FINAL MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Historic District Commission of the Town of Greenwich
Wednesday, June 13, 2018, 7:00pm
Mazza Room, Town Hall

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

ALTERNATES: CYNTHIA SMITH

ABSENT: ANNIE MCGINNIS, MARTIN KAGAN, ARIS CRIST, MARIE WILLIAMS, SERENA BECHTEL

Mr. Bishop called meeting to order at 7:07pm

1. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

YMCA
50 East Putnam Avenue
Owner: YMCA of Greenwich
Represented by: Sound Solar Systems, LLC

Review proposal to install PV Solar System on the gymnasium and natatorium roofs

The applicant identified through visuals the natatorium roof and the placement of the solar system indicating that the system’s visibility would be low as they stand about 5 inches off from the roof. The other roof (the gymnasium) shows a parapet wall that runs over the roof that should hide some of the modules. The south elevation view was presented that proposes the design and the racking system that will follow the roofline.

Mr. Bishop asked that it will provide an energy efficiency component. That was confirmed.

Mr. Toraby inquired about the repair of the roof. The applicant responded that presently the roof has no warranty that the YMCA is aware of. As such, the roof will be inspected both before and after installation.

Mr. Toraby then inquired after the roof’s age. The applicant responded the natatorium roof is about 10 years old. The gym roof had work done with the slate being replaced approx. 18 months ago and that had also included select tile replacement. Also, the modules should add some longevity to the roof.
Motion to accept the application as presented for the June 13, 2018 HDC meeting

Moved by Ms. Sheridan
Seconded by Mr. Toraby

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

Unanimously approved

[note agenda items #2 and #3 changed presentation order]

2. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

779 North Street
Owner: North Street Real Estate LLC
Represented by: John J Heagney, Esq., Heagney, Lennon & Slane, LLP

Review proposal to change the zone of the property to Historic Overlay to allow expanded use of the building

Mr. Heagney opened his presentation by describing the property and alerted the Commission that while the property is in a residential zone, it has maintained its commercial status for several decades. Mr. Heagney stated that presently his clients are unable to use the building as is and hoped to change the zoning to afford the opportunity to run a veterinary clinic. One of the options to have a zoning change was to explore applying for Historic Overlay.

Mr. Heagney identified that the historical records of the property are rather spotty. According to the Tax Accessor, the buildings were built in 1962. But there is evidence that the buildings have an earlier origin (based upon maps) having been extant in 1938 that would qualify them date-wise for a historic overlay review. Mr. Heagney also indicated that presently research in the Archives is unavailable as the building and its collections are being prepared for relocation.

Mr. Heagney then stated that he is asking if the HDC believes that this property is worth investigating for its eligibility to receive Historic Overlay and the incentives that the designation may allow.

Mr. Bishop explained that HDC must be very careful towards approving the incentive for the HO. Mr. Bishop continued saying that after review of the presented materials, he believed that there wasn’t any historical significance related to the property to warrant further study for a historic overlay designation.

Mr. Bishop inquired of the other members and their response was unanimous in supporting Mr. Bishop’s assertion.
The application was withdrawn.

3. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

107 Patterson Avenue
Owner: Whit and Lilly Armstrong
Represented by: William I. Haslun II, Johnson, Haslun & Hogeman, LLP

Review plans to convert garage to a secondary dwelling/pool house with a kitchen and housekeeping facilities in keeping with the incentives provided for an historic overlay by Section 6-109.

Mr. Haslun began his presentation with an overview of the current owner's and their history with the property. Mr. Haslun was hopeful that the HDC would consider this property worthy of receiving an Historic Overlay designation and the opportunity to apply for the incentives it allows for – ideally hoping to get a bonus unit in the garage. Mr. Haslun stated that the main house has remained relatively unchanged since it was built in 1902. The addition to the rear was made in 1997 and is not visible from the street (Patterson).

The proposed design calls for replicating some the existing elements of the main house and incorporating them into the garage (but not identical but still respecting the main house) [note: presently there is a garage in the main house (underground)]. The new proposed use would be for a living space with two bedrooms above.

Mr. Bishop asked to view images of the main house, as the key here is to preserve this structure. If it is recommended by HDC and then approved by P&Z, then the applicant is to agree that the whole house will be preserved.

Mr. Haslun inquired if cedar shingle siding could be used on garage rather than stucco. Mr. Bishop and others were amenable to the suggestion.

