

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

**ATTENDEES PRESENT**

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

ALTERNATES: CYNTHIA SMITH, MARTIN KAGAN, MARIE WILLIAMS

ABSENT: ANNIE MCGINNIS, SERENA BECHTEL

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

1. **ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING**  
250 Greenwich Avenue -- Frame Denim Retail [Located in Greenwich Ave  
Historic District – NRHP]  
Owner: Diane Seader and Dan Carnes, Jr.  
Represented by Donald Brown, Paul Bennett Architects, PC

For new retail business, repair of rear windows and doors, rear HVAC screen wall  
and concrete entry ramp, new rear façade awning and sign plaque at rear entrance.

[Applicants were not immediately present so Mr. Bishop moved on to the next agenda  
item]

2. **ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING**  
171 Greenwich Avenue [Located in Greenwich Ave Historic District – NRHP]  
Owner: Winter-HPG, 171 Greenwich Avenue LLC  
Represented by Paul V. Giammona Crown Architecture and Anthony Totilo  
Architects

Review plans to remove existing front windows, glass block and metal panels and  
install new double-hung and fixed windows with concrete sills; infill stucco walls to  
match existing exterior wall finish.

Mr. Friedman [Crown Architecture] presented and handed out to HDC members larger  
and additional images of the proposed project. He stated that the project's exterior  
renovations would only be touching up to the residential levels. The windows and gray  
panel would be replaced with Marvin Integrity Windows with a bronze finish. The finish  
was chosen because it matches the store front door (for Club Monaco). Mr. Friedman

further stated that Marvin Integrity Windows were chosen as they are a higher-class of window and the client was looking for a clear feel (using the precedent of what other surrounding buildings had). Additionally, the client does not want a dividing light window on the store's façade. Mr. Friedman continued stating that the white façade color would be matched and the color it most closely resembles is Shalante Lace white paint.

Ms. Smith inquired about the current store front and Mr. Giammona responded that currently it is 'like a black finish'. At present, there are very few offerings that have a black finish so that was why the bronze color was chosen.

Mr. Bishop asked if there were any photos of the building prior to its renovation in 1970. The applicant responded no.

Mr. Bishop stated that he feels that what is being proposing is not very attractive as he would rather see something with more interest. Mr. Bishop went on to explain that usually the HDC does go for divided light (or sub-divided light) as it gives more interest. An example being at 158 Greenwich Avenue, they have a transom and a couple of double-hungs on either side – he finds that preferable.

Mr. Toraby agreed with Mr. Bishop's statement and feels it is too stark and lacks details even though the applicant does introduce a new concrete sill. The applicant responded that it was not put on the lower window as there is a band on the Club Monaco. While it was explored, the applicant felt that the sill looked silly sitting on top of the band.

Ms. Smith offered if the applicant put the fill in the upper one and it would be better from a practical purpose. Presently it looks like they are missing.

Mr. Toraby asked if they are cut out from the existing masonry or are they within the existing opening?

The applicant responded that everything is within the existing opening. The sill would be underneath the existing opening.

Mr. Toraby then asked if the applicant would cut into the masonry to create that.

The applicant confirmed.

Ms. Smith then stated that the existing opening doesn't get shorter. The applicant confirmed.

Mr. Toraby thinks the sill is a good feature. The applicant said they would review that detail.

Mr. Toraby would like to see a detail of the band and sill to better understand what it is actually going to look like and entail.

The applicant reminded the Commission that nothing is changing on the first level that only the windows are being replaced.

Mr. Toraby also wanted to comment upon the window detail. If it is a 12-inch wall, it sounds like you are trying to put the windows inside the wall, not within the wall.

The applicant responded that once you open it you have the frame wall and the masonry wall, you would want the window right at that threshold.

Mr. Toraby stated that the window has to be within the thickness of the wall.

The applicant responded that it is at the beginning of the brick.

Mr. Toraby countered, no it is at the inside of the brick and this should be worked out.

The applicant responded that until the wall is opened up then that can be determined.

Mr. Bishop asked if any other members had any comments.

