

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING  
MAZZA ROOM  
GREENWICH, CT  
MAY 10, 2017

MINUTES

**ATTENDEES PRESENT**

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

ALTERNATES: MARTIN KAGAN, ANNIE MCGINNIS, SERENA BECHTEL

ABSENT: ARIS CRIST, MARIE WILLIAMS

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

\* \* \*

1. ADVISORY PLANNING & ZONING

24 East Elm Street

Owner: 24 East Elm LLC

Represented by: Andreas Stresemann, VP, Granoff Architects; William Haslun,  
Johnson, Haslun & Hogeman

Review proposed addition, including two new building entrances in existing  
openings and new side entry porch with ADA compliant ramp

Mr. Haslun began his presentation and reminded the Commission that this  
application had been seen approximately two years ago. The current plan has been  
altered to reflect residential housing in the rear (per P&Z recommendation). So, a  
total of four units of housing is being proposed (two in the rear), the cottage will  
be demolished and two other residential units (located above the retail) are to be  
refurbished.

Mr. Stresemann emphasized that the application was to keep the integrity of the  
existing building but the architecture of the addition will be designed to look more  
'residential' and will be mimicking the front (from the street – the front of the  
building -- the addition cannot really be seen). The design of the addition is to  
compliment the building but be modern in design so as to distinguish between the  
two as well as offer contemporary amenities. The shingle siding will be restored (as

seen in front) with the same white tonal color extending throughout and shutters will be added. Parking will remain under the building.

Ms. Bishop asked if there were drives on both sides. Mr. Stresemann responded that there was only one.

Ms. McGinnis asked about an unidentified 'piece' and its use. Mr. Stresemann responded that it was where the elevator and its facilities will be for the building.

Mr. Toraby inquired about the chimney. Mr. Stresemann could not confirm that the chimney was functioning but it will remain. Mr. Toraby commented that it looks like there were two chimneys and now there is one. Mr. Stresemann commented that the chimney in the rear of the building was removed but a facsimile chimney could be added should HDC required one.

Mr. Bishop asked for details regarding the windows. Mr. Stresemann responded that the window selection was done to separate the "historic" from the "new".

Mr. Bishop said looking at the proposed application, is it four gables with one acting a dormer? Mr. Stresemann said they are keeping the historic look of the existing house and then a transition into the more contemporary. Mr. Bishop responded that the rear is going to be very inconspicuous. Mr. Haslun interjected saying that not seeing the addition from the street was also a P&Z concern. Mr. Bishop said that as the rear of the building is inconspicuous, he did not have a strong feeling whether the proposed addition mimics the original structure and that, perhaps, it might be more appealing to break-up the design.

Ms. McGinnis inquired about the vertical element under the window. Mr. Stresemann responded that they are just wood slats and help to break up the architecture.

Mr. Bishop asked if the rear was going to be wood clapboard and painted? Mr. Stresemann said yes. Mr. Bishop commented that if the addition were to mimic the historic structure then the end-result would be similar to a long boarding house. Ms. Brown commented that the proposed design feels fresh. Ms. Bechtel added that you need the large windows next to the other buildings.

Mr. Toraby asked if the parking under the building was for residents? Mr. Haslun confirmed. Additionally, the parking in the front of the building will remain (for retail purpose) and there will be additional parking (seven spaces) below the building (which is also below grade).

Mr. Toraby then commented that he is confused by the way the applicant treated the fenestration, especially with the plate glass without muttons and further stated that the proposed plan has a lot of duality.

Mr. Bishop asked if the fenestration could be broken up or varied? Mr. Stresemann said yes. Mr. Toraby said there is room for improvement as it is currently being proposed, it is reminiscent of low income housing and you are taking away from the stature of the building. You could benefit from dividing it as it is a matter of proportionate design. Mr. Bishop agreed. Mr. Bishop suggested that the inclusion of a mutton or two could add quite a bit.

Mr. Bishop stated that the design of new fenestrations could be circulated and should be sent to him.

Ms. Sheridan commented that when you take the interior design into consideration, then the placement of the windows do make a great deal of sense and feels that they are functional. Mr. Bishop asked if the window design should be an upper or lower? Or a T? Or if there were more depth, perhaps that might make it more interesting?

Mr. Toraby asked about the type of roof on the existing structure. Mr. Stresemann said it was wood-shingle and that it would be continued on the addition.

Mr. Haslun stated that he would be happy to return if HDC wished to revisit the application.

Mr. Bishop stated that the members should be focused on the front of the building and hopes it is restored to its original design. Mr. Bishop continued by asking that in the original part, the windows are to be double hung and are going to be wood trim and simulated true divided light? Mr. Stresemann confirmed. Mr. Bishop then asked which manufacturer will be chosen. Mr. Haslun replied that the window material style and color as well as the shingle color and material will be circulated

Mr. Toraby asked if the columns in parking lot are solely concrete? Mr. Stresemann confirmed. Mr. Toraby suggested that the applicant may want to consider concrete and steel as it would help circulation to use heavier beams to eliminate the amount of columns.

Mr. Bishop commented that as a general statement, the applicant is heading in the right direction.

Motion to approve the design as submitted with the exception that the HDC would like to see a redesign of the window fenestration on the proposed addition and a materials list and samples of the original building and details of the windows (material style, color and manufacturer) and shingles (color and material) – with the actual materials being brought to HDC for approval which, at that point, final approval will be granted.

