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

ALTERNATES: CYNTHIA SMITH, ANNIE MCGINNIS, MARIE WILLIAMS, SERENA BECHTEL

ABSENT: MARTIN KAGAN

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

1. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
   96 and 100 Maple Avenue (96 Maple Avenue has Historic Overlay designation)
   Owner: Greenwich Academy
   Represented by: Bruce F. Cohen, Esq., Fogarty Cohen Russo & Nemiroff LLC and Tim Peck, project architect

Request to modify condition of Certificate of Appropriateness granted March 2019 in order to install landscape/planted screen between subject site (96 Maple Ave) and neighboring property at 94 Maple Ave in lieu of a “physical barrier”.

Bruce Cohen began his presentation by giving a description of the history of the application and stated he is here to modify the past approval for a Certificate of Appropriateness given in March of this year by the Historic District Commission.

A physical barrier be installed between the shared property of 94 and 96 Maple Ave. During the course of construction, Mr. Bloom (owner of the property that abuts) asked if the school would install a landscape plan instead of a fence. The applicant agreed to the itemized landscaping provided that the HDC approves the changes.

Ms McGinnis asked to see the exact location on the map.

Mr. Bishop inquired of the applicant that you are changing the hard fence to a natural landscape? Mr. Cohen confirmed.

Ms. Brown stated that it seems that everyone is happy now.

Motion to approve as submitted
Moved by Ms. Smith
Seconded by Ms. Brown
Unanimous vote
Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Williams, Ms. McGinnis, Ms. Smith, Mr. Crist, Ms. Brown, Ms. Bechtel

Ms. Young announced that a court stenographer would also be attending and transcribing the meeting.

Prior to moving to the next application, Mr. Bishop allowed for the departure of Aris Crist (who recused himself at 7:11pm) and appointed Ms. McGinniss to replace him solely on this matter.

Mr. Bishop then stated that the applicant would present, public comments would follow, then a discussion would occur between the HDC members and the applicant.

The applicant representative, John Heagney, agreed to the above procedure.

2. **CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

0 Strickland Road [to be designated #33 Strickland road]
Cos Cob, CT 06807
Owner: Flouty Family Limited Partnership
Represented by Heagney, Lennon & Slane, LLP
Architect: Aris Crist Architects

Demolish existing carriage house and construct a new single family dwelling and detached garage at 0 Strickland road within the Strickland Road Historic District [Local Historic District]

NOTE: the following HDC members will be participating in a vote should a motion be moved requiring a vote: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Sheridan, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Brown and Ms. McGinniss

John Heagney began his presentation and stated that he did ask for a recusal of one of the regular members of the Historic District Commission and formerly submitted to Chairman Bishop a letter outlining his concerns regarding a potential bias.

Mr. Bishop stated that it wasn’t his decision and Mr. Heagney understood.

Mr. Heagney stated that he brought additional packets for those members who did not receive them in the mail. Ms. Bechtel announced that she had not received a copy. Mr. Toraby asked how it was distributed and Mr. Heagney replied by fed-ex.

Mr. Heagney then proceeded declaring that the applicant is looking to demolish the existing structure (“0/33 Strickland Road”) and construct a new single residential dwelling and detached garage.
The report done by Mr. Kerschus (and submitted to HDC members) outlines the original development of the site. It was originally built in 1873 as an outbuilding to the Amos Brush House (31 Strickland road) however at the time, it was built with a minimalist interpretation and does not embody all the design interpretations of #31 (most likely due to financial constraints of the property owner (Amos Brush) at that time). There are a number of deficiencies that make this structure less valuable to the historic district. Part of that is the reason behind the request to demolish the present structure.

In particular, the deficiencies include: the mansard roof only covers the front and side facades (bare on the rear) and does not have the flare or curve on the corners that is common with other mansard roofs. In contrast, the one present on the existing structure is very straight and is a cost-saving measure that is often used for structures of this type. Additionally, the windows are inset (built-in). On more prominent or well-designed structures they are seen as dormers (like #31). And in this case, they were built in and the current structure is suffering leaks because of this. In the GIS maps, the mansard roof is actually a flat roof showing that the original construction was done for minimal cost.