Ms. Sheridan stated that the chosen bronze finish is handsome and will have lasting staying power.

The applicant agreed and further added that the choice of the bronze added something against the white.

Mr. Bishop asked the applicant if they thought the owner would be willing to change the window configuration?

The applicant asked if 4-over-1 would be acceptable?

Mr. Bishop replied that could be considered and asked the applicant, what would you do with the center fixed?

The applicant responded that maybe a transom over the top (break it up) so it is not one big picture window. He went on to add that a possible design might have the upper portion of the fixed window look like a 4-over-1 as the client wants a picture window to have as much light in the space.

The applicant offered to return with some options with different divided light – “2-over-2” or “4-over-1” and bring more detail on the sill.

Mr. Toraby then said as the applicant will be reviewing the suggestions, might he also address the center portion of the large opening that is going to be filled in could the applicant also present how the stucco line will be married to the brick.

Mr. Bishop asked about if there were any comments on the color for trim and stucco.

None were offered regarding the color.

Mr. Bishop reminded that a decision would not be rendered until the next HDC meeting in September. Mr. Bishop offered that HDC could offer comments during the interim.

No decision. Applicant to return.

3. ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING

7 Brookside Park

Owner: Phil and Linda Andryc

Represented by William I. Haslun II, Johnson, Haslun & Hogeman, LLP

Review proposal to rezone property to RA-1 HO to permit conversion of existing cottage on property to a secondary dwelling unit.

Mr. Haslun began his presentation by giving a historical overview of the property. He stated that the applicant is considering moving out of the main house on the property and into the cottage (which presently cannot have a full kitchen as it is considered an accessory structure). After careful examination, it was felt that applying for historic overlay under the recent incentives (secondary dwelling unit) would provide the best solution for the applicant (as opposed to subdivision, etc). However, there is question if the possibility exists if the property could have a façade easement only on the cottage and not the main house should the owners decide to sell. A meeting with the Director of Planning & Zoning yielded that the decision of what structure or structures receives the HO designation should be at the discretion of the HDC. Mr. Haslun then asked that HDC simply look at the cottage first which has a building date of 1923 (which is the same time that the main house was built).

Mr. Haslun concluded that presently there are no current plans to do anything with the cottage except to make it legally habitable (according to current regulations). Further he stated that he suggested to the client proposing to the HDC that the entire property receive an HO (thus requiring a COA for any proposed exterior changes) and the façade easement would only be on the cottage.

Mr. Bishop remarked that the layout is unusual as the cottage is on the other side of the street from the house but both are very attractive structures.

Mr. Toraby asked if the property is all one lot?

Mr. Haslun confirmed that it is deemed all one lot.

Mr. Toraby mentioned that the members should be examining the features of the main house when considering the application.

Mr. Bishop determined that while the road bisects the house and cottage the road has common easement. Mr. Bishop continued that the intent of the new HO regulations is to provide incentives for people to place designations to preserve their house and that just designating the cottage and not the main house doesn't seem to serve the regulation very well – HDC members preferred to have the entire property designated.

Ms. Williams inquired of the applicant the suggested future expansion of the cottage.

Mr. Haslun responded that we should just assume that the applicants are going to leave it as it is. However, pending the HDC's decision this evening, that question can and will be addressed at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Bishop stated that if the whole property (cottage and house) came in with a HO, he would support it. He felt that both buildings were great.

The sense of the Historic District Commission (unanimous vote) is that should the applicant decide to place Historic Overlay status upon the entire property (to include the main house and cottage), the Historic District Commission would recommend the property as deserving to receive the incentives.

1. **ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING**

250 Greenwich Avenue -- Frame Denim Retail [Located in Greenwich Ave  
Historic District – NRHP]

Owner: Diane Seader and Dan Carnes, Jr.

Represented by Donald Brown, Paul Bennett Architects, PC

For new retail business, repair of rear windows and doors, rear HVAC screen wall and concrete entry ramp, new rear façade awning and sign plaque at rear entrance.

