

FINAL MINUTES  
Regular Meeting of the  
Historic District Commission of the Town of Greenwich  
Wednesday, April 10, 2019, 7:00pm  
Mazza Room, Town Hall

**ATTENDEES PRESENT**

COMMISSIONERS: STEPHEN BISHOP – CHAIRMAN, FI FI SHERIDAN,  
KATHRIN BROWN, DARIUS TORABY, ARIS CRIST

ALTERNATES: ANNIE MCGINNIS, MARTIN KAGAN, CYNTHIA SMITH

ABSENT: MARIE WILLIAMS, SERENA BECHTEL,

Mr. Bishop called meeting to order at 7:03pm

1. **ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING**  
10 Glenville Street (NRHP)  
Owner: The Mill Owners Company LLC  
Represented by: Granoff Architects

Continuation of proposal review to window and balcony design from September 2018 meeting  
[Mr. Crist recused himself]

Mr. Stresemann began his presentation and addressed several items – the air conditioning units on historic building; the windows in the 1981 building as well as the balconies.

**AIR CONDITIONING:**

We have a high parapet wall with a slight slope on the parameter and thus are able to hide the cadenza unit behind the parapet wall and as such nothing will be visible.

**WINDOWS:**

Focusing on the 1981 building, this building has its own identity and character so the focus will be on the windows first. The problem of going traditional was that it is not in character as the building built in 1981 is, in essence, more mid-century modern. So keeping the present function in mind, a double hung-window with a panel below. This is in keeping with the building and is also in keeping with other buildings on the property that too have double-hung windows.

The windows will be from Heller [a color sample was provided] and the choice relates nicely to the brick façade.

**BALCONY:**

Mr. Stresemann provided more detail for the balconies on the 1981 building than had been provided at his previous presentation. He presented a rendering that displayed the new balconies creating a certain amount of rhythm and lightening up the overall look of the building.

Mr. Stresemann stated that between the proposed windows, the proposed balconies and the building, this is the right answer.

Mr. Bishop said that with the windows, it looks like there are three divisions.

Mr. Stresemann replied that they are a double hung with a fixed panel on the bottom and all clear glass. The original solid panel now becomes clear glass.

Mr. Stresemann further commented that the windows are pretty big – 4 feet wide and eight feet tall. So glass is important to open this up.

Ms. Smith asked whether the existing solid panels would exist?

Mr. Stresemann replied no. He further added that you could call it a “triple hung” with the lowest portion of the window being inoperable. The top part would be available to open for ventilation and the middle part must be allowed to be opened for egress.

Ms. McGinniss asked why go from two panels to three?

Mr. Stresemann answered that at the last HDC meeting, there was a concern about children. The lower panels will be safety glass and the uppers won't. By giving more detail due to the large glass expanse, the triple gives it more character

Mr. Stresemann remarked saying that some of the balconies will have a sliding glass door to take advantage of the waterfalls (view).

Mr. Bishop asked how do you support a balcony that deep?

Mr. Stresemann replied and said as it is 6 feet, it will cantilever out with the steel going back into the building.

Mr. Toraby spoke to the high maintenance of the balconies, especially with railings surrounding them, are exposed to the weather, snow, ice, moisture that invites a lot of maintenance costs. If you made the balconies “Juliet”, they would become less so. As for the windows, you are changing the entire appearance of the exterior of the building. I would defer to other members about their feelings on that.

Mr. Bishop stated that as they are solid windows presently with a filled in panel . . .

Mr. Stresemann interjected and said that the new design gives more character and it is a change. The original windows were aluminum and the new windows will be fiberglass.

Mr. Toraby said and four-foot wide panels are hard to lift up and down.

Mr. Stresemann said that's why a double-hung is a good option.

Mr. Toraby further commented that the intermediate rail where the two operable portions of the sash meet is about 6 feet off the floor so I have to reach above my head to lower it?

Mr. Stresemann confirmed.

Mr. Toraby said then maybe it might be more practical to use the window if you have a transom that is operable or an awning or moving sash that will occasionally be used but the main part of the building would look more accessible because it will be residential building.

Mr. Stresemann stated that he would have a sample window installed and could make the top sash fixed but the middle sash must be operable.

Mr. Kagan asked what would be a second alternative? What was the idea that you had but didn't pursue?