Mr. Heagney continued saying, in addition to the historical consultant’s report, a structural engineer’s report was also hired and the report stated that the present structure was a poor candidate for repurposing for a single family dwelling due to the inability to bring the structure up to current building codes. In particular he flagged the foundation which is substandard (only 12 inches) and the existing framing which has been repaired a number of times as problems that create structural issues for the dwelling.

In terms of the foundation, the current building codes requires a 42 inch deep foundation and the present deterioration of the foundation has led to patches of water and cement (which in and of themselves have deteriorated) and the moisture due to the low foundation has caused problems to the interior wood floors. The framing repairs have indicated that the original structure has been modified so many times during the modern era that it is no longer a structure worth preserving. In particular there are types of construction materials used during the 1960s and 1970s that compromise the structure’s integrity.

Ms. Sheridan interrupted asking what type/kind of lumber.

Mr. Heagney responded that 2X10 was used when the second floor was restored and other types of plywood (indicating that plywood was not originally used when the building was constructed). Mr. Heagney stated that the applicant is left with a building that does not add to the historic district and is a poor candidate for maintenance and repair.

Mr. Heagney then distributed an exhibit to determine what an appropriate design would be stating that the proposed design would be better for the neighborhood and the historic district.
Mr. Heagney continued saying, we looked and researched for what an appropriate design would be. Mr. Heagney identified in his exhibits a design showing the Tomes-Higgins House and was included as it was built in the same era as the Amos Brush house (built between 1860-1880) which we thought was a good comp for what we had here. As noted from historical consultant’s report, this structure was originally constructed as an outbuilding for the Amos Brush house, so we looked for another prominent main home as a jumping off point for what would be appropriate here. In subsequent photos, you see the Tomes-Higgins house in relationship to its carriage house and the existing structure in relationship to the Amos Brush house. We looked at the standards for what Historic District Commissions are supposed to look for in determining a new structure in a historic district [Connecticut State Statutes] and you are supposed to look at what a historic district is defined by. In this case we looked at what architectural merits guides the district. For Strickland Road Historic District, it is marked by a diversity in styles [architectural styles designed between 1740-1930] making it difficult to decide what would be appropriate. We drew our main two inspirations from the Brush House (a 1870s design at #31 Strickland) and the Tomes-Higgins house which led to the creation of our exhibit here. The Tomes-Higgins house was designed by Calvert Vaux and examined his 1864 edition of *Cottages and Villas* for details to figure out what would be appropriate for the site. In particular Vaux highlighted his preference for materials and textures best suited, at the time, for modern construction. Those included horizontal wood siding, slate shingles (which are incorporated in our proposed design) and large windows. Vaux also had a preference when dealing with mansard roofs for a high pitch and a flat top. For entrances he had a preference for three design and we chose (shown on the lower right) a double door entrance with side-lights. So by using these two inspirations, we felt there would be something appropriate.

Mr. Heagney continued . . . when evaluating historic structures, the Historic District Commission can also look outside for historic architectural features. In particular we selected two over two windows and wood framing which would be appropriate here (which may not be as common within the district although wood framing is predominant). Also HDC looks at sighting, location and proportionality.

In terms of size, proportion and location to the main structures that were built to accompany, we have a similar sighting. On the front exhibit, our architect has included a height diagram, we are looking to maintain the size of the structure while repurposing it for modern use.

Mr. Heagney then stated that he wanted to note that while not within your purview, the project will comply with all local zoning and building regulations. No drainage issues will be caused (as being with 1000 feet of Long Island Sound we will be required to submit a coastal plan to P&Z). We wanted to come to HDC first to ensure that the proposed design was on the right track although construction documents have not yet been produced.

We do have a garage that will accompany this which is a design in keeping with the neighborhood. We are carrying over the doorsides from the existing structure. An
outbuilding like this would not be uncommon. Houses like the Amos Brush house and Tomes-Higgins House were to have several outbuildings on their properties. We believe that this would fit well in the neighborhood. We are talking about a rear property and an outbuilding on it would have a minimal impact on streetscape (over 200 feet away from the street and screened by an existing structure and landscaping).

Mr. Heagney completed his initial presentation.

Mr. Bishop then opened the presentation for public comment.

