

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION MEETING  
TOWN HALL MEETING ROOM  
GREENWICH, CT  
JULY 13, 2016

MINUTES

**ATTENDEES PRESENT**

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

ALTERNATES: JENNIFER KOSSLER HAOUARI, MARIE WILLIAMS

NOBLE WELCH (in attendance but cannot vote due to term limitation)

ABSENT: LLOYD HULL, KATHRIN BROWN

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

\* \* \*

1. 41 WEST ELM STREET  
GREENWICH, CT

REPRESENTED BY: DOUGLAS VANDERHORN, AIA, DOUGLAS VANDERHORN ARCHITECTS

OWNER: V.H.WEST PROPERTIES, LLC

PRESENTED:

ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING

Review proposed exterior modifications, including new steps, railing, walkways, lighting and landscaping for Historic Overlay designation

Mr. Vanderhorn began his presentation by stating his love for the building. He is not planning to construct any additions to the building bur rather is executing a restoration and to that end some windows will be removed and replaced with a consistent double hung 6 over 1 window.

Mr. Vanderhorn proceeded to describe the structure and stated that the existing front had its left first floor window replaced with an ill-fitting one. That is to be

replaced. On the recent addition (approx. 30 years old) will see a replaced 6-over-1 window replacement.

On the lower level, a garage door was removed and a pair of pedestrian doors was added in its place. Mr. Vanderhoven is proposing putting back a swinging wooden garage door with windows. The siding will be changed to a natural cedar. Additionally, Mr. Vanderhoven discovered that the house originally had a green cedar roof (based upon the discovery of old shingles inside the house). In the future, a wood shingled roof will be proposed but as cost is a factor, that is not to be discussed at this present meeting.

Additionally on the front, gas lanterns will be added near the front door as well as code compliant handrails. The handrails will be done in natural bronze. A sign (as seen at 31 east Elm Street and in the same position) is also being proposed.

The building's sides have odd casement window placement. On the east end, Mr. Vanderhoven proposed to replace the odd casement panel with three 6-over-1 windows (as shown on the plans). Further, on the first floor, there are currently five doors into the building and Mr. Vanderhoven proposes to remove two. All windows would be replaced with 6-over-1 and the creation of a faux porch division with piasters similar to the design at the opposite side of the building. All the windows would be wood and flat trim to match the existing trim.

Similarly for the other side of the building, Mr. Vanderhoven proposes using 6-over-1 windows and eliminating the large 1-over-1 windows. On the second floor, also removing the casement windows in favor of the 6-over-1 and centering the door.

Mr. Vanderhoven continued with the rear of the building and described it as a real hodgepodge. A balcony would be kept on the building's east end but the west side balcony would be removed (windows would be inserted). The bridge would be removed and replaced by two ladders for the fire escape (and they would be against the wall). The chimney would be removed. Additionally a balcony would be removed with a portion of the roof extended and a larger 6-over-1 window inserted to allow for an emergency escape.

In the rear is a handicapped ramp that would be reconstructed to bring it up to code. Around the building, concrete was poured against its foundation. Mr. Vanderhoven is proposing to remove some of the concrete and return it to 'green'. A sidewalk against the west side of the building is proposed to have safe pedestrian access from the parking to the structure. Most of the shrubs will remain but additional shrubbery may be included as filler if needed. The proposed sidewalk will be a New York grey blue stone that will replace some stepping stones across the front lawn.

The bronze handrail detail and the wood detail are not included in the package.

Mr. Crist asked why is applicant here?

Mr. Vanderhoven replied that originally he was seeking a historic overlay for the property but decided to do that at a future date.

Mr. Bishop responded to Mr. Vanderhoven saying that you would like the HDC to approve the proposed changes as it reflects a commitment to the restoration of the building rather than a detriment that might deter the application from receiving a future historic overlay designation.

Mr. Vanderhoven agreed.

Mr. Bishop then asked for the type of windows that are being proposed.

Mr. Vanderhoven replied that a Lepage simulated true divided light with a 7/8-inch mutton bar is to be used.

Mr. Vanderhoven further added that he would like to replace the window boxes and may use Azek.

Mr. Vanderhoven went on to discuss the chimney. He stated that currently there is only one chimney that is visible. Years ago, the upper portion of the main chimney was taken down to the level of the attic. The applicant does not want to restore that. Currently, there is a small chimney for the furnace at the building's rear and that too may be removed. The new furnaces are all direct vents so a chimney is no longer required.