Mr. Stresemann replied that it was a casement window (as shown on the original design packet) which would be one big panel and one panel below. Issues were it that it would be difficult to make a casement window like that and be cost prohibitive. It was always a balance between personality and not wanting to change the personality of the building.

Mr. Toraby commented that fiberglass windows are not structurally sound enough to have that wind and that tall a panel and that's why they are usually aluminum. Mr. Toraby suggested truly considering several samples.

Mr. Stresemann reiterated that a sample window would be installed that encompassed all the comments but must also address the maintenance. Mr. Stresemann reminded the commission to simply look at the aesthetics and allow the applicant to work on the functionality.

Mr. Toraby replied that the functionality of the window intuitively reflects on its aesthetic qualities. Is this really user friendly? Is it difficult to handle in a residential setting? You may want to consider small awning that allows for a small amount of ventilation without having to let it go to a four-foot wide sash.

Mr. Stresemann reminded Mr. Toraby that it needs to be egress compliant. You need to be able to get out through a ladder and be safe. Every window under 12 stories must be an egress window. Mr. Stresemann continued that once the sample window is installed, we would like to invite HDC to inspect. If it doesn't work, then we will return with a new design.

Mr. Toraby stated a fiberglass sash must be viable.

Ms. Smith stated that she wasn't sure what was being done. So the existing buildings have solid panels now? And they will now be clear glass? Mr. Stresemann confirmed.

Mr. Bishop stated that personally likes it and feels it is a positive change. He continued saying we deal with how it looks. Mr. Bishop complimented Mr. Toraby's points about operability and use but as you (the applicant) have to maintain it, then that's your problem.

Motion to approve the proposed window design with the understanding that an invitation to view the first installed window will be extended to all HDC members.

Moved by Ms. McGinnis

Seconded by Ms. Sheridan

Unanimous Vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Smith, Ms. McGinnis, Mr. Kagan

Mr. Stresemann understood that an invitation is to be extended for viewing the sample window one installed.

Moving on, Mr. Stresemann addressed the air conditioning and said as no details were provided at the last meeting regarding air conditioning for the 1881 Building, Mr. Stresemann stated that is to be hidden behind the parapet.

The air conditioning in the new building will be in the center and hidden and comply with the current codes.

Mr. Bishop said he was a bit confused about the elevator in the Centro Building and asked the applicant to elaborate. Mr. Stresemann added that there are to be new elevators going into the Centro building (not visible). On the exterior, the present stairs are to be removed and replaced with an elevator. It will be brick and not stand out as a different element. This is the only new exterior elevator being added.

Mr. Toraby asked about railings for the service people and/or sunbathers.

Mr. Stresemann said there is no roof access for renters but will probably be investigating and if it is visible we will return if it has impact on the building.

Motion to approve the proposed design for the exterior air conditioning units [for 1881 Building] that will be placed on the roof's center (and therefore not visible from the street) and to comply with current codes and the addition of an exterior elevator to the [Centro] building to be clad in brick to replace deteriorating exterior stairs.

Moved by Ms. McGinnis

Seconded by Ms. Sheridan

Unanimous Vote

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

[Mr. Kagan stepped outside prior to the vote]

## BALCONIES

Mr. Bishop stated that he understood Mr. Toraby's comments regarding how balconies can become 'eye soars'. Mr. Stresemann responded that there will be rental guidelines /

uses (part of property management) to keep renters from abusing the balconies as storage space.

Mr. Bishop asked if there was a picture showing all the proposed balconies. Mr. Stresemann said that while there was no picture, there were elevations showing the balconies. He reminded the HDC that the design was to complement the building by being light and delicate and showing a sense of rhythm.

Ms. Smith said then it was more industrial?

Mr. Stresemann responded no, it was more a mid-century modern look.

Motion to approve the proposed balcony design for the 1981 Building  
Moved by Ms. Smith  
Seconded by Ms. Brown

Unanimous Vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Smith, Ms. McGinnis  
[Mr. Kagan stepped outside prior to the vote]

[NOTE: Mr. Crist and Mr. Kagan returned for next agenda application review]

2. FOR DISCUSSION ONLY\*  
35 Strickland Road (C-Local Historic District)  
Cos Cob, CT 06807  
Represented by George Flouty

Continuation of discussion of possible addition of garage for front house, window replacements, addition to barn on second lot, addition of garage for barn on second lot, rear-right corner of house to be squared from March 2019 meeting

\* No certificate of appropriateness will be issued at this meeting

Mr. Flouty identified through visuals the placement of the two properties. The front has a driveway on the south and there is another driveway (shared) on the north. He summarized the discussion from the last meeting.