Debra Mecky spoke (speaking on behalf of Greenwich Historical Society) and asked what is the tradeoff for demolishing the building tonight? First, nothing is being restored. Where are the documents and photographs for what this building looked like? Adaptive use might be a third reason for demolition. Usually adaptive reuse recognizes a fact that a barn no longer makes sense. We want something to work for us in the future. Usually for adaptive reuse you are using something that was once there and adding on to it for making it work - there is something kept and using that in a different way. So this isn’t an adaptive use project. Are you getting a reconstruction project here? There are guidelines for reconstruction projects. To reference another building in another neighborhood is not a reasonable reason. I would argue that there is no present reason here that HDC has been given by the applicant that would merit demolition.

Faith Toraby (31 Strickland Road). I have several concerns about the demolition of this structure which was never a dwelling or a house. This is a very important application because it is concerning a structure that is intertwined with the history of our house and the house in front of it (which is not part of the application tonight). I have always said in the 28 years that I have lived here that when you buy in a historic district you make a bargain. There are promises made. The promise is that you will maintain your property with possibly a few tweaks to make it more livable. With all the restrictions that are placed on you, you have the promise that the general area that you bought into will be relatively the same for perpetuity.

Ms. Toraby asked about what are the restrictions of living in a historic district. Generally speaking the Commission is concerned about what you can see from a public way. By and large, the masses that you see is what you should always see. The structure that is being presented tonight is not the finest example of the second federal style that our house is and has been severely neglected. You can see from the street that barn and a feeling of the sense of history that is there. For my point of view, demolishing this barn to build a structure that is twice the size is inappropriate. I know the Commissioners are not supposed to discuss zoning but certain things are inextricable. Here, the size and mass of what is being proposed is inappropriate for recreating a barn-like structure.

Right now the structure is 1,200 sq feet and I know these measurements as we have the reports as at one point we had thought about doing something with that structure. I know that the present structure’s second floor would not pass inspection as it would have to be raised up a couple of inches to meet inspection levels.
Now the attorney said that maintaining the height and size of the structure could not make it livable to today’s living standards. I don’t think going from 1,200 to 2,400 square feet is maintaining the size of the present structure. If you were to build exactly what is there (height) and only use the back to expand, you could add 25% maybe 30% and have 1,600 square feet.

Every single house that asked for an addition, the addition was limited to the rear. (ex Mill Pond Court). What other house was allowed to be built on to the front and side and enlarged 100%. What you presently see is what has already existed when the road was formed into a local historic district.

The shape of the roof that the applicant is proposing has no relationship to the roof that exists at 31 Strickland. Keep the mansard roof not add a hip roof/dome which is 5 feet higher than what is there now.

The dormers, shutters and fenestration are all out of scale and incorrect.

So let’s talk about tearing down something. When you tear it down it is gone and you cannot get it back. Outside of the Strickland Road LHD, #19 Strickland road (a structure placed on the National Register of Historic Places) was town down. And across the street, those bungalows will go as well. What replaces it has to be appropriate and in keeping with the historic nature of the street. Ms. Toraby quoted that the style of the district is characterized from the assembly of architectural styles from the 18th through the 20th century (as stated in the Strickland Road LHD application). Ms. Toraby referenced a past variance issue brought to Planning & Zoning a few years ago but did not possess the application’s full facts. Ms. Toraby continued saying that Davidde Strackbein attended the meeting to fight for the barn and called it a historic treasure) if you look for the those P&Z minutes). Therefore what is being proposed is not appropriate.

Ms. Toraby also wanted to add saying that, I don’t think a historic district is where profiteers should come in. This is not an area to max out the FAR. There are other places in town. You have to respect what is there. You must respect what is there and the final product must relate to the historic nature of the district.

Ms. Toraby continued saying there is also one other property on the road – the “Highland’s house” that has a large red barn in the rear. They came with an application to create a rental of the barn which was denied. I am here asking for the protection I am due. I trust you make the appropriate decision.

Ms. Toraby then stated, on a bookkeeping note, I just want to say to the attorney, on regard to recusal, I don’t think it was appropriate for your firm to decide that Mr. Toraby should recuse himself. You did not send him the papers that every Commissioner was due. We had to ask for them and seek opinion from the town attorney regarding recusal. Additionally, amending your application a few days before and sending things through fed ex and email did not give people who are deciding proper notice. It did not give me
proper notice. And lastly, I find it particularly difficult to have people criticize architectural plans of a colleague who sits on the HDC generally.