[Applicant is ready to present]

Mr. Donald identified that the proposed work to be done is at the rear of the building. It is two stories and the labor would involve maintenance work on the main floor with the brick remaining the same, the windows would be re-caulked, the window moldings would be painted black and the door wood frame would be white. The other work involves painting the fire stair black as well with new concrete placed at its base. No structural modifications are being made at this time.

Mr. Bishop stated that the structure is not very visible. He inquired about the lower windows and was told that the frame would be painted black. The back of the house would be storage and offices.

Motion to approve the proposed improvements with no structural changes as presented for the July 11, 2018 HDC meeting

Moved by Mr. Toraby  
Seconded by Ms. Brown

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

Unanimously approved

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

226 and 230 Mason Street and 16 Havemeyer Place (buttressing Greenwich  
Municipal Center – NRHP); and 230 Mason Street (National Guard Armory  
Building – Contributing)

Owner: GDC Havemeyer, LLC and GFC, LLC

Represented by Thomas J. Heagney, Esq., Heagney, Lennon & Slane, LLP

Review proposal to preserve the front portion of the Armory and construct a  
synagogue on the corner of Mason Street and Havemeyer Place  
[Currently Chabad Lubavitch [of Greenwich] at 75 Mason Street is seeking a new  
home]

Mr. Heagney identified the location due to its historicity being in close approximation to Greenwich Municipal Historic Center and Greenwich Avenue Historic District (National Register of Historic Places). He further discussed the reasoning for the application is due to the fact that Chabad Lubavitch [of Greenwich] is seeking a new home.

Mr. Richard Granoff (architect) continued the presentation discussing the context of the proposal. The proposal site is an important corner and very visible. The site is surrounded by very important works of architecture that are freestanding and from different eras therefore having different architectural styles (and listed the buildings).

Mr. Granoff went on to describe that the proposed building is a four-story, mixed-use facility with parking underground. In addition to a synagogue, it would include a preschool and offices. Mr. Granoff went on to describe that after consultation with his client, they had settled on an oval shape with the first floor housing the preschool and the synagogue being located on the second level. The façade would be clad in a limestone (Jerusalem stone) that relates nicely to the limestone on the firehouse building (north) and Richard's (south).

Mr. Granoff further indicated that the 'parking' aspect of the site would not be visible as it is buried behind and while the Armory would be preserved, the "shed," which is three times its size would be demolished, with the exception of its existing brick wall (the parking is behind this and Richards has agreed to let the applicant's clients use their ramp to access the parking structure).

Mr. Toraby asked Mr. Granoff to elaborate on the significance of the Armory building in regard to what makes it a historic landmark

Mr. Granoff replied that according to the State Register, the building is a Romanesque Revival, the specific comment of the arched entry and brick work surrounding it as well as the cornice made it significant.

Mr. Bishop interjected that while he is keenly aware that the architect is not trying to match any of the nearby structures, he felt that the design does not relate well to its surroundings.

Mr. Granoff replied that he was trying to relate to the scale of the Armory and he did not want to force symmetry on the site. He wanted to create a work of architecture that when viewed would be considered an important building on an important site.

Mr. Toraby responded that all the buildings around the site respect the facades and avenues and road and he felt that the applicant's rendering chose not to follow that precedent and asked why.

Mr. Granoff responded that he did not agree with the statement.

Mr. Toraby said that looking at a bird's eye view of Havemeyer Street, the proposed building is taking a different angle and asked if the applicant was trying to emphasize the parking entrance?

Mr. Granoff replied no as the sway of the façade was created to include an outdoor space.

Mr. Toraby said you have a perfectly rectangled geometry and you have an oval shape building introduced on the corner which has a two-story high glass wall – totally foreign to the entire complex there. Massing wise it is not respectful of the surroundings. Mr. Toraby added that he admires Mr. Granoff's work but feels the proposed design is not appropriate to this particular site.

Mr. Bishop also felt that it is massive and does not really relate to the architecture around it nor the historicity of the area. He added that while the applicant does not have to copy the nearby architecture, the present design is an anomaly.

Mr. Granoff understands the history of the area but believes that there is a time and place for more forward-looking architecture and that this is the place for that to occur.

