ATTENDEES PRESENT
COMMISSIONERS: STEPHEN BISHOP – CHAIRMAN, KATHRIN BROWN, LLOYD HULL, NOBLE WELCH, DARIUS TORABY, FI FI SHERIDAN

ALTERNATES: JENNIFER KOSSLER (arrived at 7:50pm), MARIE WILLIAMS

ABSENT: ARIS CRIST

Mr. Bishop called meeting to order at 7:07pm.

* * *

1. 3 MILL POND COURT*
   COS COB, CT

PRESENTED BY: ERIC BROWER
REPRESENTED BY: ERIC BROWER AND SHORELINE DESIGN GROUP
OWNER: 3 MILL POND COURT, LLC
   * Structure is located within Strickland Road Local Historic District and notice of the meeting appeared in Greenwich Time, April 1, 2015.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS [REQUESTED]
Review plans for new clapboard siding, roof, doors and windows, dormers at front elevation, addition and deck at rear, and railing and deck above existing garage.

Mr. Bishop opened the discussion by apologizing that the meeting was postponed from March to this date and then asked the applicant to step forward.

Mr. Brower began by stating that the last discussion by the Historic District Commission on this property was January 2015. Since, information regarding the establishment of Mill Pond Court as a local historic district (attached and continued to the Strickland Road local historic district) as well as the building date had been dispersed and was greatly appreciated. He continued his presentation by describing the plans submitted to the members of the historic district commission emphasizing that the Mill Pond side of the house was to have two dormers that maintained the
existing pediment above the front door and a new railing above the garage that is similar to other homes on Mill Pond Court. The proposed addition would be in the rear as well as a small deck behind the garage (not visible from the street). All trim would be wood and any vinyl would be removed.

Mr. Bishop inquired about windows. Mr. Brower responded that currently, there is a mix of wood and vinyl windows but the windows would be replaced and the new ones would be six-over-six and would have insulated glazing with wood on the outside.

Ms. Sheridan asked if the 'end-user' could be described. Mr. Brower said that the 'end-user' is a family (who were present at the meeting). They had decided to use a corporate name in being identified with the property on the application rather than their own name for personal reasons.

Mr. Toraby highlighted that the addition of 700 square feet (of a house that is currently 1,651 square feet) creates a completely different house and that the design, if accepted, would transform the current historic character of Mill Pond Court. He continued by saying that the wood clapboard siding, the new windows and roof were acceptable, but not the addition to the rear of the structure.

Mr. Brower responded that he had studied the Mill Pond Court local historic district application and did not see any guidance offered to assist in further changes/future development to the structures’ front (streetscape) or rear sides. He continued by saying that while the fronts of the Mill Pond Court homes have retained their integrity, there is a great deal of variety in design of those homes’ backs. While some of those homes can be visible from the Post road, those sides should not be considered ‘streetscape’ as there is a pond (Mill Pond) and foliage and a park between the rear of the Mill Pond Court homes and the Post road. Mr. Brower concluded that 3 Mill Pond Court’s design adds livable space that has been a continuous request in all previous Mill Pond Court applications that have been reviewed and approved.

Mr. Toraby stated that if the Historic District Commission allows this level of expansion to every house in the local historic district, then soon the charm of the street would be lost.

Mr. Brower responded that the crux of the proposal is saving the streetscape but allowing expansion in rear. Mr. Brower reminded the commissioners that since the regulations are not specific and certain standards have not been established, it is inappropriate to deny the proposal.

Mr. Bishop said that when a proposed expansion to a structure lying within a local historic district has been approved, that expansion was at the rear of the building. Since this current application does not affect the front, Mr. Bishop believed that
there would be severe repercussions in not allowing the application to move forward.

Mr. Bishop asked if anyone in the audience cared to comment.

Ms. Faith Toraby, 31 Strickland road, felt it was difficult to make opposition to the chairman who has made a statement of support to the addition. Ms. Toraby expressed concern that the proposed design would contribute to the detriment of the district’s established character and feels that the decision to allow the proposed expansion is being made too quickly. Ms. Toraby respectfully requested that the Historic District Commission ask for alternate plans with a restricted addition.

Mr. Bishop asked that Ms. Brown stand in for the vote for Aris Crist who is absent.

Mr. Bishop then submitted a motion to approve the proposed design plans submitted to Historic District Commission members for April 8, 2015 meeting subject to a further approval of materials to be used for siding, roof, doors, windows, railing and deck. The vote on the materials must be a majority vote by the members of the Historic District Commission before final approval is given.

This was seconded by Mr. Hull

Voting in favor:
Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Hull, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan

2. 12 HAVEMEYER PLACE*
GREENWICH, CT

PRESENTED BY: RUDY RIDBERG
REPRESENTED BY: RIDBERG ASSOCIATES
OWNER: CONTINENTAL FINANCE CORP.
* Structure is located in Greenwich Avenue Historic District that is on the National Register of Historic Places

ADISORY OPINION TO PLANNING AND ZONING [REQUESTED]
Review addition of handicap ramp and replacement of window with a door and endorsement of historic merit for change of use.

Mr. Ridberg stated that the current application for the building is to have a restaurant on the first floor. As the current feelings are towards keeping the structure, the client will be applying for a façade easement and hopes that the Historic District Commission would support that application. Mr. Ridberg continued and identified the proposed changes to the building would include repainting, installation of a handicapped ramp in the rear of the building to come up to the existing entry level and addition of a new entrance on the west side of the building
to allow entry/exist for different floor users. He further stated that from a zoning context, the building is a non-conforming structure esp in regards to parking. Since a restaurant is being proposed, in order to seek relief, an application for an easement is being made under the regulations that allows for greater F.A.R. and parking (the building is listed as a contributing structure on the NRHP Greenwich Avenue (see pg. 14 of application)).