Suzanne Branch Martin spoke. I have lived in my house for over 25 years. We all appreciate the protections. My fear is that there might be a dangerous precedent in allowing a building being demolished because what would prevent anyone else later on from doing it to this neighborhood?

Mark Pruner, realtor and worked with George Flouty, spoke. I have toured the barn and while you cannot see it well in the photo, there is a true mis-mash of materials of all periods and is a structure that is not useful nor would most people want to keep. My understanding of the ordinance referred to is that you are not allowed to have an auxiliary structure on a separate property and the variance that was requested was to keep the barn there so it would not have to be torn down as required. A couple of other things to note, is properties in that area have been substantially expanded. Everyone should have a right to do what is most appropriate for their house. If you look at many of the houses in the Strickland Road Local Historic District, they were built in the 1930s and 40s. As a realtor, the present structure as is would not be one desired for living. What is proposed is a good solution for a very unique property. The property was subdivided and you can argue whether that was appropriate and the Town did do that. And as such it is a buildable lot. The question is is what is there now is not a dwelling but an auxiliary structure and can’t be used other than the variance that was granted. So what we have are two oversized lots that took over 18 months to sell and were sold at a substantial discount. There is a significant concern of buying into an area that cannot be totally changed. Times change and it is appropriate for this property to change. Within a year, most people aren’t going to recognize that the present structure is gone. The proposed new design, should it be built, will look like one of the houses that is integrated with the area. The present barn does not enhance the value of the area. When you walk into it, it does not exude historic-ness that you would expect from other historic houses. The design is a sensitive one. The owner is allowed to build something there and it is a reasonable use. The FAR being presently sought is under the maximum allowed.

Mr. Bishop thanked Mr. Pruner and asked if there were any other comments.

Caroline Stewart spoke saying that she resents there are suggestions that there is any flipping being involved. There has never been any discussion on that. The Floutys have always loved the land.

Mr. Bishop ended public comment and asked the HDC members if they had any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Bishop began by asking about the relationship of the building that is there now and the frontage (being the east side) and how does it compare to what is being proposed.

Mr. Heagney responded that the landscaping plan would address a visual aspect of the frontage. Mr. Heagney asked that the members look at the existing streetscape photo
pointing out that the proposed structure’s location will be very much the same – the new structure is occupying the same portion of the property. There is some extension but that is to be addressed with screening on our landscaping plan.

Ms. McGinnis asked what distance was the extension.

Mr. Heagney replied that it was 7 feet.

Mr. Bishop said that basically looking at it from the front, from the east side, that the width is basically the same.

Mr. Heagney responded yes it is. When you look at the footprint of the proposed building, it is in keeping with some of the additions that have already occurred on Strickland road.

Mr. Bishop asked what is the square foot difference?

Mr. Heagney responded that the existing is 1,244 and the proposed is 2,301 (little Less than doubling it with the first floor at 1,196 and the second floor at 1,105) – for zoning regulations we could build a 4,116 sq foot building and therefore we are taking a much more responsible approach.

Mr. Bishop then asked how does the height of the present structure compare to the new structure?

Mr. Heagney responded saying that we do not have a grade plane for the property yet and best we can offer is based on the exhibit which was distributed which shows a 19 foot measurement from grade to the top of the second floor but not to the top of the mansard roof.

Mr. Toraby asked what does that mean?

Mr. Heagney replied that while we do have a concept here that we would like to review, we need to assemble more information to get you an exact measurement. The proposed house is in proportion with what is currently on the site.

Mr. Bishop then said so these are not complete plans.

Mr. Heagney agreed and said, no these are conceptual plans and we are happy to come back bringing construction plans.

Ms. Smith said that the engineer spoke about the foundation issues and I have seen homes lifted, foundation replaced and house lowered. Have you considered lifting the house?

Mr. Heagney said that that was not part of our evaluation. Mr. Heagney introduced Christain DeKuna (construction team) who said that that the problem with the floor joints
is that they are sitting on the ground and not even on the foundation and you don’t even have a floor to jack it up.

Ms. Smith continued saying that on the new proposal I see this new house is sitting very close to the ground which surprised me.

Mr. Heagney said that that is just an exhibit. The proposed structure will meet building code and will have a minimum 42 inch foundation.

Ms. Smith continued whether you had asked the state for exemptions as she thought there was something in the building codes that waives some codes for historic “plaqued” houses and if you are in a historic district you have a good case and the building department does consider that you do not need to make ALL building codes.

