman Davis adjourned the meeting at 6:38 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

***Jessica Suwala***  
Jessica Suwala  
Recording Clerk