BARN [rear property]

An extension of 15X15 (on both floors) was proposed last time and an addition of a garage as far back on the property as possible. He continued stating that the GHS asked if he had considered making the garage a part of the structure. Mr. Flouty said he had considered it but HDC felt that needed more work. So if done, the entrance would be on one of the sides rather than in the front.

So today, I am presenting that idea (having the parking as part (into) the building -- one structure (which makes for a wider building) – and now there isn't a separate garage.

Mr. Flouty stated that he wanted the building to remain authentic. He stated, “The reason why I like this (presented design) now (which is to have a separate garage) is that the more we looked at the barn, it structurally needs a lot of work. There is no foundation, the floorboards need work (cannot support a second floor), to make the structure sound, and it needs a lot of work.” He further stated that he needs an eight-foot clearance for a second floor. Continuing, Mr. Flouty stated that his thought is to expand the barn to accommodate for residential space -- sensitively dismantling the barn, reassembling it as much as possible, then putting in a proper foundation, a basement for the utilities (there is no basement) and storage. Mr. Flouty commented that lifting the building up is hazardous; there are no utilities so those must be brought in from street; and he has no idea of the condition of the roof. He said it makes more sense to build something new but make it authentic.

Mr. Bishop stated that he wants to save as much of the structure as possible and preferred to build out the back rather than wider. He further stated that he likes the idea of having a separate garage in the rear and keeping the 15X15 addition.

Ms. Smith offered integrating the roof with the mansard so if you design a transition box between the old carriage house with the garage you could have two mansard roofs and the transition linking the two together.

Mr. Bishop said that he liked that idea especially as you don't expand the front of the house so as to keep the barn feeling and you haven't expanded the view from the street. Mr. Bishop stated that he would appreciate keeping the barn door (street view).

Mr. Flouty declared that the bottom line is that the barn needs to be rebuilt. Mr. Flouty said that adding another 14-18 inches to the height, maybe there is a mathematically formula to make it work – to keep the original proportions.

Mr. Flouty would like to present a structure that has proportions that are appropriate to barn, faithfully maintain its look (to include the doors) and have a mansard roof. He hoped that would be acceptable to the Commission.

Ms. McGinnis said that if the structure is to be rebuilt, would it make sense to move the building forward and thus give more space for the garage in the rear? Mr. Flouty confirmed that would be of help.

Mr. Flouty also reminded the Commission that run-off and drainage as it affects the rear foundation of the bungalow is a big concern.

In conclusion, Mr. Flouty stated that his design will incorporate a slightly bigger – at least higher – (keeping the proportions) and incorporate parking in the back (with a garage) and an increase of living space.

Mr. Crist asked the applicant about FAR.

Mr. Flouty responded that he had spoken to others about that. Mr. Flouty said he was told as the barn is a historic structure he may qualify for a HO incentive. He added though that he does not have a FAR problem with the property.

Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Toraby about his concerns.

Mr. Toraby responded that he is concerned about the expansion. He asked, as a commissioner how sacrosanct is the existing structure?

Mr. Bishop agreed that that question is appropriate. Mr. Bishop stated that his preference is to go out the back and making the back where you have all the new stuff. Mr. Bishop felt that the barn cannot presently remain the way it is as it is completely unusable. But the Barn is a handsome building and does have a relationship with the neighboring property.

Ms. McGinnis said that at the end of the day, you will have a new building that looks like the old building. Mr. Flouty confirmed her statement. But he wants to reuse as much from the old structure into the new one.

Mr. Toraby felt that the new design needs to be respectful of the Historic District and agrees that the building is in a great state of disrepair. He continued saying that a meeting with the building inspector should be had as well as P&Z to understand exactly what is feasible.

Ms. Smith said to restore the building and then have the addition be what is restricted by code.

Mr. Kagan asked that the drawings when submitted show exactly what is being saved and what is new. Mr. Bishop concurred.

Mr. Toraby said that the skeleton of the structure is salvageable but all the trim, siding and roof needs to be redone. The building has withstood the test of time.

Mr. Bishop said that his preference is to go out the back and that is where the 'new' should be. You can go up in height to make the proportions correct but I would have to see it. This is an extremely important project and needs a great deal of attention.

Mr. Flouty agreed.