Mr. Heagney replied that in my experience and we are happy to look into that, in order to get to that point, you do need to have a pending building permit in town in order to explore those exemptions.

Ms. Smith then commented that when it comes to materials we don’t know what they will be?

Mr. Heagney said we are looking to match designs and are looking for a slate shingle on top and wood on the bottom but we have not finalized yet.

Ms. Smith said we were invited by Mr. Flouty to look at the house but I could not see the inside. I felt I could see the house very clearly from the road so I wouldn’t say it was insignificant because it was in the rear – it was quite visible to me. Are you looking at repurposing any part of the existing structure?

Mr. Heagney replied that we are thinking of carrying over the design of the existing doors to the garage.

Ms. Smith asked why is the garage detached?

Mr. Heagney replied it is mostly to do with the programming (no basement or attic for the proposed structure). And we determined that a garage would be helpful. On the May 8th HDC hearing we did receive positive feedback on accessory structures -- 456 square feet is being proposed for the garage – 336 on the bottom and 120 on the top. We do lose a portion of the driveway as an access way and the tip of the rear lot based on lot shape. If you total the lot area of the property, more building can occur than what we are proposing.

Ms. McGinnis said that in previous meetings with you had discussed the bungalow property, what are the intentions now?
Mr. Heagney responded that the bungalow is a separate property and presently no plans are had at this time but the applicant is aware that a COA would be required if any changes were to be proposed on the property.

Ms. Williams asked the applicant if there is any merit to repurposing the existing structure, reassembling it somewhere else?

Mr. Heagney said that he would look into that but the contractor has noted that the flooring was incapable of performing a lift.

Ms. Williams said so you couldn’t disassemble it.

Mr. Heagney said no it is a hodgepodge of construction. He continued saying one of the things we can do is work with Historical Society to have it documented and will see if there are materials for repurpose.

Ms. Sheridan asked when was the lot split approved?

Mr. Heagney responded in 2001.

Ms. Sheridan asked what is the size of the proposed new structure?

Mr. Heagney said we did not provide that in the materials rather we have estimates on the new design.

Ms. Sheridan continued asking saying based on Dr. Mecky’s comments what would your client be willing to exchange in order to have this project approved for a house that is twice the size?

Mr. Heagney said that this sounds like a quid pro quo. Mr. Heagney said we are dealing with a limited amount of space and the existing structure based on a variety of reviews, we do not have a lot here that is worthy of preserving. We are willing to hear requests.

Mr. Heagney said we are willing to return with more completed drawings if the concept being presented is approved. Mr. Heagney further added that there is a significant elevation change best shown on the topographical map. We are looking from the street level all the way up to where the existing buildings are. If you are driving or walking it is not demonstratively visible. This is a separate lot. We are entitled to have a single family dwelling on it. We are not required to maintain an accessory structure in any way. If we wanted to maintain an accessory structure, we would need a variance for that.

Ms. Smith said that you are going back and forth on an accessory structure. If it is its own lot is it its own building or an accessory structure.

Mr. Heagney replied it was originally constructed as an accessory structure. It was maintained for many years as an accessory structure. In 2001 when it was created as its
own lot, at that time the P&Z commission said that if it was to be reused or redeveloped in any way it cannot be used as an accessory structure and must be used as a single family dwelling.

Ms. Brown asked if the barn was ever inhabited?

Mr. Heagney said that recently it has not been inhabited.

Ms. Brown then said when it was purchased was it thought it could be a dwelling?

Mr. Heagney said no not due to previous owner’s intent.

Mr. Heagney is asking the Historic District Commission for a decision to pursue the path of having a single family home, incorporating the present design elements or have HDC provide a list of what they want to see as they do not want to produce construction documents that HDC does not want to see.

Mr. Bishop closed the public portion of the meeting but left hearing open.

Discussion then occurred with amongst voting HDC members: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. McGinnis (for Aris Crist), Ms. Brown

Ms. Brown stated that during her tenure, the HDC was never presented with a demolition request. She is also concerned with 35 Strickland road. Both of these properties may be gone. The property was bought as a barn and it is not what it is going to be. I have trouble with setting precedent.

