

**TOWN OF HADDAM
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (ARC)
PUBLIC MEETING
WEDNESDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2021
TOWN HALL
21 FIELD PARK DRIVE, HADDAM, CT 06438
UNAPPROVED MINUTES
*Subject to Approval by the Commission***

ATTENDANCE

X	Mark Degman – Recused from 1572 Saybrook Road Discussion/Review
X	Lorraine Riess, Chairman (6:26 p.m.)
X	Wayne Rutty
X	William Warner, Town Planner
X	Bunny Hall Batzner, Recording Clerk

1. Call to Order

Mr. Rutty called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

2. Attendance

Attendance was taken and all members seated.

3. Discussion and Review

a. Addition to 1572 Saybrook Road and Overall Site Plan

This is a continuation from Thursday, 28 October 2021.

Lisa Wadge, Agent, DBP, LLC, was present.

Mr. Degman recused himself from this matter as he worked on the project; however, he will remain seated to retain the quorum.

Ms. Wadge stated she will be following up on some items from the 28 October 2021 meeting. Ms. Wadge stated she is asking for approval on Building 2, approximately 6,700 square feet, adjacent to the historic building which has been restored, with a total square footage of approximately 12,000 square feet.

Ms. Wadge stated Mr. Fellner addressed the flow of the property and the campus environment (a place for people to hang out) and is working to take care of two issues – a) the flow through the property coming in/off of Brookes Court for Phase 1 and b) access from Saybrook Road for two additional buildings totaling approximately 3,000 square feet for Phase 2. Using the site plan, Ms. Wadge pointed out that the two buildings are not attached, but will have a roof structure and walkway in-between.

Materials: A question from the last meeting was the use of materials. Proposal calls for retaining the colors of the existing house - white and black. **Proposed materials:** Gray standing seam metal roof (maintenance and will provide transition to the two buildings), composite white siding and trim (Certain-Teed - allows for insulation to go behind it; noted material used at Tylerville Village/Swing Bridge Plaza and is currently 15 years old), and aluminum clad windows. Ms. Wadge submitted a copy of George Fellner's architectural narrative, dated 12 November 2021.

Landscaping: Ms. Wadge stated she was filling in for Nancy Balleck. The strategy is to retain some of the old trees around the existing house – dog woods and beech tree. As there will be an entrance at the front of the existing house, the proposal calls for two trees on both sides. Would also like to have draught resistant, deer resistant, and low maintenance plants noting that the soil is very sandy and would require

quite a bit of watering. Five flowering trees have been spec'd out: dogwood will go well with the other dogwoods that are on the property, hydrangea trees; and nine shrubs as there are a number of windows so a lot of the plantings will be on the shorter side to allow viewing through the windows. The community area: water retention or water fountain. Keeping old trees in the area and planting small shrubs while keeping the walkway open to allow people passage. Will come back to ARC with more details on Phase 2 for Buildings 3 and 4 after seeing what plants survive on the initial planting. The proposal also calls for the planting of bulbs and marigolds and annuals to provide color during the spring and would like to retain the existing older lilacs.

Mr. Warner asked Ms. Wadge if she proposes to match the fencing to the north. Ms. Wadge stated yes, noting that the crosshatching on the plan indicates the fence. Ms. Wadge noted she didn't put the fence anywhere else as they do not want to block people from coming across the property; however, when they come back for Phase 2, they will propose another fence. Ms. Wadge noted that she had previously constructed a sidewalk in front of the property. Mr. Warner asked if there were existing street trees. Ms. Wadge stated there are some small trees, but most of the trees she was required to plant were along Brookes Court. Ms. Wadge stated there are evergreens all along the back property line. Using the plan, Ms. Wadge pointed out the parking areas, the trees, the fencing, and the sidewalk.

Mr. Warner stated the Saybrook at Haddam and the new approval of the apartments emphasized shade trees along the fence area; and asked if additional shade trees could be added. Ms. Wadge stated there is a big maple, not along the fence, that they would like to retain as well as some other larger trees.

As Ms. Riess had not yet arrived, the Committee decided to wait to vote on the matter.

After the conclusion of the Elm Tree proposal, the Committee returned to this matter. Ms. Wadge gave a brief summary of the proposal to bring Ms. Riess up-to-date.

MOTION: Wayne Ruddy motioned to approve the referring plan for expansion of existing building at 1572 Saybrook Road for additional retail/office space including landscape plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Condition: Landscape plan to be provided by Lisa Wadge. Lorraine Riess second. Motion carried with Mr. Degman abstaining.

b. New Apartments 105 Bridge Road

This is a continuation from Thursday, 28 October 2021.

Donald Tarinelli, Architect; Sal Indomenico, Owner/Developer, and Ryan Hayman, Landscape Architect, were present.

