

FINAL MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Historic District Commission of the Town of Greenwich
Wednesday, April 11, 2018, 7:00pm
Mazza Room, Town Hall

ATTENDEES PRESENT

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

ALTERNATES: ANNIE MCGINNIS, SERENA BECHTEL, CYNTHIA SMITH

ABSENT: MARTIN KAGAN, MARIE WILLIAMS, KATHRIN BROWN

Mr. Bishop called meeting to order at 7:06pm:

1. PRESENTATION REGARDING THE NEW ZONING INCENTIVES FOR HISTORIC
PRESERVATION GIVEN BY KATIE DELUCA, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & ZONING

2. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

9 Normandy Lane, Riverside, CT 06878 (Historic Overlay)

Owner: Robin and Jim Carey

Represented by: Andrew Kotchen, Workshop/ADP Architecture DPC

Review proposal to repaint all existing windows, replace all existing doors to match, revise glass lite layout and replace entry and patio doors with new design to fit aesthetic of existing house

Mr. Kotchen reminded the members that the house was fully renovated 14 years ago with a new addition added to the rear of the home. He is here this evening to receive approval to change the color of the sash of the windows and doors (all the trim would remain white) and switch out several of the doors of the house with new doors and modify the light pattern within the doors. The south elevation displays the historic part of the house (which can be seen from Normandy Lane) and shows doors that are divided with muntins coming across. Currently they are 10 light panels and the applicant proposes to convert them to 4 light panels.

Mr. Bishop asked if any members of the HDC had questions.

Mr. Toraby asked what the motivation was for the change.

Mr. Kotchen replied that all the windows of the house (which are to remain as is) are two over two. The doors need to be replaced due to age. The applicant wants to switch the doors to the proposed divided light pattern, as that is more in keeping

with the existing windows. Mr. Kotchen further added that the chimney that wasn't original to the house would be removed as well.

Mr. Toraby commented that the original doors were in the same spirit as the windows that the applicant is calling original and felt that these should be in the same design vernacular.

Mr. Kotchen agreed to that design suggestion.

Mr. Bishop asked if everyone understood the suggestion. Mr. Kotchen clarified and said that the alteration would be taking this window and divide it three down and one up so that the length is more consistent across.

Ms. McGinnis offered that the balance of the divided light on main door is more attractive than the long panels. Within the window it makes sense but these elongated panels do not make sense proportionately.

Mr. Toraby said the same comment could be applied to the long sidelights, as they are too modern looking. While it works with the muntins in some places in others, it becomes too 'much' and should be blank panels.

Mr. Kotchen suggested adding three panels and eliminate the sidelights (not being proposed).

Mr. Toraby felt that this would make the design more consistent.

Mr. Toraby then inquired about the color change and Mr. Kotchen replied just the sash everywhere would go to black and all the door units would be black with white trim. Mr. Toraby asked why black was chosen and Mr. Kotchen responded that black was a nice look and a very historic thing to do in some areas.

Mr. Bishop said that that proposal would be a plus and give it a 'barny' look.

Ms. Smith suggested that "black black" disappears into the window and felt that the applicant should consider another color, perhaps a deep gray.

Mr. Toraby asked if there was a sketch rendering or a sample and the applicant did not have one on hand. But Mr. Kotchen did produce a Farrow & Ball sample, "railing" for consideration.

Motion regarding on the east and west elevation changes to occur to the three windows on the gable end to six divided light units. On the south elevation the three large door openings will have the sidelights removed and converting them into three equal-sized panels with four light glazing with a fixed panel below to match the proportions of the front door. Further the sash and door leaves are to be

changed to the color gray (called "Railings" by Farrow & Ball). Additionally, the chimney will be removed and the proposed front door will be wood.

Moved by Ms. Sheridan

Seconded by Mr. Toraby

Unanimous vote

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

Mr. Bishop stated that he would sign off on the plans subject to his review of the proposed changes.

3. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

140 Greenwich Avenue, Greenwich, CT 06830 (Greenwich Historic District -NRHP)

Owner: Willgreen Holdings LLC

Represented by: Jim Sackett, VP, CPG Architects

Tim Wetmore presenting

Review proposal to change window material from steel to aluminum on previously approved application

Postponed from March meeting.

The proposal of 140 Greenwich Avenue was approved by HDC in September 2017. Mr. Wetmore introduced drawings of windows produced by Diamond Window (Casement 5200 from the Steel Replica 5000 series) that are steel replicas. This is in keeping with the look, muntins and windows.

Motion to approve the aluminum version with smaller frame and muntin profile as presented and manufactured by Diamond Window of Boston (Casement 5200 from the Steel Replica 5000 series)

Moved by Mr. Toraby

Seconded by Ms. McGinnis

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

[Ms. Bechtel was not present for the vote]

4. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

50 East Putnam Avenue, Greenwich, CT 06830 (NRHP, HO)

Owner: YMCA of Greenwich

Represented by: Katherine LoBalbo of Perkins Eastman and Jonathan Metz

Review proposal for new terrace doors.

Ms. LoBalbo updated HDC on the building's restoration and improvements and indicated that there were two options for the HDC to review and then select.

Ms. LoBalbo stated that the present windows are not original. The proposal comes from attempts to match from historic photographs. What is there today is not a true divided single glass and not energy efficient nor is it historically accurate.

Mr. Metz stated that the original design of the building's windows and doors do not comply with today's building codes and that the doors will have a thicker frame but the transoms would remain the same and thus ensure their continuity especially as the doors (on Mason Street and Route 1 operate differently due to their casements).

Ms. LoBalbo described an existing coating on the steps that contained moisture – forcing corrosion of the steps that is now a problem.

Mr. Bishop agreed that at some point the steps should be discussed but steered the applicant and members back to discussing the appropriateness of the proposed windows and transoms.

Mr. Crist asked for clarification on whether the Café is going to have three or four sets of doors. Ms. LoBalbo responded that it was to have three. Mr. Crist identified that the window to the right is being described as a door. Ms. LoBalbo clarified the design.

Discussion revolved around describing the two submitted options.

Mr. Toraby opined that there are a large variety of openings on the building. Each opening has to be respectful to its own construction and design pattern. Therefore, the applicant cannot say that all the transoms have to be the same. Some transoms simply do not belong to some openings. Therefore each opening should be uniquely designed. Therefore Option #2 is his preference.

After hearing Mr. Metz describe the history of the building's transom, Mr. Bishop stated that he felt the applicant clearly preferred Option #1. Mr. Metz confirmed.

Mr. Toraby then asked if Option #2 (the transoms matching the doors option) if the transoms were in different in other locations, would the applicant have made them less different? If you are in a space and you are looking at all the transoms, the transoms going over the door can be different and that's what it should be.

Mr. Metz stated that there are other windows with different transoms. In this case we are trying to match openings that we feel architecturally are similar except that one set of openings has casements and one set of openings has doors.

Mr. Toraby felt that the uniqueness of the building deserves custom-made doors.

Mr. Bishop said that whether the doors last or are uniquely crafted, that is a quality issue. So when you have to replace a door, you do so and that is not within HDC's purview.

Mr. Toraby stated if the transom lights do not match the door lights, it looks as though you only changed the doors and not the transoms.

Mr. Bishop moved the discussion to a vote for either Option #1 or #2. As no one began the discussion Mr. Bishop continued and said that the choice is difficult and therefore, in this instance, it would be prudent to defer to architects on the job and owners of the building – their choice.

Mr. Bishop then asked the HDC members for their choice of options. Ms. Smith, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Bechtel and Mr. Bishop selected Option #1 (which is preferred by the applicant). Mr. Toraby and Ms. McGinnis selected Option #2 (Mr. Crist recused himself).

Mr. Toraby then stated that if the ownership approved Option #1, then he supports the decision of the ownership.

