

Architectural Design Review Committee

Meeting Minutes

November 18, 2021
On-Line Zoom Meeting

7:00 p.m.

Meeting was called to order at approximately 7:00 pm.

Members in attendance were Tim Eagles, Sheldon Crosby, Jack Kemper, Bob Sanford, Peter VanBeckum. Also, in attendance Town Planner Rutherford and Senior Assistant Town Planner Cyr.

Absent: Myles, Brown, Tim LeBouthillier, David Quisenberry, and Dean Burhoe

1. The Vault – 12 Brickwalk Ln. – replacement sign

The owner is proposing to replace the existing sign in a like for like manner with respect to size, material and color.

Written comment received via email prior the meeting:

Sheldon – sign looks fine

Jack – sign looks fine

Myles – sign looks fine

David – sign is good

Bob – Sign is fine

Tim Eagles– Sign is good

Tim LeBouthillier – sign looks fine

All present for the on-line meeting concurred the sign was acceptable as presented. Town Planner Rutherford will convey this to the Farmington Historic District and the Town Plan and Zoning Commission.

2. Chase Bank – 782 Farmington – review of deviations from approved plans

Chris Martello, Global Facility Mgmt and Construction and Mehmet Kara, TPG Architects were in attendance on behalf of Chase Bank.

During final review prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy the town of Farmington planning staff identified the following discrepancies between the constructed bank and the approved elevations:

- a. Gutters on the building were not approved as part of the architectural plans
Resolution: ADRC understands the need for the gutter and downspout; however, the white downspout against the brick building is glaring and the gutter detracts from the cornice. ADRC recommended correction is to replace the installed gutter and downspouts with round copper downspouts, and half-round copper gutters.
- b. South Elevation (Farmington Ave)
- o There are some discrepancies in the column construction
 - **Resolution: In reviewing the portico construction and comparing the photographs to the approved plans, it was determined the columns are likely in the correct location, but the portico is not constructed correctly. The portico appears to be too wide; therefore, it is overhanging the columns in all directions. The ADRC recommend correction is to have the portico reconstructed in accordance with the approved plans and renderings.**
 - o The white horizontal trim board was carried along the clapboard portion of the building, however this was not on the approved plans. The board runs behind the sign.
 - **Resolution: paint the band grey to match the siding**
 - o There is a white banding board along the bottom of the clapboard portion of the building that was not on the approved plans.
 - **Resolution: the white water table band may stay as installed.**
- c. East Elevation – the white banding was not to be the full length of the building.
Resolution: paint the band grey to match the siding, for the southern portion of the building only. The white band shall remain on the northern half as shown on the approved plan and rendering.
- d. Corner boards appear to be 6in, however plans state 4in. I did not measure these, but based on the photos, it appears they are much wider than 4in.
Resolution: the 6-inch-wide corner boards may remain as installed.
- e. I assume the doors on the north and south elevations are not permanent. I spoke with our Building Official, and he mentioned you were waiting for the final doors to be shipped so you can install.
Resolution: A review of the shop drawings during the meeting revealed the doors on order do not comply with the approved plan and rendering. After further review and discussion, it was the consensus of the ADRC members that the rear door (facing the parking lot) can remain as ordered; however, the front door facing Farmington Avenue shall be as per plan and rendering, requiring the correct door to be ordered. Material suggestions were made which included a wood door or an aluminum clad wood door.

- f. The gable vents do not specify a color, however in the renderings they appear to be not white.

Resolution: Paint or install new vent to match the window coloring – black / dark grey.

- g. The canopy on the ATM has white banding around it which is not reflected in the approved drawings.

Resolution: The ATM canopy is fine as completed.

Written comments received via email prior the meeting:

David Quisenberry's written comments:

There are several other issues that need to be discussed.

- h. The trim along the window sides in the clapboard areas appears incredibly thin. (The drawings show this trim as gray but note it as white. White is correct.) Are the installed windows really gray, they appear black.

Resolution: the window casing shall be reconstructed to match the approved plan and rendering. The vertical trim shall be 3-1/2 inch wide and the header and sill shall be rebuilt to proportionally accommodate the additional width of the casing.