A motion to endorse the plans as submitted that include the alternative sign proposals

Moved by: Ms. Sheridan

Seconded by: Mr. Crist

Unanimous vote

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

2. 181 WEST PUTNAM AVENUE  
GREENWICH, CT

REPRESENTED BY: THOMAS J. HEAGNEY, ESQ.

OWNER: COUNTRY REALTY CO.

PRESENTED BY: JOHN HEAGNEY, ESQ.

CERTIFICATE OF APPRIATENESS

Review revised plans for relocation of the John Addington House, including mock-up of proposed signage.

Mr. (John) Heagney began his presentation by announcing that he took the HDC's comments from the June hearing and brought some new materials for the members to review. Mr. Heagney presented plans for the relocated Addington House as the applicant had been working off a sketch based upon Malcom Pray's records incorporating the comments received at June's HDC meeting that include changing the access to the crawl space from the interior hatch to the exterior scuttle. In essence, the plan shows the house on top of the new foundation with the concrete that was reviewed last time with this veneer (Mr. Heagney produced an actual sample).

Mr. Heagney then drew the commissioners' attention to the packet and asked them to look at one of the photos shown in exhibit two that displayed a veneer versus the actual foundation of the John Addington House. Mr. Heagney stated that it was a good match for what is there. The architect felt that the color would not change much over the years (mostly due to sun exposure).

Continuing, Mr. Heagney stated that the plans also included drywall and that the applicant is committed to installing a termite shield to protect the house. Also protecting the crawl space will be a 6 mil vapor barrier and plastic sheet covered in 4 inches of crushed stone.

Mr. Heagney affirmed that he felt that the white trim that is now on the building is appropriate. A research request is still pending with the Historical Society but they have not come back with any alternatives. Mr. Heagney commented that if the HDC wished the trim color to be changed, the applicant would abide by that request.

Mr. Heagney announced that the house was photo-documented earlier in July by Nils Kerschus. Those photos will be kept at the Historical Society for future reference.

Lastly, Mr. Heagney discussed cleaning the shingles on the existing building. He stated that his concern was towards ensuring that they not be damaged during cleaning. His research produced a product called Cedar Wash (by Wash Safe) and it can be used should HDC request the shingles be cleaned. The current cedar shingles were last cleaned/placed by Malcom Pray in the 1980s.

Mr. Crist asked if the original condition of the shingles was examined. Mr. Heagney replied "Yes, in 2014."

Mr. Heagney then proposed that the HDC allow the applicant to obtain a building permit to relocate. Then the applicant would come in perform 'touchup work' that

would include the chimney cap and flashing and lower shingle work so that after the house is moved it is brought up to the level that it needs to be.

Mr. Bishop expressed interest in allowing the applicant to move forward but was concerned the Historical Society's responses may delay the process.

Mr. Heagney responded that the applicant could work around it. He further stated that the official process would entail approving the application as is so they could proceed to file for a zoning permit and allow for adjustments.

Mr. (Thomas) Heagney suggested that making it a part of the condition for the Certificate of Occupancy (no COA granted until the window trim color is resolved).

Mr. Bishop would like to see a little less mortar and a little more stone on the foundation.

Mr. Toraby agreed and he also felt that the color was a bit too white.

Mr. Toraby then inquired how are the stones attached?

Mortar backup.

Mr. Toraby asked the applicant how do you make sure how they are not peeling away? They need to be secured somehow.

The mason will provide a warranty.

Mr. Toraby asked if there is a site plan showing the topography?

Mr. J. Heagney showed the site plan with the elevations.

Mr. Toraby asked if the plans show the installed basement access hatch?

Mr. J Heagney said that the current plans have not been updated to reflect that but they will.

Mr. Toraby was concerned about the slope towards the street.

Mr. J. Heagney stated that there would be proper drainage installation to move water away from the foundation wall and the scuttle would be placed in the back of the building. Sand filters are also to be used as part of the drainage system.

Mr. Toraby asked about the building's ventilation as currently for the building it is only windows. Mr. (T) Heagney responded that at one point heating was available but that has been removed and there are no plans to replace it. Additionally there

are no plans to neither replace any bathroom fixtures nor introduce an outhouse to the site.

Mr. Toraby asked about ventilation for the crawl space in order to avoid moisture buildup that would result in mold and mildew.

The architect responded that there would be vents in the foundation wall (a common practice amongst many crawl spaces). The existing building would revert back to an existence in late 18<sup>th</sup> century where opening a window would be considered ventilation.

Mr. Bishop inquired if there should be a ventilation system in the attic. Mr. Toraby agreed that something is needed to allow for the house to breathe.

Mr. (T) Heagney that currently there is nothing in the second floor but added that the currently does breathe well.

