

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING
TOWN HALL MEETING ROOM
GREENWICH, CT
JUNE 8, 2016

MINUTES

ATTENDEES PRESENT

COMMISSIONERS: STEPHEN BISHOP – CHAIRMAN, NOBLE WELCH, FI FI
SHERIDAN, DARIUS TORABY

ALTERNATES: JENNIFER KOSSLER HAOUARI, MARIE WILLIAMS (ARRIVED
7:31pm)

ABSENT: ARIS CRIS, LLOYD HULL, KATHRIN BROWN,

Mr. Bishop called meeting to order at 7:15pm.

* * *

1. 50 EAST PUTNAM AVENUE
GREENWICH, CT

REPRESENTED BY: CARL ORDEMANN, PERKINS EASTMAN ARCHITECTS, DPC
OWNER: YMCA OF GREENWICH

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Review plans to replace windows and approve brick and slate.

[YMCA appeared before the HDC in Feb 2016 and returned as requested with the suggestions suggested by HDC -- MOTION:

A motion that the submittal be approved as presented with the provision that before construction gets underway, members of the Historic District Commission will visit the site and see and review samples of brick, mortar, slate and capping and approve said samples].

Mr. Bishop commented that the materials (the brick, slate and cement mortar) that were on view at the site for HDC members to see were good matches.

Motion to approve the proposed installation of brick and mortar joints where the brickwork is being replaced at the site (50 East Putnam Avenue), the proposed metal capping over the existing slate sills with the provision that there be a slight

extension over the front face and the slate examples as seen at the site (50 East Putnam Avenue) which match the existing slate.

Moved by Mr. Toraby
Seconded by Ms. Sheridan

Unanimous vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Kossler Haouari, Mr. Toraby

The applicant then focused the application on the window selection. Originally, the Master Plan called for the prioritizing of replacing the windows on the Mason Street and East Putnam Avenue first. However, none of the original windows remain. What exists are aluminum windows that do not possess any historic character nor are they energy efficient (being single-paned glass). Based upon historic photographs, the applicant is proposing a simulated division that provides a historic 'depth' look that would have been used 'back in the day'. Another part of the Master Plan (third phase) is to put the windows back in the gym façade but that will be submitted at a later date.

The current proposal has 1¼ mutton, as a thicker looking mutton will hold up to the character of the building. The windows are aluminum clad and will not have a screen as historically screens were not used.

A Norwood window was brought in as an example that had an aluminum clad exterior and white finished interior.

The applicant stated that the project has 18 different window types and that the windows would be simulated for energy reasons.

Motion to approve window sample as shown at present meeting to HDC ("Norwood" example).

Moved by Mr. Toraby
Seconded by Mr. Welch

Unanimous vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Kossler Haouari, Mr. Toraby

2. 299 GREENWICH AVENUE
GREENWICH, CT

OWNER: TOWN OF GREENWICH

Approve final plans and brick

[moved to the final agenda item]

3. 47 STRICKLAND ROAD
COS COB, CT

PRESENTED BY: DEBRA MECKY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, GREENWICH HISTORICAL SOCIETY & BRUCE COHEN

REPRESENTED BY: BRUCE F. COHEN, ESQ., FOGERTY COHEN SLEBY & NEMIROFF LLC

OWNER: GREENWICH HISTORICAL SOCIETY, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Review plans to consolidate the Society's land into one 77,011 square foot parcel and 1) restore the structure's 1900 appearance as "Toby's Tavern"; 2) demolish existing archives building and construct new archives/gallery building behind the renovated "Toby's Tavern"; 3) construct new parking lot and re-stripe existing radial parking lot; and 4) add landscaping and site improvements to expand usable lawn areas and provide better ADA accessibility

Mr. Cohen stated that the Planning & Zoning Commission heard the site plan application at their meeting last month and gave it their approval that also included the consolidation of several lots. Mr. Cohen related the history of the properties – the Historical Society of the Town of Greenwich acquiring the Bush-Holley House (#39 Strickland Road in 1957), the Justus Bush House, and an empty parcel acquired from the Connecticut State Department of Transportation. All these are being consolidated to become one campus. To this parcel, the semi-circular parking lot will be joined as the Connecticut State Department of Transportation has leased this to the Greenwich Historical Society that now allows the applicant to come to the HDC with a single project (that incorporates the entire campus).

