The meeting of the Derry Township Design Review Board was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairwoman Joyce St. John in the Meeting Room of the Derry Township Municipal Complex, 600 Clearwater Road, Hershey, PA.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Joyce St. John, Chairwoman; Ed Buchan, Vice Chairman; Sandy Ballard, Secretary; Pam Moore; Brian O'Day; Ted Herman; Glenn Rowe

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Chuck Emerick, Director of Community Development; Brandon Williams, Assistant Director of Community Development; Jenelle Stumpf, Community Development Secretary

Public registering attendance: Gary Gilbert, Apple Retail Properties; Kenny Hinebaugh, Evans Engineering; Peter Levasseur, LSC Design; Rob Kinsley, LSC Design; Nick Dreisbach, LSC Design; Lauren Russell-Wood, Chipotle; Cheryl Heidorn, Chipotle; Brittany Danahy, Chipotle; Lee Wolaniuk, Capital Construction Management, LLC; Keith Heigel, Light-Heigel & Associates; Sue Stough, 750 Creekside Drive; M. A. Weir, 1986 Church Road; Louis Paioletti, 156 West Areba Avenue; Andrew Varcoe, 116 East Caracas Avenue

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion made by Member Moore, seconded by Member Rowe, and a unanimous vote, the minutes of the March 25, 2013 meeting were approved as presented.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Consideration of renovations to portions of the facility located at 19 East Chocolate Avenue (The Hershey Company, DRB #332)

Rick Russell, Director of Government Relations for The Hershey Company, and Rob Kinsley of LSC Design, Inc., represented the proposal.

Mr. Kinsley explained that design changes have been made to the renovation project since the applicant had received approval from the Design Review Board in February 2012:

• Reuse of the existing fluted cast stone *(sheets 5 and 9 of the presentation)*. Mr. Kinsley stated that there are existing stone pre-cast accents that establish a pattern which the applicant is using to determine where to add windows. The original proposal did not include the reuse of the stone. Where there are currently

groups of three sections of cast stone, it is proposed to retain the stone in the center section and install windows in the outer two sections. The groups of two sections of stone will remain as is.

- The applicant had previously considered adding caps to the tops of the towers in an effort to bring light into the building *(sheet 9 of the presentation)*. However, there are mechanical penthouses behind the towers that must be maintained, so the applicant cannot install the caps. This will result in less change to the historic building.
- Replace the existing mirrored glass in the tower windows with spandrel glass. The metal framework will remain in place as much as possible. *(Sheet 11 of the presentation)* Secretary Ballard asked if the glass will be the same throughout. Mr. Kinsley answered yes, and that the difference would only be noticeable at night if the interior building lights are on.
- An atrium is proposed to be installed in the center of the building, in a location that is almost entirely outside of the Chocolate Avenue Preservation overlay. All that will be visible of the atrium from the street is a small amount of the roofline. None of the façade will be visible.

Mr. Emerick noted that on sheet 13, it appears as though two sections of fluted concrete will have to be refabricated and asked if that is accurate. Mr. Kinsley responded that is not correct, it is coming from the north side. Mr. Emerick asked if "Hershey Chocolate Corporation" will remain on the back of the building. Mr. Kinsley answered yes.

Mr. Emerick stated that the lack of horizontal muntins in the windows of the one-story building on the east end of the south elevation seems out of character with the rest of the project. Mr. Kinsley stated that he will look into it, but he thinks it was intended to match the size and shape of the windows of the 14 East Chocolate Avenue building. Mr. Kinsley believes that adding one horizontal muntin to the top of each window will better match the rest of the facility at 19 East Chocolate Avenue.

Mr. Emerick asked if the applicant is seeking approval for the light sconces that are depicted. Mr. Kinsley stated that they are existing. Mr. Emerick asked if the applicant is seeking approval for the signage depicted on sheet 9. Mr. Kinsley answered no, that will be presented at a later date.

Member Herman asked if, in the spirit of making as few changes to the building as possible, consideration was given to retaining all of the fluted stone work instead of installing windows in some of the sections. Mr. Kinsley stated that they had discussed this idea at the February 2012 meeting, and the problem with keeping the entire area

of the wall intact is that it would bring very little light into the building. It was necessary to find a way to bring more transparency to that wall.

Member Herman asked for the applicant's specific plan with regard to the window detail depicted on sheet 5. Mr. Kinsley responded that there is no casting. The shaded gray area depicted along the side of the window will consist of existing stone in the façade. They are not adding any new stone to either side of the window.

