ATTENDEES PRESENT
COMMISSIONERS: STEPHEN BISHOP – CHAIRMAN, FI FI SHERIDAN, DARIUS TORABY, KATHRIN BROWN

ALTERNATES: MARIE WILLIAMS, MARTIN KAGAN, ANNIE MCGINNIS, SERENA BECHTEL

ABSENT: ARIS CRIST

Mr. Bishop called meeting to order at 7:08pm.

Mr. Bishop introduced two new members – Martin Kagan and Serena Bechtel

* * *

1. 165 SHORE ROAD
   OLD GREENWICH, CT

REPRESENTED BY: CHRISTOPHER P. FRANCO
OWNER: HARBOUR HOUSE INN, LLC
ARCHITECT: KRIST DODARO, DODARO ARCHITECTS

REVIEW PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANS TO ADD A SMALL CUPULA

Mr. Franco introduced himself and Krist Dodaro, project architect, and identified the location of the site (the former Harbor House Inn). Mr. Franco described the restoration efforts to date. Mr. Franco identified “a great find” of discovering quite a bit of trim work that was located once the aluminum siding was removed. Mr. Franco furthered the discussion by stating he was able to take the original windows and get them replicated by Marvin Windows.

One of the aspects that was brought to Planning & Zoning was the construction of the roof deck. Originally there was a flat section of the roof, unseen at street level, which has since been dropped down about 12 inches and restructured with a railing and a stair access up to it – all approved by P&Z. The intention of the roof deck was for residents to observe Greenwich Point, sun sets (and rises), etc and limited to 10 people at one time with no parties. However, when the applicant applied for a
building permit at the building department, the originally designed hatch did not think it would comply with code and thought it was unsafe. They suggested a more traditional and typical roof bulkhead that would cover the staircase. The zoning and building codes both allow for this without any variances.

The architect, Mr. Di Nardo, then came up with a rendering that incorporated many elements of the building -- the elongated diamond, the pilasters, matching the outrigger, and the width of the door accommodates the opening. The door and design are being kept as minimal as possible. The railing (already approved) will go approximately halfway up – covering the bottom half of the structure and even more so when looking up from the street level and Mr. Di Nardo concurred.

Mr. Franco continued by stating that his reason on being before the HDC is based upon the historic easement that was agreed on between the applicant and P&Z for the building’s four sides which necessitated that if there were to be any changes to the structure, the applicant would be required to meet with the HDC to discuss the proposed changes and receive HDC approval. The current proposed changes are all permissible by zoning code.

Ms. Williams stated that the frontal view then is the door that would open when someone comes out (which Mr. Franco confirmed). Ms. Williams then asked if there were any possibility that the door way could be reversed? She felt that there would be the possibility of seeing (from the streetscape) the door opening and closing as it was being used. Mr. Franco demonstrated that this would be minimal if not viewable at all.

Mr. Toraby asked for the history of the use of the building. Mr. Franco stated that from 1895 until the start of the project, the building was used as an inn with 23 guest rooms.

Mr. Toraby then inquired if the building had always had a flat roof to which Mr. Franco confirmed. The flat roof was originally used for different purposes so it did not consistently act as an observation platform. Mr. Franco then said that Planning & Zoning did grant the applicant the ability to use the roof as a roof deck.

Mr. Kagan commented that the applicant may want to consider a ceiling light/skylight to the stairway as that could add more light on the stairs. Mr. Franco responded favorably to that suggestion.

Mr. Toraby asked what was the finish of the main roof. Mr. Franco responded that is was cedar shingle.

Mr. Franco continued saying that the structure has a copper roof. It will have windows that go all the way around and will be similar to the diamond shaped windows already found on the main structure. The white pilasters will that match the ones found on the lower part of the building.
Mr. Toraby asked what are the provisions for either storm windows or a storm door? And is it open to the elements?

Mr. Franco replied that the roof deck is open to the elements.

Mr. Toraby continued saying conceptually the design poses a huge maintenance issue. Design-wise, Mr. Toraby felt that the pergola does not belong at the top of the roof but he understand the choice. Mr. Toraby inquired of the applicant if they wanted do you want to do something in keeping with the design of the structure or do you want something that is like a roof garden?

Mr. Franco responded that we need something that the building department will approve. The first design did have a different roofline with a deeper pitch and matched the architecture precisely. But, Mr. Franco wanted the roof lower so this design was chosen and it is architecturally appropriate.