Mr. Kagan suggested that perhaps Mr. Flouty would like to bring an architect to the next meeting.

Faith Toraby, resident in Strickland Road Historic District commented that detached garages in relation to bungalows are common and there are four detached garages in the Strickland LHD (not counting Mill Pond).

Mr. Bishop agreed that having a detached garage is feasible.

### BUNGALOW

Mr. Flouty stated that initially the bungalow was to be a simple renovation with an additional garage. But with closer inspection, there is water damage to the foundation wall from run-off; the wiring is very old; there is no air conditioning; heating is through a radiator system and has old plumbing (which was added without permits and probably not up to code). Mr. Flouty continued, saying that the present windows are not viable; there is no storage space; the hip roof does not lend itself to easy expansion; the backyard may need a retaining wall; there is no garage; and the front porch, a nice feature, needs carpentry repair. Mr. Flouty asked is this house really worth keeping?? He continued saying that if he could find a way to tear it down and come up with a craftsman-style so it would like somewhat like the original house but have a second floor and then the garage can be integral in the building – would that be possible? Mr. Flouty said he would stop here and discuss this further at the next meeting.

Mr. Bishop agreed.

Faith Toraby, as a LHD resident, approves the idea of replacing the present house with a new bungalow-style. She further pointed out that there were several within the near vicinity to use as inspiration.

Mr. Bishop said that he would really appreciate hearing the consensus of the neighbors.

Ms. Toraby said that the neighbors are anxious that something be done and would support a new project.

Mr. Flouty said that he had quite a bit to go on and would return next month.

3. ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING  
124 Old Mill Road  
Greenwich, CT 06830  
Owner: Old Mill Farm, LLC  
Project Architect: Parisot Design, LLC

Review plans to rezone property from residential to RA-4 HO.

Mr. John Tesei began the presentation and identified and described the property. The property is approximately 76 acres that is down from its original parcel (“Old Mill

Farm”) of about 130 acres (and was on both sides of the Merritt Parkway as it was built prior to the Parkway). The main house remains intact. Mr. Tesei stated that he is appearing on behalf of the applicant to make an application to P&Z for a HO whereby the project that ensures the preservation of the main house by adapting portions of the property (per the regulation) to add additional dwellings to the property. The application is looking for the maximum number of additional units. Mr. Tesei stated that the applicant is not asking for any FAR bonus. In terms of land coverage, we are substantially under that. What we are doing is proposing a project that actually increases conservation land as well as the streetscape.

Mr. Tesei continued saying the new proposed buildings are all behind the existing buildings and/or natural landscaping. This project is basically hidden”. The applicant is preserving the building and existing streetscape.

Mr. Kagan asked that the structures that the applicant is proposing are all able to be built today? Mr. Tesei replied, no not all. 27 new units are being proposed but 19 would be allowed today.

Mr. Kagan then asked so the reason for wanting the HO is not for the FAR but for the additional dwelling units? Mr. Tesei confirmed.

Ms. Smith said so there will be a total of 29 on the property

Mr. Tesei confirmed

Ms. Smith said so then you are getting 10 extra houses.

Mr. Tesei confirmed

Mr. Crist inquired the FAR Tolerance Allowance.

Mr. Parisot (architect) replied that the design that HDC is viewing is in schematic stage and as the main house’s FAR has not been exactly determined, the term ‘FAR Tolerance Allowance’ is being used to allow for ‘wiggle room’ pending grade plane elevations.

Mr. Tesei said that the Director of Planning & Zoning suggest that the applicant come before HDC early on in the planning phase for commentary.

Mr. Toraby wanted to know the current status of the property.

Mr. Tesei replied that there is a subdivision of record that are presently four properties that are being proposed to merge back.

Mr. Toraby so we are seeing a project that is post merger.

Mr. Tesei confirmed.

Mr. Kagan asked which of the buildings re going to be demolished

Mr. Parisot replied the manor house, the log cabin, the caretaker’s cottage (which is a stone structure) remain. The stables are beyond keeping and will be demolished as well as the utility buildings, greenhouse and barn for trucks would be removed.

Ms. Smith asked what was to be done with the caretaker's cottage? Mr. Parisot responded that it would convert to a single-family residential house.

Mr. Kagan asked if there were historic value to the demolished buildings?  
Mr. Parisot responded no.

Ms. Smith asked if the existing tennis court go?  
Mr. Parisot confirmed. But we will keep the little pavilion and there will also be a new wellness center that the pavilion would be a part. A pool will go where the tennis court is.

