1. 50 EAST PUTNAM AVENUE
GREENWICH, CT

REPRESENTED BY:  PERKINS EASTMAN ARCHITECTS, DPC
OWNER:  Y.M.C.A. OF GREENWICH

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUESTED

Review proposed restoration and repairs to historic brick and stone faces, slate roof, cupola, balustrade and pediments

Katherine LoBalbo (project manager) began the presentation and gave a brief history of the building and its initial restoration in 2006. As “The Y” is sensitive to the building’s centennial year, “The Y’s” administration wanted to revisit the second phase of the restoration.

Mr. Ricardo Viera (Building Conservation Associates) then presented the restoration efforts that happened between 2006-2008 where most work occurred on the upper floors.

He then commented on the contemporary analysis and stated that BCA’s finding declared that anything that had a white color to it on the façade of the building was
painted and was considered not original to the building. The original building was brick with brown cast stone. And through the years due to dirt, it was painted to ‘update’ the look. And to keep water away, all the joints were sealed with caulking. Nevertheless, water did enter the building and as it became trapped, water began to damage the building. So work began on the upper ledge – it was stripped, the sealant was removed and it was repointed. As this occurred about nine years ago, the process was deemed successful as there has been limited to no water damage since the restoration.

The baluster at the entrance way was removed (during the first restoration) as there were steel rods going through each one of the balusters and that the steel rods had become corroded. Currently, the balusters are being stored in the basement of the building and will be reinstated.

As part of the centennial work, “The Y” has asked that a master plan be developed by BCA. Mr. Viera stated that the priority was to remove the remaining paint and repoint the building. Mr. Viera side-barred to the brick of the building and stated that a lot of effort was made to find a matching brick to the building and he feels that this has been a very successful effort. All the brickwork on the top floor (near the corroding lintels) was all removed, the steel was replaced, and the brick was reinstalled and 99% of the brick was able to be salvageable. “The Y” has selected a same contractor used ten years ago during that restoration and Mr. Viera has confidence that the work on the main façade will be consistent and valuable.

The balustrade will be re-installed and attempts will be made to reuse the existing cast stone but a matching cast stone will be made if the current cast stone proves unsalvageable.

Ms. LoBalbo continued by stating that this is a large project and time priorities were identified in regards to what has to be done as soon as possible and determine what has to be done to restore the character of the building that may not have the same urgency. So approval is being sought on the entire package so work may begin immediately.

Mr. Viera then continued to describe the deterioration of the south façade of the gymnasium wall. Water has corroded the high beams in the gymnasium that resulted in there being sections of the wall that allowed you to see right through into the building. This area will be the most invasive of the work to be performed that will require rebuilding. The brick on the outside is red and the interior brick is buff. The best way is to shore from the inside and work from outside to stop water from getting in. All efforts are being made for stabilization and to have the building look like it did when it was originally constructed. He further continued by saying that they have the capacity to match the brick and the recipes to match the mortar and are confident with the matching.
Mr. Viera continued that another point of priority is the ceramic tile on the dome of the building. The ceramic tile and slate have retained their original steel nails but those nails have corroded with the point being that none of them are copper and as such, the ceramic tile roof is starting to fall and becoming a hazard. The ceramic tile roof will be dismantled and the tiles salvaged and reinstalled and copper nails will be used -- and this is process is to be duplicated with the slate roof. Additional Vermont slate pieces can be acquired where needed.

Mr. Crist asked what was to be put under the slate.

Mr. Viera replied that it was an “old retainer” which consisted of felt, 30lb. building paper and a waterproofing membrane.

Mr. Bishop inquired about the gable-end that is visible from Mason Street as you are going towards East Putnam. Mr. Viera responded that it was to be rebuilt and is visible from the parking lot.

Mr. Bishop inquired whether all the brick from the main façade was to be dismantled and he was told no. The main priority is to strip off all the paint (not sandblasted). Then all repairs will be made. Whatever can be salvaged and restored will and, if not, will be replaced with “in kind” to match the original.

Mr. Toraby commented that he did not see any details regarding coating and was told by Mr. Viera that there will not be any coating as this has been determined as the main cause of the building’s structural problems. As there hasn’t been any coating since the last 8-10 years and it has weathered well. This is the logic to follow.

Mr. Toraby stated that he had discovered a new product by Keim that protects the stone from an excessive permeation of water and wondered if the applicant had considered this. Mr. Viera responded that Keim has a lot of products and are used when prudent. He further stated that the embedded steel has corrosion that is a result of water coming in and out through the mortar joints. Having the ability to monitor the restoration for 8+ years has provided the evaluation that removing the paint and using mortar instead of sealant has proven successful and so the response is to go back to the way the building was intended (no paint).