Member Herman asked whether the goal of installing windows is to let light into the building or to be more functional for employees. Mr. Kinsley answered that both issues are factors. If the building is going to continue to be used, they need to be able to get daylight into it again so that the employees are more productive and have a better quality of life.

The motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal as presented, with the discussed modifications to the windows of the one-story building on the east end of the southern elevation, was made by Member Rowe, seconded by Secretary Ballard, and passed by a majority vote. Vice Chairman Buchan abstained from voting.

b. Consideration of new monument sign on Park Avenue frontage of the property located at 1 East Chocolate Avenue (Hershey Trust Company, DRB #333)

Lee Wolaniuk of Capital Construction Management, LLC, represented the proposal on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the proposed sign is identical in every respect to the sign that is already installed on the Chocolate Avenue frontage of the property. Mr. Wolaniuk noted a change to the information that was submitted, being the placement of the Bryn Mawr Trust panel in relation to the Northwest Savings Bank panel (he distributed revised copies of the sign rendering).

Vice Chairman Buchan asked if there are any issues with the proposed sign regarding dimensions, color, etc. Brandon Williams responded that he thinks everything is the same as the existing sign on Chocolate Avenue, which has already been approved by the Design Review Board. He added that, to be consistent with previous approvals, the 'WEALTH MANAGEMENT DIVISION' text on the Bryn Mawr Trust panel and the 'ALLIANCE LLC' text on the Display Source Alliance, LLC panel should be allowed to be vinyl because the text is less than 1" in height. Mr. Williams also commented that since the sign was approved by Zoning Hearing Board in 2008, the dimensions should be consistent with what was presented to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Secretary Ballard asked if the proposal meets all of the Zoning Ordinance regulations regarding signs. Mr. Williams stated that the Zoning Hearing Board granted relief to allow both signs to contain up to 6 colors. Secretary Ballard asked why the second sign is only being installed now, when the relief was granted and the other sign was installed in 2008. Mr. Wolaniuk responded that it was the applicant's decision at the

time not to install the second sign right away. Mr. Williams clarified that the relief granted by the Zoning Hearing Board has been extended by the Permit Extension Act.

Member Herman asked if there are any concerns with sight distance. Mr. Williams responded that this issue was already addressed during the Zoning Hearing Board process, and it will be verified during the permit review process. Secretary Ballard asked if the distance the sign will be from the right-of-way will change because of the relocation of Park Avenue. Mr. Williams stated that the location of the sign may have to be shifted to meet the required setback from the right-of-way.

The motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal as presented was made by Vice Chairman Buchan, seconded by Member O'Day, and passed unanimously.

c. Consideration of final site and building details for the Chipotle Mexican Grill proposed at 202-214 West Chocolate Avenue (Apple Retail Properties, DRB #334)

Keith Heigel, Light-Heigel & Associates; Gary Gilbert, Apple Retail Properties; Josh Welfle, Red Architecture and Planning; and design manager Cheryl Heidorn represented the proposal.

Mr. Heigel explained that the applicant received a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Design Review Board in November 2012 for the site layout and the basic architectural concepts of the building. At that time, the Board made several recommendations for the final site layout and building design. The applicant has incorporated those recommendations and is now requesting final approval.

Building

Mr. Welfle stated that the building height is proposed to be 25'-6" at the taller section, and 21'-8" for remainder of the building. Secretary Ballard asked if the archways on the north elevation (facing Chocolate Avenue) will have windows. Mr. Welfle answered no, the arches are similar to what The Hershey Story building has. Secretary Ballard stated that more windows are preferred, especially along Chocolate Avenue. Ms. Heidorn noted that the first (westernmost) arch would be adjacent to the walk-in cooler, which would not be a desirable view, and the center arch would be adjacent to the restroom. The third (easternmost) arch could be open. Mr. Welfle stated that it would not be a problem to incorporate windows into the arches. Ms. Heidorn suggested that the easternmost arch contain clear glass, and the center and westernmost arches contain spandrel glass to block the views of the restroom and walk-in cooler.

Vice Chairman Buchan stated that he likes the look of the north elevation as presented (indented arches without windows), and that enough windows are proposed

as is. He suggested the addition of the indented arches to the west elevation. Secretary Ballard asked Vice Chairman Buchan if he would agree with the addition of windows to the north elevation arches if arches were also added to the west elevation. He maintained his position that the additional windows are not necessary. Secretary Ballard is concerned that the north elevation will look too dark without the windows. Ms. Heidorn noted that having spandrel glass windows will look just as dark as infilled brick. Member Rowe commented that the dark glass windows in the CVS building are not very appealing. Member Moore stated that having more windows would make the building look more inviting. Secretary Ballard made the suggestion that the easternmost arch on the north elevation could contain clear glass windows, and the other two arches could remain as in-filled brick. Chairwoman St. John added that three arches should also be added to the west elevation.