Mr. Bishop responded said that all demolitions require a COA

Ms. Sheridan added that the lot split in 2001 and the requirement is only a single dwelling is allowed, we are in a difficult position. Do we build around the existing structure realizing it is not totally salvageable, that it is not a structure? Do we set a negative precedent? She felt that a portion of the structure could be built around.

Mr. Toraby stated that in a previous presentation (informal), it was never discussed that this would be demolished. It was always discussed that there would be an addition to it. It can be restored and I guess it is a matter of finances depending on the number of bedrooms, foundation which are miniscule compared to building a structure twice the size of the present one. Plus an outdoor separate garage. By the way, the garage originally suggested was a one car, and here it is a two-story structure. Now we have a completely new two-story structure. We are losing the historic aspect of this entire complex – 31, 35 and this barn. If you demolish it, it will not be the same. It will be a different appearance, look, and a loss of the historic feeling of the district.
Ms. McGinnis said they are asking for both moving and expanding and they can’t expand if they don’t move. One thing to consider is if they don’t move it then they have a much smaller footprint to put in the back.

Mr. Bishop said that he is more positively inclined to this application then his members are. He continued saying that this as a very difficult position that the owner is in. This is a reasonable compromise. There are some things Mr. Bishop would like to see changed but it is a good compromise. The present building is a disaster – a hodgepodge of materials with no foundation that sits on the ground. To try and restore it, you would end up rebuilding it any way. The applicant is entitled to have a single-family house there. I would ask that the design would have a bit more of a ‘barny’ look. The garage is so separate and far back – in a triangle – you will never be able to see it. This structure will fall apart from something if nothing is done. We have to be reasonable and come to a compromise.

Mr. Toraby said the compromise – if the structure if not salvageable – would be rebuilt on the same footprint with any addition to the rear.

Mr. Bishop said that is not what is before us.

Ms. McGinnis said what is the experience here in terms of 30% expansion in the back, are there are other homes in the district that have expanded?

Mr. Bishop said that why does it have to be in this district?

Ms. Young interjected saying that yes there have been garages that have been demolished, yes there have been additions and yes there has been repurposing but all have come under their own applications. And according to statutes you are not here to compare applications . . .

Mr. Bishop interrupted saying that you are allowed to look at the whole district to see how it fits in.

Ms. Young wholehearted agreed. But to decide whether you are setting a precedent or not is not what the application is about.

Mr. Bishop added that every property is different. And this particular application is a difficult and unusual one.

Mr. Bishop asked if anyone feels whether we can give the applicant direction?

Mr. Heagney interjected and suggested that the commission propose a delay an action on the application and that the applicant return with information. Mr. Heagney also asked if any of the commissioners wished to see in a future application any specific design guidelines.
Mr. Toraby stated that in all due respect, those suggestions were made at past meetings with the applicant and not considered.

Mr. Heagney the difficulty in coming in with discussion items is that it is too blank of a canvas. The applicant has brought a concept design with some deficiencies but the request being made of the HDC is to determine whether the proposed design was on the right track.

Mr. Toraby said that his suggestion would be that the size be paired down so the addition would be more in keeping with the character of the site and area. Not to have a massive three-bedroom plus 2-story garage replacing this barn.

Ms. McGinnis said that she did not see that the proposed structure was so massive as what the drawings indicated. The expansion is on the rear.

Mr. Bishop asked if everyone had seen the property and then asked if the applicant would schedule a site visit.

Mr. Heagney supported that recommendation by Mr. Bishop.

Mr. Bishop asked for property and proposed building stakes to provide context and height indicators.

Ms. Toraby interjected and asked Mr. Bishop if the applicant could ensure that the proposal did not infringe on the easement.

Ms. Branch Martin asked if blasting were to occur and would hope that its does not as the historic structures in the neighborhood are fragile.

Mr. Heagney stated that he would work with Miss Young to organize the site meeting.

No vote was taken with the above application.

MINUTES
Motion to approve October 23, 2019 minutes
Moved by Ms. Sheridan
Seconded by Ms. Brown
Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Mr. Toraby, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Williams, Ms. McGinnis, Ms. Smith, Mr. Crist, Ms. Brown, Ms. Bechtel

DEMOLITIONS
24 Park Avenue
Old Greenwich, CT

30 Northway
Old Greenwich, CT
Motion to end the meeting at 9:13 p.m.
Moved by Mr. Bishop
Seconded by Ms. Bechtel
Unanimous vote

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