- i. Also, the drawing calls for fixed double hung units. The installed units do not have a check rail and don't look at all like double hung.

Resolution: See response to item j. below.

The gable vent should be painted to blend in with the brick color, or at least match the windows (not white).

The white gutters on a brick building bother me (especially because the windows are not white). I think they should be copper.

I am okay with the banding as installed but wish they had followed the drawings.

I don't know what can be done at this point about the front portico, the columns look "off".

Bob Sanford's written comments:

I agree with Dave's comments on the windows.

- j. When I last drove by, at a quick glance, it almost looked like the divided lights in the windows were not simulated divided light. It's hard to tell from the pictures but the windows don't have the same definition to their divided lights that the presentation depicted.

Resolution: Forego the installation of the two double hung windows at the front of the building as noted on the plan and rendering and instead install simulated check rails and simulated divided lights on all windows. The simulated divided light pattern for the large windows at the front of the building shall be proportioned similar to the adjacent windows with a vertical orientation.

k. Cornice detail appears to not match the plans.

Resolution: Cornice detail is fine as installed; however, the joints should be reviewed and corrected along the entire length of the cornice.

Compromise Option for Portico and Windows

The compromise involves items b., i. and j. Instead of strict adherence to the plan for the correction to the portico, the portico will be permitted to remain as constructed in exchange for the installation of fixed double hung windows for all windows. Members may consider leaving the smaller second floor windows as SDL, and all lower level windows as fixed double hung.

3. Thomaston Savings Bank – 2 South Main St., Unionville – façade improvements

Mark Marzi, Don Hammerberg Associates submitted revised elevations for review with the following description:

At our last ADRC meeting we received comments that all circled around the point that our design did not do the original architectural language justice. Based on those comments, we relooked into the façade design and determined that the existing building design does not fit the visual needs of the Owner. In order to address these needs, we have decided to remove the existing roof overhangs and clad the entire building in the same brick material we originally proposed. We then added a fiber cement cornice and built-up parapet walls at different locations.

Mark Marzi participated in the on-line meeting on behalf of the applicant and reviewed the revised architectural elevations with the ADRC. The following comments were offered by the ADRC:

1. Overall, all of the ADRC members were very complimentary of the changes made to the elevations and feel the design is advancing in an appropriate direction.
2. On the south, east, and west elevations build out the relief in the brick arch to provide more definition between the two surfaces.
3. Remove the brackets from the cornice.
4. The cornice is proposed to be constructed from fiber cement board. This element should be appropriately detailed, so the construction joints are not easily visible.
5. The parapet on the west elevation shall be double in width, or if possible, increased in width to match the east elevation.

6. Remove the sashes on the small window on the east and south elevation and use regular rails to match the adjacent large four windows.
7. The drive-thru canopy will be constructed of black aluminum. The members requested to see the construction detail of this element for the next meeting.
8. The brick soldier courses at the roofline and above the doors and windows should remain flush with the adjacent brick façade. The brick soldier course immediately below the 'arch' of the south, and east elevations should be pushed out approximately 3/4-inch from the adjacent brick façade.
9. The visibility of the existing rooftop unit was discussed. On the west elevation the unit is approximately 6-ft from the edge of the roof and will be screened by the proposed brick parapet wall. The rooftop unit is illustrated on the south elevation; however, it is located approximately 30ft back from the edge of the roof and will have limited visibility from the ground due to the view angle from the ground and the setback from the edge of the roof. The unit is not shown in the north elevation, but it should be added to this elevation as well. The visibility will be similar to that of the south elevation.

4. Approval of the 2022 meeting schedule

Response via email:

Jack – motion to approve schedule

Myles – seconds motion to approve schedule

David – vote to approve schedule

Tim Eagles – vote to approve schedule

Tim LeBouthillier – vote to approve schedule

Bob Sanford – vote to approve schedule

All present for the online meeting concurred the 2022 meeting schedule is acceptable and approved as presented.

Other Business:

There was a brief discussion at the end of the meeting regarding improving communication between the ADRC and the TPZ. Shannon agreed to initiate coordination between the chairs of both boards, once the newly elected TPZ members are in place in January. The goal is to have a workshop meeting in February or March with both boards.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:00pm.