Mr. Studer commented that there are some old stone foundations will be kept as well as all historic gardens will be kept. The present character will determine the style of the community. The new cluster houses will be subordinate to the Manor house – somewhat similar to a historic village.

Mr. Parisot provided a historic overview of the architectural style of the manor house.

Mr. Parisot went on to describe the design of the proposed new buildings that have three-unit types with a spring point roofline from the first floor. So they are no more than 31 to 32 feet high and will be subordinate to the manor house. They will be approx. 3,800-3,900 sq foot range (which also includes the garage) and set back. Stucco would be used up to the first floor line and then above that would be wood treatment.

Mr. Studer described the community style that is reminiscent of aspects of English villages (like Cotswold) incorporating stonewalls and trees. He continued saying that the large tennis court with stone pavilion will be a wellness center. Their encompassing stonewalls will be retained (as a definition of usage of property). The wellness center and guard gatehouse will be a part of the 27 units. Mr. Studer added that interesting buffers would be added for privacy (since the proposed housing is 'cluster housing'). Trees – substantial spruce trees – will be used as screening. Finally, the Manor House will extend its belvedere and new hedging to allow for privacy for the Manor. Existing paths and bridle trails will be maintained.

Mr. Studer stated that the landscape and environmental preservation is an equally important aspect alongside the historic preservation of the property's buildings.

Ms. McGinnis asked how the manor house's renovation is being handled.  
Mr. Parisot described the renovation planning that involved dealing with energy consumption; restoring the roof; redoing windows and doors and upgrading HVAC and essentially redoing the servants quarters.

Mr. Bishop asked if the applicant will also be obtaining an easement façade?  
Mr. Tesei confirmed.  
Mr. Bishop continued, so a façade easement on the exterior but anything on the inside?  
Mr. Tesei said that was doubtful.  
Mr. Bishop asked to reconfirm the preservation of the various facades that included:

the Manor, caretaker's cottage (community house), gardens around the pool area, front entrance, the allée of trees and fountain.

Mr. Parisot commented that the present service drive would be removed as well as the maze.

Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Tesei to speak on the Selleck Mill as he is concerned about its present debilitated condition.

Mr. Tesei agreed that the condition needs to be addressed and will be done.

Mr. Toraby commented who controls the destiny of the Manor? Mr. Tesei said it will be separate ownership but it still retains Historic Overlay based on the HO-Zone.

Mr. Toraby noted that the allocated land to the association is lovely but the association is not getting all the benefits of the land. It looks boxed in. Regarding the layout - the first cluster that has an inlet and outlet is quite pleasant. The others are dead ends. Those should be made more like the ones having inlets and outlets. And this creates a more open feeling.

Mr. Parisot responded that the design actually creates a sense of community and the cul-de-sac gives each cluster their own village green.

Mr. Toraby also commented favorably on the new house design(s).

Motion to endorse the plans presented that include:

- A façade easement for the main structure, caretaker's cottage and tennis court pavilion; and
- Preservation of the allée of trees and gardens; and
- As the proposed new construction is acting in harmony and has a spatial relationship with the buildings already present, the applicant does not need to return to the Historic District Commission for approval on new construction; and
- As the Commission was also made aware that the Selleck Mill (the second oldest mill structure in the State of Connecticut and listed on the National Register of Historic Places) is to receive stabilization, the members asked to receive a copy of its preservation plan.

Moved by Ms. Sheridan

Seconded by Ms. McGinnis

Unanimous vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Smith, Ms. McGinnis, Mr. Kagan, Mr. Crist

MINUTES

Motion to approve March 13, 2019 minutes

Moved by Mr. Bishop

Seconded by Mr. Toraby

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Smith, Ms. McGinnis, Mr. Kagan, Mr. Crist

DEMOLITIONS:

[note: any Greenwich resident may place a stay on a noticed demolition].

2 Patterson Avenue  
Greenwich, CT  
HDC, by unanimous vote, will place a stay on the above

68 Binney Lane  
Old Greenwich, CT

5 Indian Harbor Drive  
Greenwich, CT

99 East Elm  
Greenwich, CT

53 Edgewater Drive  
Old Greenwich, CT

Motion to end meeting  
Moved by Mr. Toraby  
Seconded by Ms. Sheridan  
Meeting adjourned at 10:45pm