Mr. Cohen then introduced Debra Mecky and she began her presentation with a visual power point. Her presentation included a history of the Historical Society's acquisition of several buildings beginning in 1957 and ending with its most recent purchase of 47 Strickland Road, "Toby's Tavern", in 2012 [these acquisitions were at one time landholdings owned by the Bush family] and a layout of the current buildings.

Dr. Mecky continued by stating that the property acquisitions prompted the Historical Society to produce a study to determine the site's best use to tell the history of the Art Colony and the history of the Town and stay true to the Historical Society's mission. The study identified current obstacles to success that included:

difficulty to access, insufficient parking, no single point of entry, treacherous walkways, below grade facilities as well as having outgrown the current storage facilities in archives (some materials are stored offsite). The current proposal offers an orientation gallery to best tell the story of the Art Colony prior to visiting the Bush-Holley House, a repurpose storehouse for offices, a new exhibition gallery (to better showcase fine art) and allow space for the segregation of archives and collections (to have all archival collections on site with the use of compact storage units that would provide for a 50-75 year growth in archival collections).

David Scott Parker, the project architect, continued the presentation and offered that the Historical Society presently operates out of four separate structures in order to fulfill the Historical Society mission and purpose. The recently acquired property at 47 Strickland through its proposed adaptive reuse will solve many of the current obstacles.

A Historic Structures' Report was produced in 2013. The earliest portions of #47 date the building to 1805. Further studies provided how the building evolved over time. The railroad arrived in 1848 and the building was transformed in 1854/55 and continued until its next renovation c1935 (this time frame being the most significant time of this structure). Further the building played a vital role both in Cos Cob and the Art Colony. Today it is a 2-family house with a 3-car garage. The building is being proposed to be restored to the Cos Cob Art Colony era and continue the historic nature of the site and will be referred to as "Toby's" or "Toby's Tavern" as Childe Hassam rendered it in an etching entitled "Toby's". The examination of #47 Strickland road included photographs which produced information that will be used in the buildings restoration that include how many clapboards were used on the building's side and the type of windows. Once restored it will be an import asset to the Historical Society and help restore the historic integrity of the site. Additionally, a barn existed behind Toby's from 1837 to 1929 (as seen in aerial documentation).

Another component to the site's success is parking. The current parking lot has 22 spaces. The recently acquired parking will allow a doubling of parking (48 spaces) and have an at grade access to Toby's Tavern and will serve as a portal to the site. Visitors will be able to walk to a lobby entrance (where an interior elevator will provide ADA access to all the structures on the site).

The proposal calls for once the construction/restoration of Toby's has been completed and the new archives' facility has been built then the present archives building will be removed (restoring open space that was there during the Art Colony era). Thus, the streetscape will essentially be what was at the late 19th century. Further, in restoring the site, the Historical Society is also opening up green area and allowing visitors to see a more historically accurate space.

Mr. Scott then specifically addressed 47 Strickland Road.

- The building was given this appearance in 1935 by essentially cutting off the top part of the building.
- The floorboards still remain.
- The roof of Toby's is essentially where the current peak of the structure is today (the exact height of Toby's).
- The porch, lean-to and window locations are original to the 1850s.
- The building was re-clapboarded with the original clapboard being 4 ½ inches (all uniform, not randomized width).
- Bay windows were on the lower level (today's garage doors).

Mr. Welch asked if the north side of the building had windows. Mr. Scott replied no. While there is an attempt to restore Toby's there is not enough information to restore the barns with detail but the applicant will use as a basis to create the same "barn massing" based on the 1929 aerial photograph.

Mr. Toraby asked if the chimney (Toby's) will be active? Mr. Scott replied no.