Chairwoman St. John asked how tall the adjacent building to the west is. Mr. Welfle responded that he does not have an actual dimension, but they will make sure the height of their proposed building is within 10% of the height of the adjacent building.

Member Rowe stated that the gauge of the fence appears to be thin and asked if more could be done to block the view of the parking lot. Mr. Welfle stated that the renderings might misrepresent what the fence will actually look like. He added that it will be aluminum and have a wrought iron railing appearance.

Chairwoman St. John stated that the vegetation represented on the rendering does not shield the view of the parking lot. She does not think the proposed fence qualifies as a means of screening the view of the parking lot. Mr. Heigel stated that he will address this concern during the site layout portion of the presentation.

Secretary Ballard commented that she likes brick wall/wrought iron fence, but she agrees that the vegetation should be denser and taller so that parking lot is adequately screened. Chairwoman St. John added that consideration should be given to how the vegetation will look in the winter when it is not in bloom. Vice Chairman Buchan suggested that a tree be added.

Member Herman commented that it would be beneficial to add some large trees along Chocolate Avenue in addition to the vegetation that is proposed.

Member O'Day asked if the brick-infilled arch proposed on the building's south elevation is representative of what would be added to the west elevation, or if the arch would be smaller, like what is proposed on the north elevation. Mr. Welfle responded that they will probably match the ones on the north elevation. Ms. Heidorn added that they will have to see which size works best proportionally, taking into consideration the door on the west elevation. She expects that the two larger arches (like on the south elevation) will look the best.

Vice Chairman Buchan stated that he likes the quoins and the overall look of the building. Member Herman commented that he appreciates the applicant's attention to detail.

Mr. Emerick asked for clarification regarding the applicant's comment that the proposed building height will be 90% of the height of the adjacent building to the west, since the applicant does not know the actual height of the adjacent building. Ms. Heidorn also requested clarification because the adjacent building is at a much higher elevation. Ms. Heidorn stated that the proportions of the proposed building are already close to exceeding the top heavy limits, and to make the building any taller will make it look even more top heavy. Mr. Emerick stated that it would be best for the Board accept an exact building height instead. The Board agreed with the proposed building height of 25'-6".

Signage

Mr. Welfle stated that the wall signs are proposed to be externally illuminated with gooseneck lights. Vice Chairman Buchan asked if the signs represent the standard corporate logo. Mr. Welfle answered yes.

In response to a question from Chairwoman St. John, Mr. Emerick stated that the sign dimensions are acceptable. He noted that the rendering indicates the use of LED illumination and asked if that meant there will be a halo illumination effect. Ms. Heidorn stated that this reference relates to LED goosenecks for energy conservation purposes. Mr. Emerick stated that the rendering is misleading in this case. Ms. Heidorn explained that the rendering might not represent their most current proposal. She also clarified that the sign letters will be aluminum (not acrylic) and stated that an accurate rendering will be provided.

Mr. Emerick asked for a detail of the gooseneck lighting. Mr. Welfle stated that he will provide a spec sheet, but the lighting will basically look like the elevation rendering. Mr. Emerick noted that the sign lighting has to be white, not colored, if the halo illumination option is preferred. Also, the signs cannot extend from the face of the building by more than 12". Mr. Welfle and Ms. Heidorn indicated that this will not be an issue. Member O'Day questioned if the signs include the words "Mexican Grill." Mr. Welfle stated that they will not. Mr. Emerick verified with the applicant that a freestanding sign is not currently proposed, and if that changes in the future, they will have to seek further approval from the Design Review Board.

Secretary Ballard asked what is meant by halo lighting. Upon seeing a visual representation of halo lighting, the Board stressed that the sign lighting must be gooseneck only.

<u>Site</u>

Mr. Heigel commented that at the November meeting, the proposal depicted patio seating on the east side of the building only. Per the Board's suggestion, the applicant is now proposing a 12' wraparound patio with outdoor seating along the Chocolate Avenue frontage in addition to the Ridge Road frontage.

Mr. Heigel stated that because of the gradient along Chocolate Avenue, they tried to balance the site with earthwork and acceptable ramps. There will be steps to the building on the Chocolate Avenue frontage, which was unavoidable based on grading. An accessible route to the building is provided along the east side of the building.