Materials/Lighting: Mr. Tarinelli stated this is a second presentation and the Committee has already seen the preliminary design elevations. Mr. Tarinelli stated the materials will be basic vinyl; perhaps some upgrading to asphalt shingles will be used. Fiberglass doors in colors that appeared to be green, dark red, and brown will alternate down the structures and a manufactured 2 x 2 rail will also be provided. Scones will be placed by the doors and the down lighting will go on the entrances that are recessed. Accent shingles will be used as well as siding with corner boards.

Mr. Warner asked if the rendering is a fairly accurate reflection of the siding. Mr. Tarinelli stated it's accurate on the front. Mr. Tarinelli stated the individual who did the three dimensional drawings has an obsession with vertical siding; therefore, the siding and the colors (beyond the limits of the program) are not accurate. Mr. Tarinelli stated some of the other renderings have more elaborate trim detail. The two bedroom units will have basic trim. Using a rendering, Mr. Tarinelli pointed out the structure surfaces facing Bridge Road.

In regard to the siding color, Mr. Degman asked if everything will be the same color or will the siding, trim, and units be a different color pattern. Mr. Tarinelli stated the paired units will all be a color, but admitted he couldn't answer the question at this time. Mr. Indomenico stated the units will be different colors as will the doors.

Mr. Degman asked if horizontal clapboards or shingles will be used on the front of the structures. Mr. Tarinelli stated shingles and accents will be used. The gables will have shingles and the B units will have a band of shingles (Mr. Tarinelli pointed them out). Mr. Degman asked if the trim will surround all the windows and openings. Mr. Tarinelli stated yes.

Ms. Riess arrived and Mr. Tarinelli reviewed the door colors and the railing.

Landscaping: Ryan Hayman, landscape architect, stated the concept planting design will have four or five more elms, sycamores, and a larger stature tree along Bridge Road, as requested. Also as requested a three rail PVC fence has been incorporated. Everything on site is native material - red maples, willows, oaks, poplars, and river birch, elm, and dogwoods. To the front have proposed some native perennial flowers, but this is a situation where you may want to leave it up to the residents as a community garden. Noted some constraint in plantings due to the sidewalks.

Lighting: Mr. Hayman stated after speaking to his lighting consultant, the AAL Providence fixture has been swapped out and will match with the lighting the town has requested. Also there will be opportunities to create pathways for anyone who may have a disability. Mr. Hayman stated they are working with Ms. Wadge to potentially create a walkway with steps down to her property.

Ms. Riess asked if there will be irrigation on the property. Mr. Hayman stated it doesn't believe it's within the proposal. Mr. Indomenico stated no.

Mr. Degman asked about the connectivity to the street in terms of pedestrians and if there have been any conversations with DOT. Mr. Hayman stated he received the DOT drawings yesterday and the hatched pattern on the proposal is the DOT sidewalk. Mr. Hayman stated breakthroughs to the sidewalk will be made through the fencing.

Mr. Degman asked if there were any additional plantings along the eastern boundary of the property. Mr. Hayman stated because of the limited space, they are trying to give everyone a small amount of backyard and to add any shade trees would hinder the use of a functional backyard. Mr. Hayman stated there is an opportunity for additional plantings in one corner, but the existing buffer will remain.

Mr. Degman asked about the existing chain link fence as well as the wood posts with the wire fence. Ms. Wadge informed the applicant the fences belong to him. Mr. Indomenico stated he would install a new fence. Ms. Riess asked what type of fencing. Mr. Indomenico stated something short, green, and vinyl that would be concealed by the shrubbery. Mr. Hayman stated there has been concern about visual screening from the south upwards as there is a 30 foot grade from the lower property and that a four foot fence may be preferable. Ms. Riess stated that should be put in as a condition of approval. Mr. Degman agreed. Mr. Warner recommended white fencing as the area is a bit drab. Mr. Degman stated the town is trying to create continuity. Mr. Warner stated it's the same idea for the street lights. Mr. Warner noted that the town's landscape architect has come up with some flowering trees above the roundabout and will coordinate with Mr. Hayman.

Mr. Degman asked if the Bridge Road Apartments sign would be lit. Mr. Hayman stated there will be top mounted down lighting.

Mr. Warner asked if there was a rendering of the clubhouse. Mr. Tarinelli showed the elevations. Mr. Degman asked if it would have the same materials and siding pattern. Mr. Tarinelli stated yes. Mr. Indomenico stated he was considering putting some stone work along the front (something to possibly match

the sign). Mr. Degman asked if there would be any lights on the building or if there would be down lighting from the soffits. Mr. Hayman stated everything will be the new fixture to match the town's lights and other building lighting will be based on the resident switching on/off their light. Mr. Warner stated he would think there would be lighting on the clubhouse. Mr. Tarinelli stated there could be some in the soffits and the back porch would have down lighting. Mr. Tarinelli also stated he would like to see some lighting on the gable. Mr. Warner stated they are trying to brighten up the road. Mr. Hayman stated if up lighting is allowed that could be an option.

