

Town of Franklin



Design Review Commission

**Tuesday, February 22, 2022
Meeting Minutes,**

Chair James Bartro called the above-captioned meeting to order this date at 7:06 PM, as a remote access virtual Zoom meeting. Members in attendance: Chair James Bartro, Vice Chair Sam Williams, Venkata Sompally, Gerald Wood. Members absent: Associate Chris Baryluk. Also present: Maxine Kinhart, Administrative Staff.

As stated on the agenda, due to the continued concerns regarding the COVID-19 virus, this meeting will be conducted as a remote/virtual Design Review Commission meeting. In an effort to ensure citizen engagement and comply with open meeting law regulations, citizens will be able to dial into the meeting using the provided phone number, or citizens can participate by using the Zoom link provided on the agenda. This meeting was recorded.

1. Bellagio Nail Bar & Lashes – 340 East Central Street – Apply gold vinyl on the existing pylon sign.

There was no representative in attendance to present this submission. Ms. Kinhart stated that she would contact the applicant tomorrow to advise them that they need to attend a meeting to present their submission as Commission members may have questions.

2. Liquor World – 365 West Central Street – Change faces in pylon sign.

Ms. Gail Chandler of Diversified Design addressed the Commission. Chair Bartro stated that the makeup of the sign as installed is not in conformance with the Town's bylaw, namely that the white background on the sign is not opaqued out which is what is being enforced. He stated that to remedy that, usually the sign maker puts an opaque sheet on the back of the sign that gets cut out. The opaque sheet stops the light from penetrating the sign and illuminating it. He stated that in order to approve the sign, it needs to be opaqued. Ms. Chandler stated okay and asked where she should go from here. Chair Bartro stated that she should reach out to the sign manufacturer to remedy the sign. Ms. Chandler stated that she would pursue that. Chair Bartro stated that the Commission would table this item and it would be put back on an agenda in the future. Ms. Chandler stated that sounded fair.

Motion: To **Table** the sign package as submitted. Motioned by V. Sompally. Seconded by G. Wood. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Sompally-YES; Wood-YES; Bartro-YES. Voted 4-0-0.

3. Union Street Business Park II – 839 Upper Union Street – Construct a new 42,750 sq. ft. multi-tenant industrial building.

Mr. Matthew Clark, owner/developer, of TMC Development & Holdings 2, LLC, addressed the Commission. He stated that the architect and site engineer were also attending the meeting. Chair Bartro explained that in the case of a development such as this, the Commission's role is a recommending board. He stated that site aesthetics including landscape design are what the Commission is mostly looking for. He stated that the Commission's approval capacity is in the signage.

Mr. Nick Dewhurst, civil engineer of Bohler Engineering, stated that Randy Miron of Bohler Engineering and David Sisson of David Sisson Architecture PC, were also present at the meeting. Mr. Dewhurst reviewed the location of the project as shown on the provided plans. He provided a history of the site. He stated that in 2005 it was permitted and approved as a three-building development. The developer only built one building and some of the surrounding parking, then the lot was subdivided. The rest of the lot has since remained vacant. He stated that Mr. Clark purchased the lot; rather than construct two smaller multi-tenant industrial buildings, the goal is to construct one bigger multi-tenant industrial building. He reviewed the site. Chair Bartro discussed that multiple monument signs on the same property are problematic. He noted that it looks like these are two different properties.

Mr. Clark confirmed that this is two different properties. He stated that the proposed building would be comprised of 15 storage bays each with an overhead door; they could be used for such things as contractors' equipment. He stated that the site would have 90 parking spaces, a few retaining walls on either side of the site, two trash enclosures at the rear of the site enclosed with 6 ft. vinyl fencing, and as depicted on the rendering, they are proposing multiple different trees and shrubs throughout the site. They are also providing multiple area lights throughout the site designed in accordance with the lighting requirements. He stated that they have included the photometric plan with their submission. He reviewed the proposed monument sign. He stated that Mr. Cam Afonso of Signs by Cam, Inc. put together the signage component; he stated that the signage mimics what is next door.

Mr. Sisson stated that the intent of the building is to be similar to the building next door to match it. He reviewed the architectural design and noted it is a pre-engineered metal building; he stated that the color is fern green. He stated that one tenant may rent more than one of the proposed 15 bays; therefore, they have not settled on a precise interior layout. He stated that the building is about 30 ft. tall, 270 ft. in length, and 190 ft. in depth. Chair Bartro requested that the materials and colors be included as part of the submittal. Mr. Clark stated that the color chart could be submitted. Mr. Wood asked about HVAC units. Mr. Clarke stated that there are no rooftop units; they do not expect to require air conditioning. He stated that the building adjacent has HVAC through the wall for the small office setup; at most there may be a split HVAC system with a condenser near the overhead doors or on the roof, but not like those protruding rooftop units.

Motion: To **Recommend** the site plan, photometric plan, and the building façade as submitted. Motioned by S. Williams. Seconded by G. Wood. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Sompally-YES; Wood-YES; Bartro-YES. Voted 4-0-0.

Commission members had no questions regarding the sign package as submitted.

Motion: To **Approve** the sign package as submitted. Motioned by G. Wood. Seconded by V. Sompally. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Sompally-YES; Wood-YES; Bartro-YES. Voted 4-0-0.

4. Marcus Partners Industrial Warehouse – 585 King Street – Construction of a new 255,400 sq. ft. tilt-up concrete wall industrial warehouse.