Secretary Ballard is concerned that pedestrians will take a shortcut through the grass instead of using the sidewalk to get from the eastern side of the property to the crosswalk at the intersection of Chocolate Avenue and Ridge Road. She suggested that the applicant may want to relocate the sidewalk. Mr. Heigel explained that they are trying to retain the park-like setting adjacent to the intersection. Based on the Design Review Board's suggestions, they removed a previously proposed large stormwater facility. They will be creating a berm and landscaping to discourage people from taking a shortcut across the grass.

Mr. Heigel explained the landscaping plan. There is berming along the Chocolate Avenue frontage to help screen the parking lot and in addition to that, the brick pillars/faux wrought iron fencing is proposed. Secretary Ballard mentioned that the regulations state the parking lot should be *well* screened, but in looking at the rendering it would appear that the parking lot would be visible. Mr. Gilbert believes an opaque screen would present a safety issue. Vice Chairman Buchan commented that the grading is such that the parking lot is located 4 or 5 feet lower than sidewalk level so the parking lot will not be very visible. Secretary Ballard thought that the bushes on the rendering looked meager, and that more should be proposed. Mr. Heigel stated that the applicant is not opposed to denser screening, but they do not want to have opaque screening. Secretary Ballard recommended adding 2 larger bushes on either side of the fence. Chairwoman St. John added that it should be something that still has branches in the winter.

Chairwoman St. John noted that no other property in downtown Hershey has white stones around plantings. Mr. Heigel responded that they are proposing substantially fewer stone beds than before to lessen the white stone effect. Mr. Gilbert commented that white stone always looks attractive, whereas mulch either looks attractive or terrible, and it is hard to maintain. Vice Chairman Buchan thinks the stone is acceptable in the small amounts that are proposed. Secretary Ballard agreed with Chairwoman St. John.

Matt Weir, a Township resident, commented that the applicant should also have included aspects of the Hershey Rose Garden in the plan. The proposed landscaping

is uninspired, and he thinks that Milton Hershey would have hired a good landscape architect for the site. The grassy area to the east of the building would be a good location for a rain garden and some modern approaches to stormwater, not just piles of white rocks. Also, there is an opportunity for a curb cut at the southwest corner of the building.

Mr. Gilbert stated that the all of the sidewalks and the dumpster pad are proposed to be of pervious materials.

Secretary Ballard asked if the Board could make a decision on the landscaping details at a later date. Ms. Heidorn stated that they are seeking approval for as many aspects as possible so that the project can move forward.

Member O'Day asked if the Board finds the landscaping plan acceptable, exclusive of the white stone. Member Rowe does not have an issue with the stone, as long as it is not a noticeable white marble stone. Mr. Heigel stated that it is not shiny at all, it more closely resembles river rock. Secretary Ballard noted that the stone needs to be kept within the bounds of very small, planted areas. The Board approved the white stone proposal for its very limited use in 6 planting areas, based on the testimony from the applicant that it will look attractive. The trees will be mulched.

Chairwoman St. John questioned who will maintain the grassy area next to Ridge Road. Mr. Gilbert responded that it is the Hershey Trust Company's responsibility now, but will become Chipotle's responsibility.

Mr. Emerick asked for clarification on the height of the brick wall upon which the faux wrought iron fencing will be placed. Mr. Heigel stated that it will be a minimum height of 2' between the columns. Mr. Gilbert interjected that he does not want to commit to that height. He was agreeable to a minimum of 18". Mr. Gilbert was unsure of the height of the brick columns, but they will have to be proportionate. Mr. Emerick asked what the height of the fence will be in between the columns. Mr. Gilbert stated that it will be anywhere from 24" to probably 36" at most.

Mr. Heigel explained the site lighting proposal. The light standards will be a darker color (cocoa, black), but a decision has not yet been finalized. Member Rowe asked the applicant if they looked at any other lighting heads that would be more compatible with this type of building. Ms. Heidorn commented that there are not many options for site lighting. Vice Chairman Buchan stated that he thinks the proposal is acceptable based on the size of the lot. Member Rowe asked if the parking lot lighting can match the gooseneck lighting. Ms. Heidorn responded that it is not an available option. Mr. Heigel added that they were not trying to have a noticeable feature in the lighting, and that the requirement for zero cutoff greatly reduces the lighting options. Chairwoman St. John does not think the site lighting will be noticeable in comparison to Chocolate Avenue.

Secretary Ballard asked what the dumpster pad will shielded by. Mr. Gilbert stated that it will probably be split-face block and its height will be tall enough the shield the dumpster. Mr. Emerick pointed out that the land development plan indicates that the enclosure will match the building facade.

The motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal, including the modifications discussed during the meeting, was made by Vice Chairman Buchan, seconded by Member Moore, and passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Chairwoman