Mr. Bishop asked if the barns would be period style. Mr. Scott replied that the barns and the inclusion of a cupola are based on period photographs. Mr. Scott further stated that the proposed wood shingles would be an 8-inch cedar.

For Toby's, Mr. Scott stated:

- Glass in lobby is frameless and tinted.
- The stonework will be a granite that will match granite walls on the site
- The structure will be more of a field stone and not so squared off.
- Shutters would be louvered.
- Real wood clapboard would be used.
- The windows will be energy efficient and will be Marvin windows with a 7/8 mutton.

Mr. Bishop stated that there is a lot of exposed stonework and attention must be made to that. Mr. Scott said that the current 18th century stonework on the site is dash pointed.

The retaining walls as currently seen in the present structure [in front of Toby's] are original to the 1855 period (when the structure was expanded and required walls to be built in the front). The proposal is that the stonework that is on the face and on the face of the proposed barn structure would be of that character as the barn was built in 1837-1848. So it would be appropriate to match the stonework.

The current low garden wall (of the Bush-Holley House) made of stone is of a different date and provides a different texture. And having different creation dates provides a sense of texture.

The posts that support the lobby would be more of a dressed character – the same granite that the base building is made of – with consistent color. Tooling would vary as the construction dates differed for the various building.

Mr. Toraby asked about the existing fireplaces. Mr. Scott replied that it would be removed as it was added in 1935. Mr. Toraby said that the fireplace brings you back to the historical ambience. Mr. Toraby asked if it could be recreated at the second floor level? Mr. Scott replied that the one that they are restoring would be recreated from the third floor up but the one that runs up the back of the building would be removed.

Mr. Scott mentioned that a fence that ran between storehouse and Toby's. The fence will be recreated with various heights and would be painted wood (based on historic photographs).

Mr. Scott then introduced John Conte (Conte & Conte Landscape Architects) to discuss the landscaping.

Mr. Conte began by stating that the planting in the parking area was the designated area of importance. The philosophy that was chosen for the overall plan is understated with light footprint approach. This is an exercise in letting the architecture speak for itself. London Plane trees are best suited for a streetscape side tree as it can withstand the 195 pollutants. Red Oaks will be chosen for near the entry. Along the back, Norway Spruce and White Pine are used to section off the site from the neighbors.

Mr. Toraby asked if there would be any walls or fences near the property line? Mr. Conte said that he was only responsible for plant material. The utility unit will have a fence around it and Spruce trees and large Junipers will be used to 'soften', camouflage, that.

Mr. Welch asked how do you handle the slope between the two parking lots? Mr. Conte responded that it is a continuous slope and the civil engineer has designed a two-tier effect for parking with a retaining wall in between. The retaining wall is to be cast concrete (not stone) and will be colored to look like a stone which is also a cost-saving measure.

Mr. Toraby asked for a location description of the fencing. Mr. Conte responded that a picket fence would run from Toby's to the Storehouse and that is the only fence other than the one going around the chiller which will be a cedar and will be helping to camouflage that.

Mr. Toraby then asked Mr. Conte how he personally felt about the inclusion of the 'fake' stonewall. Mr. Conte responded that he had given it a considerable amount of thought and that while that type of concrete faux stone can be garish, there has been progress made about that material being used towards making it 'less garish'. The

manufacturer that was chosen has proven to be very reliable about matching color and texture so that the final affect is almost a non-event. Additionally, vines will be added to soften the look.

Mr. Toraby then asked why not use plain concrete and cover it with plants and thereby avoiding this expensive material? Mr. Scott responded that it was well thought out but considering the scale and the mission towards keeping a domestic scale the choice became one that necessitated being able to control the color and texture which concrete did not provide.

Mr. Welch asked if all the stonewalls on the property would be retained? Mr. Scott responded yes.

Mr. Bishop then opened the application to public comments.

Suzanne Branch Martin, property owner in Strickland Road Local Historic District, expressed concern over the application that is blending modern architectural elements into a local historic district area that affects the streetscape. Further she posed the question, what would prevent a homeowner within the Strickland Road Local Historic District from proposing the same drastic changes that the Historical Society is posing as they (HS) are setting a precedent.

