ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD VIRTUAL MEETING MINUTES July 13, 2020

The Architectural Design Review Board held a virtual meeting via WebEx on Monday, July 13, 2020 at 6:00PM. Attending were members, Michael McKinley, Mark Comeau, Christopher Delaney, Leslie Driscoll, Christopher Thorp and Alternate, Elizabeth Brummund. Also present was Town Planner, Keith A. Brynes. Chairman McKinley called the meeting to order at 6:03PM. Ms. Brummund was seated.

Preliminary review of proposed new mixed-use building and associated site improvements at 26 & 38 Old Stonington Rd., Mystic. Applicant: Old Stonington Road, LLC. Owners: Richard Donald Bromley & Daryl Dion Bromley & Old Stonington Road, LLC.

Project architect, Russell Sergeant, presented the application to the Board. The development is subject to a pending variance request for building setback relief from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Should the variance be approved, this application will be reviewed again by the Board prior to Planning and Zoning Commission approval. The existing retail building at 26 Old Stonington Rd. would be demolished and replaced with a new mixed-use building which will house offices for Densmore Oil as well as other leasable office space. The upper stories will contain 2 apartments. The 3rd floor will contain home offices / loft spaces for the residences. Site plans include additional buffering from the adjacent restaurant and oil company. Several existing trees buffer much of the site from Rt. 1. Building materials will consist of hardi-plank siding with a shingle-style on the gable ends.

Members stated that they were not in favor of waiving the requirement for plans stamped by a landscape architect. Landscaping plans should include additional detail. Mr. McKinley stated that he had no issues with the building design but that the landscaping, site and architectural plans are inseparable, especially in this case with 2 building frontages. Mr. Sergeant stated that additional landscaping could be added along the Old Stonington Rd. frontage. Mr. Thorp stressed that a simple, low maintenance, landscaping plan would suffice. Mr. Delaney praised the overall building design. Mr. McKinley recommended considering horizontally staggering the gables to further break up the massing. The façade along Old Stonington Rd. could be further articulated with a central lobby entrance.

Mr. Sergeant asked whether the Board could submit a letter to the Zoning Board of Appeals recommending approval of the pending variance. The Board discussed the precedent of commenting on variance applications. Consensus of the Board was to send correspondence to the Zoning Board of Appeals endorsing the variance application to allow for more appropriate design given the site's constraints. No vote was taken.

ADRB20-05 G. Development, LLC (Cherenzia) – New structure and associated site improvements at 32 Broadway Ave., Mystic. Map 174 Block 19 Lot 1.

The Board discussed Mr. Comeau's appropriate level of participation as both a Board member and part of the application team. Consensus was that Mr. Comeau would not present the application, vote or act as a member of the Board but would be available to answer questions related to the architecture. Project engineer, Sergio Cherenzia, presented the application. The former gas station at 32 Broadway would be demolished and replaced with a multi-story commercial building. A design goal was to maximize parking on this small site. The new structure will be elevated with parking underneath. This strategy will also meet FEMA flood hazard requirements to elevate the structure by approximately 6'. Site access will be better managed with one-way curb cuts on Washington and Broadway. Landscaped areas will feature low plantings but planting details are yet to be established.

The new building will feature a contemporary design that also reflects its historic surroundings. The stepped roof coping reflects the roofline of the nearby Packer Mill Building. Building materials feature brick, clapboard siding, brushed concrete base, Prodema wood panel system with recessed steel panels painted dark green or black. The specific commercial use of the building is undecided at this time. The building may need to be reduced in size due to parking constraints. The owner is pursuing off-site parking options. A landscape architect will be brought on to further develop the site design.

Ms. Driscoll questioned the lack of north or west elevations. Mr. Comeau stated that the north elevation will be a mirror image of the south side. The west side will be almost directly abutting an adjacent building and will barely be visible from the street. Mr. Comeau stated that the building was designed as a brewery or pub but there is no specific tenant yet. A change in use will warrant significant building changes. A roof deck is proposed for customer use. Mr. Thorpe stated that the building's massing is commendable with suggestions of the site's industrial past. Parking is effectively maximized but he has reservations regarding some of the architectural details. The density of architectural detail may be excessive for such a small building; fewer design elements could be used. Ms. Brummund recommended replacing the wood element with brick to tie the design together. Ms. Driscoll praised the design's variety. Mr. Delaney stated that the building's massing is well done but requested renderings that better illustrate its appearance. Mr. McKinley recommended trying to pedestrianize the ground level as much as possible with this elevated building, including adding architectural features to the underground portions. The general design is adventurous but should be simplified with more continuity. Mr. Comeau stated that the brushed concrete ground level could be replaced with the wood material. The interior stairs can be made visible from the outside. Mr. Thorp stated that the landscaping details are important in order to demarcate public vs. semi-public space and bring life to the corner. The consensus of the Board was that the application should be further reviewed with 3D renderings, landscaping plans prepared by a landscape architect and revised building elevations with enhanced design continuity as a goal. No vote was taken.

Review of Meeting Minutes:

Review of the 6/8/20 meeting minutes were tabled until the next meeting.

Mr. Thorp motioned to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Delaney. Motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 8:07PM.

Respectfully submitted,