Mr. Toraby then asked how the applicant plans to keep the water out? Mr. Toraby cautioned that the applicant would be getting into a high maintenance issue.

Mr. Franco said that the deck is already there and it has been approved.

Mr. Toraby said that the structure would be pounded by the natural elements every season. Mr. Toraby complimented the design but believed that the design was not appropriate for the structure.

Mr. Bishop invited Teresa Kirwin who lives across the street on Wahneta road to comment.

Ms. Kirwin stated that after several meetings between the applicant and concerned neighbors, the two issues that remained unresolved were the flat roof (originally it had air conditioning) and a driveway. She urged the commission not to approve the proposal.

Mr. Franco said that the issue was well discussed at the Planning & Zoning meeting with ultimately the Planning & Zoning Commission giving their approval to the design.

Mr. Bishop reminded the Commission members and attending public that the HDC purview here was not to examine building codes or zoning issues but to discuss the merit of the application.

Mr. Kagan stated then that this is a new element being proposed to a historical structure and that the purpose of the vote is to give an advisory position to P&Z.

Mr. Bishop confirmed that statement – do we think that the design is appropriate.
Mr. Franco reminded the commission that the project was an adaptive re-use of the building and thus called for some alterations.

Ms. Sheridan suggested whether a site visit would be appropriate as well as do some research about this time period.

Mr. Franco said that he was at the site earlier and would pass around recent streetscape photos that he took to the Commission.

Mr. Bishop commented on Ms. Sheridan’s suggestion saying that a site visit would require a notice to be filed and thus delay the applicant’s approval process.

Mr. Franco replied that while a site visit is always appropriate, the rendering is more indicative of what is to be as right now, there is only a blue box on site. A site visit at this time would not produce the same effect.

Ms. Brown inquired asked if the dimensions of the blue box are the same as those in the rendering? Mr. Franco said yes.

Mr. Bishop asked when the applicant would be on the Planning & Zoning agenda? Mr. Franco said that it would create a time hardship.

Mr. Franco said that it was important that HDC decide whether they like the design or not as he does not want to wait a month for that decision. Mr. Franco stated that he would return with a redesign should HDC decide it wants a new design.

Mr. Bishop asked about the railing design. Mr. Franco described the railing as white posts with white 2 ½ inch square wooden balusters with a rail on top of it.

Ms. Williams stated that she does not feel a need for a site visit.

Ms. Brown said if the applicant redesigns it to make it more historically correct than you have a higher structure. Ms. Brown believes the current design is the least offensive.

Mr. Bishop asked for a motion

Motion to approve design and plans as submitted for HDC meeting on February 8, 2017

Moved by Ms. Sheridan
Seconded by Ms. Brown

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Brown, Ms. Williams, Mr. Kagan, Ms. McGinnis, Ms. Bechtel
Abstaining: Mr. Toraby

2. GARDEN EDUCATION CENTER  
   130 BIBLE STREET  
   COS COB, CT 06807

OWNER: TOWN OF GREENWICH

REVIEW CT-STATE REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES APPLICATION FOR THE LORD AND BURNHAM GREENHOUSE (C.1928) AND DECIDE WHETHER TO SUPPORT A NOMINATION OF STRUCTURE TO THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

Anne Young presented and informed the Commission that currently, all municipalities with Certified Local Government status needed approval by the CLG coordinator for NRHP nomination regarding municipally owned structures.

Motion to support the application of Garden Education Greenhouse to the National Register of Historic Places

Moved by Ms. Sheridan  
Seconded by Ms. Brown  
Unanimous

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Brown, Ms. Williams, Mr. Kagan, Ms. McGinnis, Ms. Bechtel

MINUTES  
Motion to approve minutes from January 11, 2017 meeting

Moved by Ms. Sheridan  
Seconded by Ms. McGinnis

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Brown, Ms. Williams, Ms. McGinnis

Mr. Kagan and Ms. Bechtel abstained (not in attendance for January 11, 2017 HDC meeting)

DEMOLITIONS

252 Overlook Drive  
Greenwich, CT

45 West Brother Drive  
Greenwich, CT
27 Tomac Ave
Old Greenwich, CT

22 Tremont Street
Cos Cob, CT

47 Connecticut Avenue
Greenwich, CT

[note: any Greenwich resident may place a stay on a noticed demolition]. Otherwise, no action was taken.

Motion to end the meeting
Moved by Ms. Brown
Seconded by Ms. Sheridan

Mr. Bishop closed the meeting at 8:57 pm