Ms. Riess stated other than figuring out the fencing on the east side of the property, the proposal appears to be good.

A brief discussion followed in regard to the fencing – 6 feet high solid fence.

MOTION: Mark Degman motioned to approve the referring plan for 44 units of multi-family apartments at 105 Bridge Road including landscape plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Condition: Six (6) foot high solid fence at east property line. Wayne Rutt second. Motion carried unanimously.

c. 32 Additional Units on Brookes Court

Jeff Hartman, Owner/Developer, Elm Tree Partners; Erika Hogan, Architect, Gary Coursey & Associates, Graham Curtis, Civil Engineer, DTC; Joe Jankowski, President, Associated Construction; Kevin McConnell, Chief Estimator, Associated Construction; and Shang-Chi (Greg) Liu, Director of Finance, Elm Tree Partners.

Mr. Hartman introduced his team and stated the Phase 2 proposal is similar to Phase 1 (building style, color, and material palette). Mr. Hartman stated they would like to discuss 32 units, two buildings – 16 – one bedroom units and 16 – two bedroom units.

Using a map, Mr. Curtis pointed out the location of the septic systems (on the outside perimeter) and utilities to the front. One of the defining elements was tying the road into the circulation. Mr. Curtis talked about the scale of the structures and keeping them smaller per the regulations – two story buildings, meeting the coverage and setback requirements. The previous system was approved by Dept. of Public Health (DPH) and they are following the same path with Phase 2. There is no gas in the area, full sprinkler system, all electric heat. The existing detention basin will be re-engineered to comply with the town's engineer comments.

Architectural: Using the map, Ms. Hogan reported Building F is a combination of all two bedroom units two story and will be just less than 22,000 square feet. The aesthetics are the same color palette and materials as previously approved and permitted – horizontal siding and shakes at the entries, horizontal banding, and asphalt shingle roofing, and differential colors to making level two standout. Ms. Hogan stated Building F is a repeat of the Phase 1 Building B and will match the color palette from Phase 1 so there will be language throughout the site. Building B is all one bedroom, double breezeway and there will be two handicapped units in Building B and Building F. These units will be located close to the handicapped parking. Building B has the gray on tan color scheme whereas Building F and A gray on gray color scheme and just over 16,000 square feet. Same materials, color palette, architectural language. Mr. Hartman stated there will be balconies. Basically the same buildings as previously approved.

Landscaping: Mr. Hartman noted they did not receive a color board and asked the Committee to turn to rendering in the packet. Mr. Curtis, standing in for the landscape architect, reviewed the plan. The primary driver was to provide shade for the driveway and walkways and there will be a mix of deciduous trees – maples, sweet gums, arborvitae and white pines. Mr. Curtis noted there is an existing chain link fence along the property line of the industrial business (their fence). The foundation plantings are the same as proposed for Phase 1.

Materials: Mr. Hartman stated the fiber cement has been difficult to obtain. Mr. Jankowski stated CertainTeed siding has been the product that they have been using and noted its durability. Photos of the material had been previously emailed to the Committee members. Mr. Hartman stated he would like to come back before the Committee to request a change from fiber cement to CertainTeed for Phase 1. Mr. Warner stated it can be taken care of tonight.

Mr. Degman asked how the community building will be treated as far as materials go. Mr. Hartman stated they would like to use the panel. Ms. Riess asked if they are 4 x 8 panels or horizontal. Mr. Jankowski stated they are double horizontal panels that run approximately 12 feet and the cedar impression is an overlapping product. Mr. Degman asked if there would be a separate trim piece between the impressions and the clapboard siding or a direct transfer.

Mr. Warner clarified that Mr. Hartman is having difficulty obtaining the composite material. Mr. Hartman stated yes. Mr. Degman asked if it was cost prohibitive or time constraints. Mr. Hartman stated both.

Ms. Riess asked about door colors. Ms. Hogan stated the doors will be fiberglass and they will be white, entry doors as well. Windows will be white vinyl.

MOTION: Mark Degman motioned to approve the referring plan for additional 32 units of multi-family apartments on Brookes Court including landscape plan to the Planning and Zoning Commission as presented. Condition: Phase 1 materials to match Phase 2. Wayne Rutty second. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Adjournment

Mr. Warner adjourned the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Bunny Hall Batzner
Bunny Hall Batzner
Recording Clerk