Motion to approve Option #1 as shown on plans presented

Moved by Ms. Smith

Seconded by Ms. Sheridan

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Smith, Ms. Bechtel, Ms. Sheridan

Opposed: Mr. Toraby, Ms. McGinnis

Mr. Crist abstained as he had recused himself from the vote

Mr. Bishop then moved the discussion to the applicant's request to HDC on their recommendation of what materials should be used to replace the exterior steps.

Mr. Toraby asked if the present material was concrete and if that was original. The applicants confirmed.

Mr. Metz said he would be happy to consider granite, porcelain - a more durable material and can be made to look like stone. Mr. Metz further added, as the coating has now become part of the stone, the stone is damaged beyond repair and must be replaced. The coating cannot be separated/removed.

Ms. Smith said stone is stone and can work very nicely and should be considered.

Mr. Bishop would like to see examples of stone alternatives – the porcelain as discussed, granite etc and then a recommendation can be made.

5. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

1139 King Street, Greenwich, CT 06830 (Historic Overlay)

Owner: Eric Claycomb and Danielle Cervi

Represented by: Eric Claycomb

Review proposal to replace entire sun porch due to structural issues and replace it with a pitched roof to match the house; change the entry door to the front of the house; add a 7.5' dormer on the pitched roof to allow the staircase inside to be updated to code standards; extend the baby dormers out 3' to allow for usable windows; extend dormer on back of the house to match the new proposed dormer and allow new windows to be added and be functional

Mr. Bishop identified the house as being a part of the Chieftains property.

Mr. Claycomb brought to the attention of the HDC members the sunroom/shed (on the side) that was added in 1964. He continued by saying that the shed is now a hazard and must be removed. He is proposing to replace it and is seeking approval for a different roof style (from the current shed style). Additionally, he proposes to move the entrance that is presently on the east side to the north side. A 15 X 24 foot structure would be the replacement (no change to size) with a gable roof.

Ms. McGinnis asked if you are moving the line forward – it looks like you are losing a window. Mr. Claycomb confirmed as once you are in the house, it isn't needed. The proposed door would act as a main entry.

Questions from members arose regarding work that has been completed. Mr. Claycomb stated that all the windows on the first floor had been replaced but not on the second floor.

HDC members asked to see the existing floor plan and proposed footprint to better assist the applicant.

Ms. McGinnis asked about the applicant's proposal regarding the second floor ("baby") dormers. Mr. Claycomb stated that the bottom of the window is about 6 feet high. He is hoping to push the dormers out a few feet (down the roof line) in order to get a lower window. Mr. Claycomb also stated that he is keeping the chimney.

Mr. Bishop proceeded to outline what the applicant needed to present so the HDC members could best understand the appropriateness of the proposed alterations: included are a proposed footprint and floor plan.

Mr. Bishop suggested that the applicant speak to P&Z to better understand the FAR that the property affords and whether a bonus based upon the recently adopted HO incentives could be applied.

Mr. Claycomb asked what HDC thought about his proposed changes to the dormers. Mr. Bishop responded that if they are matched and moved down (Ms. Smith interjected that she wanted to see more pictures). Mr. Bishop said that the concept

of extending the dormers is approved but drawings need to be submitted in order to better understand the reality of the proposal. The proposed dormer on the rear does not have a decision – pending upon submitted drawing and meeting with P&Z to determine if there is appropriate FAR to allow for the addition. The decision on the shed is left open pending the submission of a footprint and floor plan.

Applicant to return.

MINUTES

Motion to approve Feb 7, 2018 minutes

Moved by Mr. Toraby

Seconded by Ms. Bechtel

Unanimous vote

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

DEMOLITIONS

131 Old Mill road
Greenwich, CT
1930

5 Sheephill road
Riverside, CT

24 East Elm (rear)
Greenwich

9 Bryon Road
Old Greenwich

93 East Elm
Greenwich

73 Willowmere Lane
Riverside

77 Strickland Road
Cos Cob

306 Valley road
Cos Cob

135 Milbank Avenue
Greenwich

Motion to end meeting

Moved by Ms. McGinnis

Seconded by Mr. Toraby

Meeting adjourned at 10:17pm