

MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Historic District Commission of the Town of Greenwich
Wednesday, May 9, 2018, 7:00pm
Mazza Room, Town Hall

ATTENDEES PRESENT

COMMISSIONERS: STEPHEN BISHOP – CHAIRMAN, ARIS CRIST, KATHRIN BROWN

ALTERNATES: ANNIE MCGINNIS, MARTIN KAGAN, MARIE WILLIAMS (late 7:07)

ABSENT: DARIUS TORABY, FI FI SHERIDAN, SERENA BECHTEL, CYNTHIA SMITH,

Mr. Bishop called meeting to order at 7:05pm:

1. 1 Lafayette Court (Greenwich Avenue Historic District, NRHP, non-contributing structure)
Greenwich, CT
Represented by: William I Haslun II, Johnson, Haslun & Hogeman, LLP

Review proposed doorway design for entrance on West Putnam Avenue

Mr. Granoff (lead architect) began the presentation announcing that per HDC instruction, he is returning with a proposed plan to create a doorway that will face West Putnam Avenue. The bay windows will remain and the new door will match two other doors of the building. He further stated the door on the Lafayette Street side is a traditional panel door with a light above and is matching another door that is there. He proposes to use the same head and it will not be dressed up (as the West Putnam entrance is not considered to be the main entrance due to a low rate of pedestrian traffic) as the main entrance is on the parking lot side.

Mr. Bishop asked for further detail for the bottom of the door. Mr. Granoff responded that it was a raised panel – an inset panel that matches the other door – similar to a Shaker design.

Motion to approve design submitted for May 9, 2018 HDC meeting

Moved by Ms. McGinnis
Seconded by Mr. Kagan

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

Unanimously approved

2. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
1139 King Street, Greenwich, CT 06830 (Historic Overlay)
Owner: Eric Claycomb and Danielle Cervi
Represented by: Eric Claycomb

Review proposal to remove current 9'X24' sun porch with a shed roof and replace with a 15'X24' extension with a gable roof and 7.5' wide dormer on the south side of the house.

Per Mr. Claycomb's application, he stated that he would like to remove the sun porch (existing side porch) located on the east side (which is not part of the original house – it being added c1960s) which would allow for a new stairway (that would be brought up to code) and also allow access to the basement. In order to do this, Mr. Claycomb stated that he would need to apply for the 25% bonus increase of FAR that is available through the newly adopted incentives for Historic Overlay. Mr. Claycomb clarified that he would not need the full 25% but is looking for a consideration bonus of under 200 square feet (as there is being proposed a cathedral style ceiling and not an additional floor).

Mr. Claycomb guided the members through his submitted packet. He would like to remove the shed style roof and have a gable roof in its place. The second picture is an open floor plan for the second floor (no changes to the house there). The third page (the first floor layout) – the use of this is for access and egress to the house. A stairway and half bath will be added and some closets. The next sheet shows access to the basement with an entry way from the outside. The front view of the house will remain (including the columns) but a gabled roof is being proposed and a railing will be there. The next page shows a window on the additional portion and a dormer is also visible with a matching dormer to be added. Nothing will be altered or changed on the right side of the house (facing King Street). The left side of the house will retain the circular window although it would be removed and then added to the proposed extension. Mr. Claycomb hoped that he could get double paned glass to make the window more energy efficient. The side view also includes a 4 foot 8 in overhang that matches what the house and porch look like now (making it a continuous pitch).

Ms. McGinnis asked to go back to page 10. She stated that the half moon window in the front is new (which Mr. Claycomb confirmed) and felt that the little roof looked bizarre in its present design state. She asked if the applicant could close in or not do a window there? Mr. Claycomb responded that when he took the window out, only siding remained there. Ms. McGinnis suggested just doing a porch in front and thus continuing the roof . . . Mr. Claycomb interrupted saying that suggestion would eat into his FAR.

Mr. Crist interjected saying that if he kept the porch open. He further explained that Mr. Claycomb could bring it out and match the other side and that will not count towards FAR.