Moved by Mr. Bishop  
Seconded by Ms. McGinnis  
Unanimous vote

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

## 2. ADVISORY PLANNING & ZONING

140 Greenwich Avenue  
Owner: Willgreen Holdings LLC  
Represented by: Jim Sackett, VP, CPG Architects

Review proposal to convert vacant 2<sup>nd</sup> floor at the Annex to two residential apartments and remove existing car elevator, associated roof bulkhead and exterior fire escape

Mr. Sackett identified the building's location as where the current Tiffany's building is. Its first documentation appears on a 1920 map (Sanborn) but there has not been much documented history discovered on it. The building has been known as the "Annex" and is a two-story stone façade and is used as parking support for the main building.

The present owner hasn't put the second floor to use and presently would like to convert this area into two residential units. The applicant is going to apply for HO in the hopes to get some relaxation of additional parking.

Ms. McGinnis asked what the use is for the first floor? Mr. Sackett responded it remains as is -- valet parking (for the office building and, if approved, for the residents). The first floor can accommodate 16 cars and there is also a car elevator in the building (not in use).

Ms. McGinnis inquired if the site had any green space. Mr. Sackett responded that there is not any on the site but some may be created.

Mr. Sackett continued saying that three sides of the building are on property lines with zero setbacks. Variances will be sought so windows can be installed.

Mr. Sackett described the first floor to have a main entry point and include a fire stair, an elevator, a vestibule and small lobby and a two-foot planting strip will be included outside.

Continuing, the second floor there is a large open area that includes the car elevator space (which will be eliminated) and this is where the two apartment units are being proposed. The elevator will not go beyond this level. The mechanical equipment will be placed on the roof but low enough to be lower than the parapet. Talk with P&Z included having a stair to access the roof where green space may be added.

Mr. Sackett further suggested that a synthetic stucco will be used for the bulkhead of the stair and that the colors would be light and have asphalt shingles. The sectional door would be replaced with a similar overhead door to match the existing door.

The biggest façade change is the west façade (which fronts onto the municipal parking lot – where there are no presently windows at all). Mr. Sackett is proposing four sets of windows and eliminating the fire exit (all on the second floor). The south façade (which fronts St. Mary's parking lot) will have some symmetry between first and second floor. There are existing windows which were designed to look like an opening but not usable. At some point, some existing openings were enlarged to become windows. There will not be any change to first floor as its use is remaining the same.

Mr. Bishop asked if all the windows will match. Mr. Sackett responded yes, all windows are steel sash now with encasements. Mr. Bishop then asked if the muttons are steel? Mr. Sackett also confirmed that.

Continuing, Mr. Sackett spoke to the east façade that presently has existing window recesses and stone. That too will remain. The stone that is taken from the enlargements will be reused.

Mr. Sackett moved to the main entrance which will have its sectional door replaced but the transom and the woodwork wouldn't be touched. The air conditioner will also be removed.

Mr. Bishop asked about the plans for the door. Mr. Sackett said the opening is the same height as the arches. It will be a taller door, about 8 ½ feet high with a thinner mutton close to a steel sash. Mr. Bishop said then there are two garage doors? Mr. Sackett confirmed that both doors are entrances to the garage.

Mr. Toraby commented that the applicant's front entrance door may pose problems. Mr. Sackett responded that he hasn't gotten to that detail. The roof, which is not completely stable, hasn't been examined yet but will be with appropriate adjustments made.

Mr. Kagan asked about fireplaces and chimneys. Mr. Sackett responded that they are not being considered. There may be a possibility that gas units might be installed but that would not affect the exterior.

Ms. Sheridan asked about gas fumes and thickness between first and second floor to which Mr. Sackett said currently there is a large vent pipe but additional ventilation will be added.

Mr. Toraby is concerned about: the stone that is being cut into be preserved (and reused) and the roof material where the applicant could use the material being taken from the elevator bulkhead and use that instead of stucco.

Motion to approve the project in concept subject to final review and approval of materials and construction details.

Moved by Mr. Toraby

Seconded by Ms. Sheridan

Unanimous vote

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

### 3. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

38 Strickland Road, Cos Cob

Owner: John Kavounas Represented by: John Kavounas

Architect: Paul Hopper, Paul F. Hopper Associates

Continued from previous meeting. Review updated plans for exterior improvements to the rear of the house, windows and any open items

Mr. Kavounas presented the prominent change that show the elimination of the chimney, no lights on the caps (only on the wall) and on the east elevation has line on the windows while also having the windows on the second floor centered per the changes that had been asked.

Motion to approve changes as presented

Moved by Mr. Kagan

Seconded by Mr. Bishop

Unanimous vote

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

### 4. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

40 Strickland Road, Cos Cob

Owner: John Kavounas

Represented by: John Kavounas

Architect: Paul Hopper, Paul F. Hopper Associates

Continued from previous meeting. Review updated plans for exterior improvements to the rear of the house, windows and any open items

Mr. Kavounas stated the chimney has been eliminated, the trim pieces have been

removed, the edges on the corners remain and inset into the stucco. Furthermore, on the eastern side, the window light reflectors are added and we mirrored the window being used on the front and keep it authentic. The light on the caps are off, there is no light on top of the post and is now on the wall and is an under mount. The trim piece has been left alone

Mr. Bishop asked for confirmation that the windows are simulated and true dividing light. Mr. Kavounas confirmed.

Motion to approve changes as presented

Moved by Mr. Kagan

Seconded by Ms. McGinnis

Unanimous vote

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

#### MINUTES

Motion to approve minutes from April 12, 2017 meeting

Moved by Mr. Kagan

Seconded by Mr. Bishop

Unanimous vote

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

#### DEMOLITIONS

19 Home Place  
Greenwich, CT

1 Martindale Road  
Greenwich, CT

16 Knollwood  
Greenwich, CT

23 and 25 Woodland Drive  
Greenwich, CT

11 Pleasant Street  
Cos Cob, CT

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

Motion to end the meeting  
Moved by Mr. Bishop  
Seconded by Ms. Brown

Mr. Bishop closed the meeting at 8:50 pm