Mr. Toraby then asked if the chimney will be repaired and asked for plans.

Mr. (T) Heagney believed that there was an issue with the cap and that it will be replaced with the same material and properly set on the new foundation.

Mr. Toraby expressed his concern about the lack of details on the places. He stated that he had heard from the applicant of their plans but that those comments had not yet been illustrated on specific site plans.

Mr. (T) Heagney replied that the building is not being changed except for a change of removing the bathroom in the rear. Mr. Toraby felt that because of the structure's move, detailing needed to be provided on paper to ensure the house's integrity is preserved.

Mr. Bishop stated that he is satisfied that sufficient documentation has been done so that changes can be viewed and reviewed.

Mr. Bishop also expressed interest that the color of mortar needs to be approved at the appropriate time (seen on site) as when the house initially sat on a stone foundation, it was more of stone on stone and therefore the amount and color of the mortar is extremely important to view and 'get right'.

The applicant agreed.

Ms. Sheridan also wants to get approval of the trim color and expressed interest regarding the trim detailing and sizing. She believed that these were important features.

The applicant agreed.

Mr. Bishop wants approval of exterior lanterns to be located either on the building and/or on post.

Mr. Toraby asked if the building would have power?

The applicant replied that the building would and it would be connected through an underground source. Further, the electric panel will exist but it is not given a whereabout yet on the building. Mr. Toraby reiterated again the importance of having a paper documentation not only for the historical record but also for the contractor to follow. Mr. Bishop said that while a panel can exist in the building's interior the meter will have to be placed on the building's exterior and would prefer to have it on the rear side as inconspicuous as possible.

Mr. (T) Heagney would like approval to proceed to apply for a building permit subject to resolving the architectural details discussed here.

Motion to approve the submission as presented and that the approval of: architectural details that include the electric panel location, the trim's detailing, the trim's sizing, the trim's paint color, the mortar's color, shingle cleaning and approval of any exterior lighting fixtures ALL of which to be determined via an onsite inspection(s) will be a condition that must be satisfactorily met by the applicant prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Moved by: Ms. Kossler-Haouari

Seconded by: Mr. Crist

Unanimous vote

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

Mr. Bishop asked that the applicant submit construction drawings at their earliest convenience.

3. 80 MASON STREET  
GREENWICH, CT

REPRESENTED BY: JON BLISTAN (not present at meeting)

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Approve small change to front columns and attachment of porch roof to building in previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness

Mr. Bishop stated that minor changes needed to be approved. First, where the roof was to be attached to the building, it had to be modified due to fancy brick work. The height of the roof will remain the same. Second, the applicant wants to change the front post from 4X4 to 6X6 that will now match the posts in rear.

Ms. Sheridan examined the plans and stated that copper flashing is more attractive than aluminum flashing and would prefer the applicant use copper as the building is historic.

Mr. Toraby stated that the corners should be chamfered but the designs are small scale and difficult to determine. He had hoped to see a proper set of plans submitted.

Mr. Bishop then suggested that a site visit be in order to best render an opinion.

No decision was rendered on July 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. A continuation was asked for and approved unanimously by HDC members.

#### UPDATE

299 GREENWICH AVENUE  
GREENWICH, CT

OWNER: TOWN OF GREENWICH

REPRESENTED BY: No one from Town of Greenwich present at meeting

Mr. Bishop reminded the members that the brick needed finalization and that a sample would be required. Also the Town of Greenwich promised to have a limestone cap on the ramp instead of a cement cap.

Mr. Bishop had not yet spoken to Bruce Spaman regarding landscaping.

Ms. Sheridan suggested a discussion with Joanne Messina (Greenwich Tree Conservancy) to discuss the future of the trees on the property.

#### MINUTES

Motion to approve minutes from June 13, 2016 meeting

Moved by: Ms. Sheridan

Seconded by: Mr. Toraby

Unanimous vote

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

## Demolitions

9 William Street (1930)  
Riverside, CT

17 Carriglea Drive  
Riverside, CT

94 Field Point Circle  
Greenwich, CT

## OTHER BUSINESS

HDC members agreed that a letter concerning the preservation of 50 Lockwood Avenue, Old Greenwich be submitted to Planning & Zoning.

HDC members agreed that a conversation with Planning & Zoning be initiated regarding the pursuit of zoning benefits for preserving historic properties.

Mr. Lloyd Hull has resigned from the Historic District Commission.

Mr. Welch will not seek reinstatement for another term.

Ms. Kossler-Haouari will resign from the Historic District Commission within the upcoming weeks (prior to September's meeting).

Mr. Bishop closed the meeting at 9:15 pm