Mr. Scott responded that the members of the HS are concerned about all things historic and complied with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards that new editions should distinguish themselves from the old. They should be complementary but slavishly copying the old. So in the restoration of Toby's, the client referenced the Secretary of the Interior's Standards on Restoration and Adaptive Re-Use. The other structures referenced the Compatibility section (of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards).

Mr. Scott went on to discuss that the use is a permitted use even though it is in a residential zone. And it is also an issue with compatibility, character and scale. The structures create the volumes that were there but are separate to keep the scale.

Faith Toraby, property owner in Strickland Road Local Historic District, asked to bring up a relative point and that regarded the Secretary of the Interior and the Y.M.C.A. and the natatorium where the natatorium, a new structure, did reference the Y.M.C.A. building. Further, on the flip side, was her inclusion of a garage (where none had existed before) and that the HDC felt that similar to the Y.M.C.A./natatorium that it should be a modern addition but Ms. Toraby felt that in regards to residential structures, this should not be the norm. Ms. Toraby concluded that for public structures seeking to add, following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards is appropriate.

Mr. Toraby commended the Historical Society for its diligence in creating a successful plan and presentation.

Mr. Scott proceeded then to discuss the additions of lanterns to the site that will match those that are already in existence (currently on the wooden posts).

Mr. Bishop stated that as this vote is for a Certificate of Appropriateness, the following members will be voting – Mr. Bishop, Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Welch and will be joined by Mr. Toraby and Ms. Kossler Haouari.

Motion to move the application as presented.

Moved by Ms. Sheridan

Seconded by Mr. Toraby

Unanimous vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Kossler Haouari, Mr. Toraby

4. 117 GREENWICH AVENUE
GREENWICH, CT

PRESENTED BY: PETER HELMES AND MICHELE CRONIN

REPRESENTED BY: PETER J. HELMES, AIA, THE HELMES GROUP, LLP

OWNER: 117 GREEN LLC

ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING

Review revised plans for storefront including historic sills and traditional recessed panels under bay windows, transom windows above entry doors and signage/lettering, all as related to the request for Historic Overlay designation.

Mr. Helmes began his presentation by recapping past meeting highlights that included the accommodation of as many of HDC's requests as possible.

The applicant has provided a bracket that is consistent to the 1909 photograph. A detail was developed that keeps the cornice detail as tight as what the photo shows and is 1' 6" out (rather than the 2' 2"). We tucked the awning up and the cornice still provides protection for the awning.

Another comment was to try and accommodate the transom lights above the doors. Detail #3 on Drawing #2 shows the ability of seeing the transom window (above the door).

The other item incorporated into the plan is to mimic the panels and the approximate height of the existing panels to the 1909 photograph. Also included are the door panels keeping consistent with the height of the window panels. Additionally, the rounded appliques are being replicated as well as the inset molding and recessed panel below the two bay windows.

Also in the 1909 photograph are applied moldings in the sidewall. The Detail on Page 2 shows the rendering that mimics the ones seen in the 1909 photograph (the door was at a much lower level on the street).

In regard to the overall façade, Mr. Helmes began with a simple awning with no scalloping on the bottom and the color being proposed is 'Captain Navy' with simple white 6 inch lettering. The color will match the decorative top cornice as well as the shutters. P&Z requested that the applicant keep the louvered shutters. So the shutters will be primed, sanded, painted and reinstalled with the existing hinges.

The cornice band will be a one-color tone with a white trim that will match the Azek.

The storefront color and the building color will be a regular mill-finished aluminum color tone (a painted finish on the aluminum).

Mr. Bishop asked if the brackets would look like the old ones? Mr. Helmes responded affirmatively.

Mr. Bishop then inquired asked about the shutter dogs and whether there was a need or not. Mr. Helmes said they were to be included as they are seen in the 1909 photo.

Mr. Toraby mentioned that the nails may start to corrode and suggested that nails used be should be stainless. Mr. Helmes agreed.