Mr. Josh Berman with Marcus Partners addressed the Commission. He stated that this is a warehouse distribution facility off King Street. He stated that they were before the Commission in November and received a number of comments. Since then, they have prepared a different orientation and size of the building. The loading and truck traffic is now closer to Rt. 495 and further from the neighbors. He stated that this is a concrete tilt wall building with a textured paint on the exterior. He stated that the building is under 40 ft. in elevation. He reviewed the exterior colors. Chair Bartro questioned the lighting and stated he wants to make sure the Commission has seen the lighting plan. Mr. Berman stated that they have the photometrics and will submit the new plan to the Commission. He stated that this is a speculative building; they have no tenant at this time. He stated that they will come back to the Commission with signage when they have a tenant. Commission members had no questions.

Motion: To **Recommend** the site plan building façade and aesthetics of the structure as submitted.

Motioned by S. Williams. Seconded by G. Wood. **Discussion:** Chair Bartro noted that this does not include landscaping. Ms. Karen Miller, Washington Street, confirmed that this was not for landscaping. Chair Bartro stated that they would have another vote on landscaping. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Sompally-YES; Wood-YES; Bartro-YES. Voted 4-0-0.

Mr. Berman confirmed that a landscaping plan was not submitted. He stated that he would like to come back to the Commission with the landscaping and photometrics as one submission. Ms. Miller stated that she is a neighbor. She pointed out that there are high tension wires and because of the easement, trees are not allowed to be put there. So, when looking at the landscaping and how to protect the residential areas that are close to the parking, she asked that they keep in mind that they cannot put trees in the easement areas; therefore, they will have to be creative. Discussion commenced as to where they can put in plantings outside of the easement.

5. Taj Estates of Franklin II – 230 East Central Street – Construction of a new mixed-use, (33) unit apartment building with (1) ground-level commercial unit.

Mr. Dan Santacroce of Dennis Colwell Architects addressed the Commission. He discussed that the location of the proposed construction is near Hill Avenue and there is a significant slope. He stated that there are 51 total parking spaces. Chair Bartro stated that the Commission is looking at landscaping, elevations and grades, sight lines, and external lighting. Mr. Santacroce reviewed the screening consisting of trees and vinyl fencing. He noted the elevation and slope. He stated that the overall height of the building is 40 ft. He reviewed the layout of the building. Chair Bartro asked about the colors and material. Mr. Santacroce stated that it was a hearty fiber cement siding, and they will work within the color pallet shown which is blueish gray on the bottom with more blue on the top. Chair Bartro stated that it is in the Commercial I zoning district. He stated that the Commission used to look at applicant's material boards; he requested a material board before he votes on the final recommendation for the façade. He stated that in general, he likes the design and aesthetics.

Mr. Williams asked about mechanical equipment. Mr. Mirajuddin Ahmed of Taj Estates of Franklin II stated that mechanical equipment was inside the balconies. He stated that there will be no mechanicals on the roof; the gas and mechanical meters will be on the side of the buildings. He stated that the dumpster is on the left side of the building in the corner. He stated that they provided plans with the landscaping. Mr. Santacroce reviewed the plantings and fencing. Chair Bartro stated that there is a lot of wear and tear on plants that are close to the street. He stated that he wants to make sure that what is proposed is hearty enough to survive. He confirmed that on the right side there is both a fence and screening of arborvitaes. Commission members voiced no concerns about the landscaping.

Chair Bartro asked to talk about the lighting on the building. He confirmed that there are wall packs and some security and parking lighting. He stated that the photometric sheet was in the submittal. Mr. Santacroce reviewed the lighting. Chair Bartro noted an area where there was a lot of light spillage on the property line. Mr. Williams stated that there must be a way to shift the light slightly. Mr. Santacroce stated okay. Chair Bartro stated that they can probably recommend landscaping tonight; however, he would like to see the updated photometric plan and the façade materials in the submittal package. Overall, he does not think there is concern from the Commission. He confirmed that he would like the applicants to return to the Commission with the requested information.

Motion: To **Recommend** the landscaping package as submitted. Motioned by G. Wood. Seconded by V. Sompally. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Sompally-YES; Wood-YES; Bartro-YES. Voted 4-0-0.

Motion: To **Table** the rest of the package while waiting for updated photometrics and materials. Motioned by S. Williams. Seconded by G. Wood. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Sompally-YES; Wood-YES; Bartro-YES. Voted 4-0-0.

Approval of Minutes: February 8, 2022

Motion: To **Approve** the February 8, 2022 Meeting Minutes as presented. Motioned by S. Williams. Seconded by G. Wood. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Sompally-ABSTAIN; Wood-YES; Bartro-YES. Voted 3-0-1.

General Matters - Old Business

Chair Bartro stated that he was in touch with Mr. Bertoldi who audited the last Commission meeting. He stated that Mr. Bertoldi is interested in becoming a Commission member. Chair Bartro stated that he also spoke to another candidate who submitted an application. He is trying to find a date that he can attend a Commission meeting. Chair Bartro stated that if neither of these candidates work out, he will continue through the list of applications. Chair Bartro noted the progress of enforcement as concerns are raised and brought to the Building Commissioner. He stated that he believes they have reached out to Siena Analytics.

Motion to Adjourn by S. Williams. Seconded by V. Sompally. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Sompally-YES; Wood-YES; Bartro-YES. Voted 4-0-0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:08 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi

Judith Lizardi
Recording Secretary