Ms. Sheridan identified that she knew the applicant personally and had high regard for the family and wished HDC members to know of that relationship for full disclosure. Ms. Sheridan continued that while conceptually she is in favor, she felt that the present proposed design was more ‘industrial’ than in keeping with the house. She hoped that the design for the garage would reflect more of what the house is – reflecting the original architectural features of the house.

Ms. Armstrong stated that the windows will remain but it is the addition of the walkway that gives it a contemporary feel. It is not detracting from the barn.

Mr. Bishop stated that he liked the idea of the shingle siding as that feature makes it more of a barn. He asked the applicant if the windows could be made two over two.
Ms. Armstrong commented that the skylight will be in line with the roof and not raised above the roofline.

Mr. Toraby asked the applicant to walk the HDC through the improvements starting with the footprint of the existing barn.

Mr. Haslun stated that the existing first floor is all open and a steep stair takes you up to the loft. A new foundation will be created that will have a basement with the ability to hide pool equipment. The proposal (with the dormer) puts the property over 400 sq for FAR (but the HO relief of the FAR would allow for dormer and setback) but the footprint remains the same.

Mr. Toraby felt that the glass railing is foreign to the property and thinks the HDC should ask for improvements to the design of the new design so that it would begin to resemble of value to the historic nature of the property. The existing barn is fine as is. The improvements should concentrate on the finishes, trim etc.

Ms. Armstrong responded that for the railing in question she is amiable to suggestions. The architect feels that glass is the best option for viewing purposes as an old-fashioned railing system blocks the views.

Ms. Sheridan commented that the introduction of a very contemporary metal that gave her pause for the proposal. She would prefer the wooden rail of the house be brought through the property.

Ms. Brown said that the garage is a simple structure and as the main house will be preserved, the design of the garage structure can be appropriately altered.

Mr. Bishop concurred and pointed out that the garage is barely visible from the street. Mr. Bishop stated that this application is an ideal use of the incentive as it provides for the protection of the main house while offering an opportunity for including contemporary wants that the main structure may not be able to provide. Mr. Bishop felt the shingles would be a good improvement and he is inclined to approve it as is presented.

Ms. Smith stated that she likes the stucco.

Mr. Toraby reminded the Commission saying that they are not trying to recreate the barn and as it is not visible and it is only for the homeowners use.

Mr. Bishop felt that as the incentive gives the applicant the prerogative for use, the HDC needs to allow this.

Motion to approve the application and plans as presented with the exception that the barn will be wood shingle siding on the exterior.
Moved by Mr. Bishop
Seconded by Ms. Brown

Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Brown, Mr. Toraby

Abstaining: Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Smith

Approved

4. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS & ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING

1139 King Street, Greenwich, CT
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 and new dormer on north side of addition. Continuation from May 2018 meeting.

Mr. Claycomb presented to the Commission revised drawings from May 2018 that include HDC’s suggested revisions and the addition on the house. The actual architectural drawings (being performed by Ron Hoina – Design Development Architects) will be submitted to Mr. Bishop next week that will verify the drawings presented at tonight’s meeting.

Mr. Claycomb reminded the Commission that a garage exists on the property that poses a safety threat (and counts against the FAR). He would like to demolish the structure (and have a shortened driveway that would create more green space).

Mr. Bishop believes the renovation of the former Superintendent’s Cottage of Chieftans merits the FAR applied bonus that is provided for Historic Overlay designated structures.

Motion to endorsing the plan as is shown now and once the architectural renderings are submitted and confirmed, the plan is recommended to receive a FAR bonus of 20%.

Moved by Mr. Bishop
Seconded by Mr. Toraby

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

Unanimously approved
MINUTES
Motion to approve May 9, 2018 minutes
Moved by Ms. Brown
Seconded by Mr. Bishop

Voting in favor: Ms. Brown, Mr. Bishop
[note: Ms. Brown and Mr. Bishop are the only attendees present that appeared at the May 9, 2018 HDC meeting]

DEMOLITIONS

188 Hobart Ave
Greenwich, 1929

19 Deer Park Drive
Greenwich 1928

184 Bible Street
Cos Cob 1930

131 Old Mill road
Greenwich, CT 1930

42 Dublin Hill road
Greenwich

38 Jones Park road
Riverside

Motion to end meeting
Moved by Ms. Smith
Seconded by Ms. Brown

Meeting adjourned at 9:10