Mr. Toraby further expressed his concern about the long period of time that the last restoration took and the eyesore that it caused. Mr. Viera stated that he appreciated the comment but that the intention was to remind everyone that the restoration was a continuum and therefore “not done”.

Mr. Crist asked about the metal caps on the windowsill? Mr. Viera responded that it is an extension of the actual aluminum window and will be white.
Mr. Crist then inquired about the metal of the lantern? Mr. Viera responded that the metal of the lantern will be made of copper.

Mr. Crist also asked for samples of the replacement slate.

A motion that the submittal be approved as presented with the provision that before construction gets underway, members of the Historic District Commission will visit the site and see and review samples of brick, mortar, slate and capping and approve said samples.

Moved by Mr. Toraby and seconded by Mr. Welch

Unanimous vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Hull, Mr. Welch, Mr. Crist, Ms. Williams, Mr. Toraby

2. 299 GREENWICH AVENUE
GREENWICH, CT

PRESENTED BY: ALAN MONELLI
OWNER: TOWN OF GREENWICH

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS REQUESTED

Review proposed handicap ramp

[Continuation from previous meeting held on December 9, 2015 and January 13, 2016]

Mr. Monelli began the presentation by stating that the drawings for this evening’s application were mailed out last week to which he recently became aware that any member of the Historic District Commission had not received them. Mr. Bishop did acknowledge that timing of the application required expediency and that the applicant should proceed.

Mr. Monelli began by stating that taking suggestions from the previous meeting, the airlock was converted to a brick and mortar airlock and that the topography was split by adding a retaining wall three feet from the sidewalk to create another planting area and then split again masking the actual ramp which is now brick following the handrail and covering the interior handrail and to get to the 42 inch code, adding small top rail. So when you turn the corner the retaining wall dies in the slope and you continue stepping down to meet the existing driveway. More landscaping will be included although it is not demonstrated on drawings.
Mr. Bishop asked about the two different colors and Mr. Monelli replied that on the original building, there is a limestone band and the drawing shows it. The ‘dark’ area is limestone and what is white is brick. Both limestone and brick are to be matched. The limestone was not matched at the front.

At the end, the height will be 36 inches to the top of the hand railing on the inside. The masonry is projecting 38 inches. The railing is 36 inches and the culping is 42 inches. There is a glass transom to match. He further added that by stepping the stone, we can hide the hand railing that will probably be aluminum. The window colors will be a patina frame.

Mr. Bishop asked about the airlock. Mr. Monelli said that there is brick on the sides, with a new window lined up to where the door is going to be (where the original window was) and the window will be matched to the current windows (that are encasement windows with a transom on top). A new window will be added to view the fire station and it too will be matched. The airlock is all masonry. There is talk of creating a masonry wall instead of sheet rocking it.

The drawings show that the top ramp is limestone capping, the brick is to match the field, then rubbed concrete to match the existing and is like a stucco finish.

Plantings will be mounded up against the ramp wall – a planted slope occurs to cover the mass of the wall.

Ms. Williams inquired about the width of the ramp. Mr. Monelli replied that the width of the ramp is 5 feet 4 inches and shouldn’t be a problem for wheel chairs passing and going. People want to enter the Senior Center under their own power. The walking surface of the ramp will be concrete. Handrails will be on both sides of the ramp and there will be scuppers to allow water to run out.

Mr. Monelli would like to bring samples in when the time comes (prior to construction).

Mr. Monelli stated that the tree warden dictates what exactly is a tree and if removed, its replacement. Mr. Bishop asked if Mr. Monelli could ask the tree warden to communicate his changes prior to their occurrence as HDC wants to review future landscaping esp in case if any ‘trees’/shrubbery is to be removed.

A motion to approve the presentation subject to submittal of the construction drawings and a visitation to the site by members of the Historic District Commission to review materials to ensure matching finishes.

Moved by Mr. Toraby and seconded by Ms. Sheridan

Unanimous vote
Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Hull, Mr. Welch, Mr. Crist, Ms. Williams, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan

MINUTES:

Motion to approve January 13, 2016 minutes

Moved by Mr. Toraby and seconded by Mr. Welch

Unanimous vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Hull, Mr. Welch, Mr. Crist, Ms. Williams, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan

Mr. Bishop moved to have the meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.