Ms. Williams if it was possible to see a model of the design and its nearby structures as it would be easier to determine the scale and its relationship. She also asked Mr. Granoff to explain how the final plan came into being.

Mr. Granoff responded that the design went through many iterations with many audiences as it is a complex site with the starting statement of how do we get what we want on the site. Then massing happens and renderings are created for discussion.

Ms. Williams inquired if Mr. Granoff's clients were in attendance and would be willing to speak. She continued by saying that the proposed design is a spiritual statement in the heart of Greenwich, in an old somewhat staid town that's trying to move itself forward while maintaining its historical fabric. And feels that HDC's responsibility is to ensure it all works.

Mr. Bishop asked that Commission members speak first and introduced Ms. Sheridan who commented that she thought the use of the space for a synagogue is quite good. What should guide the HDC is does this property which is an integral part of a historic district make or detract from the historicity of the site and that should be the guiding principle. She further stated that this particular design would work very well in an area of town that does not have a recognized historic area but not at the proposed present site.

Mr. Bishop then recognized Rabbi Yossi Deren. Rabbi Deren said the design began with a conversation about values and how you balance the difference in those values. For this case, it was history and function. Rabbi Deren expressed that we are a community organization on one hand while also being a spiritual organization. When beginning discussions with Mr. Granoff and the first design was quite forward thinking – a bit too much as we wanted something a bit more traditional so that it was in line with our organization's mission and in line with the neighborhood. The initial concept had been for an all-glass oval but the idea evolved while being discussed by Chabad's Building Committee and the presented design is the resulted balance.

Mr. Granoff put forward that he felt the crux of the situation here was how do you build a new building in a historic district in a town like Greenwich? Can you do something that harkens to the past (like limestone) and is still forward looking? He continued by saying that he felt that the proposed material and scale of the design sufficiently related to the history of the neighborhood to then allow a forward-looking building plan.

Mr. Toraby said that we should also address the comments made by the Rabbi -- in terms of protecting values, everyone is on the same page. We are given the responsibility to address the architectural design of the proposed buildings within the context of the area we are supposed to protect.

Mr. Kagan said that the entrance should be inviting – here it isn't. He continued by saying that there is something missing here that is not drawing the attention to the entrance. Mr. Kagan felt that what is missing in the design is the invitation to come into it [the building].

Ms. Smith concurred. She continued saying that she finds the design a bit fortress-like and closed and the building is not drawing me in. She added that from a historic district point of view, there isn't a relationship between the proposed building and the Armory.

She felt that the design need not be Neo-Classical but it shouldn't be one that is 'closed off'.

Mr. Bishop agreed that the design is fortress-like.

Mr. Kagan said that as a place of worship, you want it to be warm and inviting and in Greenwich, the best places of worship are their entrances. Many members were complimentary with the building's interior design.

Ms. Brown supplemented that while the color of the stone does look like the firehouse but it remains cold and austere.

Mr. Bishop stated that he felt this application may prove to be one with several processes.

Mr. Heagney agreed and said that the client and applicant had expected that. They want a design that works for HDC, that works for the congregation and ultimately ends up with something that all will be proud of.

Ms. Williams declared her admiration for the choice of stone and use of glass. But is worried that the entrance is not inviting. Ms. Williams also inquired if a synagogue must face a certain direction. Yes – East.

No decision - applicant to return.

#### MINUTES

Motion to approve June 13, 2018 minutes

Moved by Mr. Crist

Seconded by Ms. Smith

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

Unanimously approved

#### DEMOLITIONS

5 Connecticut Avenue  
Greenwich, CT

215 Valley Road  
Greenwich, CT

26 Mayfair Lane (garage)  
Greenwich, CT

30 Willowmere Avenue  
Riverside, CT

10 Cross Ridge Road  
Old Greenwich, CT

110 Glenville Road  
Greenwich, CT

14 Anderson Road  
Greenwich, CT

46 Byram Drive (garage)  
Greenwich, CT

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

Motion to end meeting  
Moved by Mr. Toraby  
Seconded by Mr. Crist

Meeting adjourned at 10:20pm