Mr. Toraby then inquired about the railings. Mr. Helmes said that the railings would remain and that they are bronze. The handle for the door will match the railings (both being bronze).

Mr. Toraby asked if there would be an exterior lighting. Mr. Helmes responded that none would be used as no exterior lighting is permitted on the building.

Mr. Bishop stated that the lower brackets would be a great improvement.

Mr. Toraby asked about two steps. Mr. Helmes stated that the two steps have an astro-turf covering but that would be removed and resealed with a dark gray granite.

Motion to approve the application and plans as presented
Moved by Mr. Toraby

Seconded by Ms. Kossler Haouari

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Kossler Haouari, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Williams

Voting as opposed: Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan

Motion to approve carries

5. 16 DIVISION STREET
GREENWICH, CT

REPRESENTED BY: TIM PECK, SHORELINE GROUP, LLC
OWNER: SUSAN LIMONCELLI

ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING

Review plans to renovate and add a new 2-½-story addition to the rear of the existing two family dwelling and remove the existing [3 car] garage at the rear of the property.

Mr. Peck began the presentation by identifying the property as an 1890 house that is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing structure to the 4th Ward Historic District. Mr. Peck stated the original siding is underneath the vinyl siding so the owner wishes to remove the vinyl siding and restore the original shingle siding. Additional work would include the restoration of the porch and replace the existing windows with an Anderson simulated window (note: the existing gable window will remain as it is original to house). Coupled with the existing renovations would be a rear addition (with the design continuing the existing roofline but with a 'Juliet' balcony addition) and a side entrance. The siding would be matched to the current structure's original siding.

Ms. Sheridan expressed concern about restoring the porch. Mr. Peck understood Ms. Sheridan's concern and explained that a sensitive removal of trim would yield a better idea of what was underneath to then proceed accordingly.

Mr. Bishop questioned the front door. Mr. Peck responded that it would remain as it is a wood front door and most probably was the original door. The screen door can be removed if HDC wants. Mr. Bishop stated that should the applicant decide to include a screen door that it too be made of wood. Mr. Peck went on to add that the railings may need to be removed to bring them up to current code as they currently are 30" and code requires the railings to be 36". Mr. Bishop expressed his preference for the railings to be retained if possible.

Mr. Peck stated that the plan is to have central air conditioning and remove the outside window air conditioning units.

Mr. Toraby asked what was to happen with the scalloped aluminum canopy? Mr. Peck replied that it has to come off (along with the vinyl siding).

Mr. Toraby commented that the window size has changed and that a double hung could be used to have matching windows. Mr. Peck said he would be happy to replace with a double hung to match the other windows.

Mr. Toraby felt that the main problem with the addition is the balcony that doesn't belong, as it isn't in keeping with the historic building. Mr. Peck said that it could only be viewed when on the property. He went on to say that from the neighbor's property you can only see the railing above the ridge.

Ms. Sheridan said that she wasn't disturbed by the addition, as it wouldn't be visible from the street.

Mr. Bishop agrees that it is not perfect but overall it works. Mr. Bishop asked what the panes were on the windows and Mr. Peck replied that right now they now are one-over-one but would be going to a six-over-one for the new windows and would be carried over into the addition. Mr. Bishop said he would prefer a six-over-six but HD members preferred six-over-one.

Mr. Peck stated that the current chimney is non-functioning. The intent is to drop it down at the roof. HDC would like to see the chimney remain and repointed as it shows the period of the house.

Motion to approve designs as presented with following changes: the windows in the rear and overall will be "six-over-one" and will have matching sides except for the smaller ones, the chimney will remain, the porch rails shall retain their original design as much as possible dependent upon current code restrictions, the balcony rails shall match shall match the porch balusters, and patches will be matched to original siding if needed.

Moved by Ms. Sheridan

Seconded by Mr. Welch

Unanimous vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Kossler Haouari, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Williams

6. 181 WEST PUTNAM AVENUE
GREENWICH, CT

REPRESENTED BY: THOMAS J. HEAGNEY, ESQ.
OWNER: COUNTRY REALTY CO.
PRESENTED BY: JOHN HEAGNEY

ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING

Review plans for relocation of the John Addington House, including new foundation, landscaping plans and signage.