Mr. Hull inquired if the street front of the building would be altered in any way. Mr. Ridberg responded that the windows and front entrance would remain the same.

Ms. Williams suggested that flowerpots or decorative urns or awnings might be used as a softening technique. Mr. Ridberg said he would certainly consider that idea.

Motion that the members of the Historic District Commission deem that building has historic merit.
Moved by Mr. Hull, seconded by Mr. Toraby.
Voting in favor:
Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Hull, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Williams, Ms. Kossler – unanimous.

Motion to approve the addition of handicap ramp and addition of a door with an appropriate railing and change of exterior color to match the front brick color.
Moved by Mr. Toraby, seconded by Ms. Brown.
Voting in favor:
Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Hull, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Williams, Ms. Kossler – unanimous.

3. 80 Mason Street
Greenwich, CT

Presented by: Kyle Stoker, Tricarico Architecture and Design PC
Represented by: Anthony Martinez
Architect: Pat A. Giacalone, AIA, Tricarico Architecture and Design PC

Advisory Opinion to Planning and Zoning [Requested]
Review proposed blocking of certain windows on the interior.

Mr. Bishop stated that the Historic District Commission had approved the plans submitted by the applicant and that the applicant has been given the easement. The applicant has returned because past proposed designs showed that some windows would be blocked in the rear and this was not properly identified in past discussions. A total of seven windows are to be blocked – two visible from the road and five in rear. The interior of the windows will have closed shutters but keep the window casements intact and the moldings not to be affected. The interior design demonstrates a need to do this as well as having an elevator again, not altering the current window design. All ‘blocked’ windows can be reverted to their original
The members of the Historic District Commission reviewed the plans without altering their previous decision.

Motion to approve plans (dated 3/15/15 PLPZ ref number 2014 00653 and PLPZ 2014 00654) and allow for seven windows to be blocked.
Moved by Mr. Toraby, seconded by Mr. Welch
Voting in favor:
Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Hull, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Williams, Ms. Kossler – unanimous

4. 24 EAST ELM STREET
GREENWICH, CT

PRESENTED BY: ANDREAS STRESEMANN
REPRESENTED BY: W.I. HASLUN II, ESQ.
OWNER: 24 EAST ELM STREET, LLC

SENSE OF THE COMMISSION [REQUESTED]
Owner looking for preliminary input regarding the two buildings at the location prior to drawing plans. This is the former Van Driver men’s clothing store.

Mr. Haslun began stating that the main building was constructed around 1895. His client wishes to tear down the additional cottage on the site (which was not part of the original construction) and is desirous to keep the main structure. Mr. Haslun and Mr. Stresemann are seeking an indication from the members of the historic district commission if the main building has historic merit and therefore worthy of preserving by applying for a historic easement.

Mr. Bishop stated that the building does have merit and would like to see it preserved, as it is one of the last wooden buildings in the [Greenwich] downtown commercial zone.

Mr. Toraby inquired to the future of the structure should the applicant not receive a historic easement. Mr. Stresemann responded that most likely ALL the buildings on the site would be demolished. Mr. Toraby continued saying that he feels that the front of the building does have historic and architectural merit and the rest has shown definitive changes over time, but nonetheless, worthy of preserving. He indicated that the proposed plans incorporate a ‘consistency’ of design for the building.

Ms. Williams and Mr. Welch both probed aspects of ‘the cottage’ to which Mr. Stresemann responded that the current use of the cottage is for residential and that it does not have any relationship with the streetscape.
Mr. Bishop queried the members of the historic district commission and they were unanimous in their support that the main building has historic and architectural merit and is worthy of being preserved.

5. 376-380 GREENWICH AVENUE
GREENWICH, CT

PRESENTED BY: JONATHAN DENNIS
REPRESENTED BY: RIDBERG ASSOCIATES
OWNER: LARACO, LLC

ADISORY OPINION TO PLANNING AND ZONING [REQUESTED]
Review of minor changes to the rear of previously approved 3-story building.

Mr. Dennis stated that the Historic District Commission had previously approved this site’s plans. However construction has revealed that there is now a necessity for altering the geometry of the louvers in the rear of the building. The type of louver that is being proposed is a drainable louver, 120 inches long that would be divided equally and the color would match the current building color. The new louvers would also have the white trim and would look continuous.

Motion to approve plans submitted to members of Historic District Commission for April 8, 2015 meeting.
Moved by Mr. Toraby, seconded by Ms. Sheridan
Voting in favor:
Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Hull, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Williams, Ms. Kossler – unanimous

6. LYON FARM HOMESTEAD
GREENWICH, CT

PRESENTED BY: STEPHEN BISHOP (in capacity as Chairman, Historic District Commission)
REQUEST FOR AN APPROVAL OF DEMOLITION OF OPEN STORAGE SHED

Mr. Bishop provided to the members of the historic district his review of the outbuilding at Lyon Farm Homestead declaring it NOT historic compared to the original standing structures. Additionally, an inspection revealed that the building was constructed with contemporary lumber. Mr. Bishop further concluded that the ruins of the structure that had been devastated by a winter snowstorm be removed with great expediency to ensure safety.

Motion to determine that the shed was 100% destroyed by snow and should not be repaired nor replaced and that the debris should be removed immediately.
Moved by Mr. Welch, seconded by Mr. Toraby
Voting in favor:
Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Hull, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Williams, Ms. Kossler – unanimous

DEMOLITIONS:

121 Lockwood Road  
Riverside, CT  
Year Constructed: 1938

5 St Claire Avenue  
Old Greenwich, CT  
Year Constructed: 1927

Meeting was adjourned at 9:40 pm.