Mr. Claycomb stated that he was told that his porch does count towards FAR by the Building Department. Mr. Crist responded that it doesn't. That it counts towards coverage but not FAR. Mr. Claycomb responded that he preferred Mr. Crist's solution and interpretation of the regulations but was still unsure as a directum was issued to him by Zoning in the Building Department.

Mr. Bishop stated that for zoning and FAR, Mr. Claycomb should adhere to P&Z and their interpretations. Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Crist to elaborate on his proposal.

Mr. Crist suggested that the roof match the porch - match the 15 foot extension to the porch so that it will 'come out, go in and come out'.

Mr. Bishop commented that to keep the house more authentic is to keep what is presently there.

Ms. Williams suggested that a third dormer should be added and it would be well received by HDC.

No member of HDC likes the half round window and would appreciate if FAR is made available, that the third dormer be created to present a 'clean' visual and better accent the architectural heritage of the house.

Mr. Claycomb stated that the 'baby dormers' (as seen on the front of the house) are not going to be moved now. Mr. Bishop was pleased with that decision.

Ms. McGinnis inquired about the steps' materials. Mr. Claycomb responded that they will be wooden steps to match the porch. They will not be that long as presented. Ms. McGinnis inquired that when you exit from the house there, do you want to go straight? Mr. Claycomb responded that he wanted to turn as the driveway is alongside the house. Ms. McGinnis suggested that if you do the porch, then the stairs could be on the side. Mr. Claycomb agreed to that idea.

Mr. Claycomb also wants to add another dormer to the rear - should they be connected or should it be having two separate dormers? Presently, there is one dormer. HDC members like having two separate dormers in the rear. Mr. Bishop stated that the dormers are charming and assist in giving the historic nature to the house.

Mr. Bishop said that as one of the dormers would be new, he would be amiable to having the present dormer shifted slightly to allow for appropriate spacing and symmetry.

Mr. Bishop stated that he is worried about voting on portions of the project if P&Z confirms the Building Department's FAR interpretation. Therefore he wants to limited the approval so that the applicant's time isn't wasted. Additionally, he stated that if the applicant needs to replace the columns, he can use fiber-glass but they all must match.

Motion for the applicant to create a new porch off the new wing of the house extending the roofline to match the existing porch and all other details including columns, railing to match (as well as the foundation); additionally that a third dormer will be added; the present half moon window will be eliminated and the rear. The existing window will be moved to the extended addition. Further, the windows will match and the dormers (which are considered very important) will contain real muntins which also includes that addition of a new independent rear dormer. Finally, the foundation will have siding to grade and below that will be concrete but the front elevation of the house cannot show cement block and the suggestion of a stone veneer to disguise it is acceptable.

Moved by Ms. McGinnis
Seconded by Mr. Kagan

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

Unanimously approved

3. 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 revised plans based on comments from April 11, 2018 HDC meeting 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.

Applicant produced all suggested changes given by HDC and application is considered approved.

MINUTES

Motion to approve April 11, 2018 minutes

Moved by Ms. McGinnis
Seconded by Mr. Bishop

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Crist, Ms. McGinnis

[note: other attending HDC members Ms. Brown, Mr. Crist, Mr. Kagan were not present at the April 11th meeting]

Unanimously approved

Mr. Bishop alerted the HDC membership that he received a call from Greenwich Historical Society advising him that the present wood shingle roof of the Justus Luke Bush storehouse is to be replaced with like kind new wood shingles. This is considered an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Motion to approve the replacement of the present wood shingle roof of the Justus Luke Bush storehouse with like kind new wood shingles.

Moved by: Mr. Bishop

Seconded by: Ms. Williams (filling in for Ms. Sheridan)

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Crist, Ms. Williams (filling in for Ms. Sheridan), Ms. McGinnis (filling in for Mr. Toraby)

DEMOLITIONS

180 Stanwich road
Greenwich, CT c1920s

38 Meadowbank road
Old Greenwich, CT

Motion to end meeting

Moved by Mr. Kagan

Seconded by Ms. Brown

Meeting adjourned at 8:06 pm