[Continuance from December 9, 2015 meeting]

Mr. Heagney updated the HDC members on the John Addington House move that included the applicant's progress towards securing the appropriate permits for the structure's relocation.

Mr. Heagney stated that at the last meeting, construction documents were to be submitted. Those are not available yet but the applicant does have limited material documents from the architects for the HDC members to review.

Mr. Heagney went on to describe that a partially new foundation was to be created at the new site for the house. While as much of the original foundation will be kept, the applicant plans to reconstruct the exterior of the foundation with fieldstones.

Also Mr. Heagney mentioned that adding clapboard to the building's sides was discussed at the last meeting. This was reviewed with the clients and architects as well reviewed other buildings in the area with two buildings standing out – the Samuel Ferris House (1760) and another Fairfield County House (Clark Stockade House). In each instance, shingles were kept on all four sides of the house. So, Mr. Heagney is asking the Commission to reconsider having the shingles remain on the front of the building and treat and keep them as they are (will not be painted).

Mr. Bishop asked if the foundation was a veneer foundation or solid stone and was concerned about its preservation. Mr. Heagney stated that the house was to be 'ballooned up' for its relocation and that the original foundation would not be moved in its entirety and that the foundation at the new site would be a mix of the old combined with new materials. Additionally, the large stones that are a part of the staircase will be removed and reestablished at the new location.

Mr. Bishop asked then that the new foundation would be a poured concrete one with a stone veneer. Mr. Heagney agreed. Mr. Bishop stated that he would like to see a tighter veneer with as little mortar as possible – the current proposed design is too severe. Additionally, Mr. Bishop would like to see the trim on the windows changed.

Mr. Toraby asked about the height of the crawl space. Mr. Heagney replied that it was four feet high.

Mr. Toraby also inquired about the aperture windows into the crawl space?
Mr. Heagney replied that they would be two feet from grade to the sill.

Mr. Toraby expressed concern about the chimney and wants to see a scuttle to access the crawl space. Mr. Bishop concurred and wants to leave the first floor as intact as possible.

No motion was given at this time. Members of the HDC asked the applicant to further explore and provide designs/plans regarding: window trim, properly photo document the Addington House prior to its move, conduct research of historic homes as existed in late 19th century (including Putnam Cottage); method of cleaning shingles without causing damage, veneer tightening, providing adequate ventilation in crawl space with a design showing a new scuttle, produce legible (viewable) plans, produce details for termite protection, provide details for flashing and chimney cap.

2. 299 GREENWICH AVENUE
GREENWICH, CT

OWNER: TOWN OF GREENWICH

Approve final plans and brick

[moved from second to final agenda item]

Mr. Bishop gave the presentation as no representative from the Town of Greenwich was available.

The comments on the final drawings were well received. The applicant was asked to submit a brick sample for the HDC members to review. The brick will be brought to the site for HDC members to review.

Mr. Toraby commented that the landscaping is unimaginative and Mr. Bishop agreed.

Motion to ask the applicant to make available at the site the brick to be used at 299 Greenwich Avenue for HDC members to view, produce a fuller developed landscaping plan, provide a sample of the railing and brick mortar.

Moved by Mr. Toraby

Seconded by Mr. Welch

Unanimous vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Kossler Haouari, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Williams

DEMOLITIONS

75 Round hill road
Greenwich, CT

12 Ballwood Road
Old Greenwich, CT

57 Tomac Road
Old Greenwich, CT

46 Byram Drive (Belle Haven)
Greenwich, CT

MINUTES

Motion to approve minutes from May 11, 2016 meeting

Moved by Mr. Bishop

Seconded by Ms. Williams

Unanimous vote

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Welch, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Kossler Haouari, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Williams

NEW BUSINESS

Discussion focused on the nomination of Greenwich Point to Connecticut State and National Register of Historic Places. Members could not produce a motion due to insufficient information.

Mr. Bishop closed the meeting at 10:25 pm