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

ALTERNATES: CYNTHIA SMITH, ANNIE MCGINNIS

ABSENT: ARIS CRIST, DARIUS TORABY, SERENA BECHTEL
Arrived late: MARTIN KAGAN, MARIE WILLIAMS

Mr. Bishop called meeting to order at 7:01pm

1. ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING
49 Greenwich Avenue
Greenwich, CT [building is located within Greenwich Avenue Historic District NRHP]
Represented by: Rudy V. Ridberg, Ridberg + Associates Architects

Request to modify the left side glass window and alter the double door.

Mr. Ridberg began his presentation and identified the present building by describing it as where Chipotle used to be and added that a new restaurant will be taking it over. Mr. Ridberg further added that the same color and materials will remain but on section of the storefront will be widened by one munition (to allow for more seating). Currently there is a double door and it is being proposed to become a single door with an added sidelight. Nothing else will change on the façade.

The 2nd part
On the rear of the building, there currently is an existing exit door but the applicant wants to cut in a new exit door to match what is there – the same details will be kept and a bronze emergency light will be added. A new exit and entry door will be added for the rest of the building.

Motion to accept as proposed with changes
Moved by Ms. McGinnis
Seconded by Ms. Brown

Majority vote
Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. McGinnis, Ms. Smith, Ms. Brown
Mr. Kagan and Ms. Williams were unable to participate as their arrival came midway through the presentation

2. ADVISORY OPINION TO PLANNING & ZONING
   169 Greenwich Avenue
   Greenwich, CT [building is located within Greenwich Avenue Historic District NRHP]
   Represented by: Granoff Architects

Request to modify door location.
[modification from November 14, 2018 meeting]

Mr. Andreas Stresemann presented. He began stating that the owner has found a tenant for the building and said tenant wants the entrance to be moved into the center (from the side). It is a fashion store so visibility and symmetry is important.

Ms. Sheridan asked if the design is a true representation of what is there now.

Mr. Stresemann responded no because what is there now is under construction and thus not completed.

Ms. McGinnis stated that while the design looks better with the door on side she understands the request.

Mr. Bishop felt that in a situation like this, we are not dealing with a historic original storefront. Therefore it is important to work with the owners to have both an appropriate and attractive front. Mr. Bishop said that on that basis he is willing to support this design alteration.

Ms. Smith said that you do not want to be moving doors every time a tenant comes in.

Ms. McGinnis responded saying that this type of request is not unusual.

Mr. Stresemann said that it offers a better-furnished look.

Ms. Williams asked how long the lease was for.

Mr. Stresemann responded that it was a ten-year lease.

Ms. Williams felt that it is an acceptable time frame for this request.

Motion to accept the alternative layout as presented
Moved by Ms. McGinnis
Seconded by Ms. Brown

Majority vote
Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. McGinnis, Ms. Brown, Mr. Kagan, Ms. Williams
Opposed: Ms. Smith

Ms. Young announced for the next application that two regular HDC members would not be in attendance – Darius Toraby and Aris Crist. Alternate Cynthia Smith will vote in Mr. Toraby’s place and Alternate Annie McGinnis will vote in Mr. Crist’s place.

Ms. Young further mentioned that while applications were sent via email, a request was made for hard copies to be delivered to the HDC members and this request was not met.

3. 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]
[continuation from November 13, 2019 meeting]

Mr. Tom Heagney submitted a copy of the transcript from the November 13, 2019 meeting. Mr. Heagney also reminded the members that subsequent to that meeting, a site visit was made to the property.

Mr. Heagney outlined “what” was the main house at 31 - being a Second Empire design with a mansard roof and it compares to the Tomes-Higgins house at Christ Church and has a carriage house – a similar time period and similar style of house to #31. Mr. Heagney directed the HDC members to look on the board to see an existing front elevation of that as well as the present structure located at 0/33 and the proposed carriage house.

Mr. Heagney advised that the height from grade to ridge (flat roof) with the existing is 19 feet. We also have 19 feet in grade to the eave on what is being proposed. And there is also a hipped roof to the proposed carriage house which adds two more feet to the building but as it is a hipped roof it all fades to that point in center. The existing has a flat roof (a Hollywood façade) and the back has just a flat wall with the roof above.

Mr. Heagney continued saying that there are a number of distinctions between the Second Empire design and what the existing carriage house has. It starts with the dormers that are inset (in the existing building but they are not really dormers) whereas with the Second Empire they (the dormers) stick out past the mansard roof. Also you have a curve in the
mansard roof of carriage house with the Tomes-Higgins house but not here as it comes straight down and breaks right before the gutter line.

Mr. Heagney continued saying that the applicant’s design is intended to address the details from that period if you were to build it to match the main house. Nils Kerschus in his report feels that the owner (Amos Mead Brush) at the time was not doing as well financially and the carriage house suffered as it did not include the detailing that would have been had. Further, Mr. Kerschus also points out in his report that this structure is the least significant one in the district. What the applicant is looking to do in this particular instant/design is have an architecturally appropriate reconstruction Second Empire style - similar to what was done with Toby’s Tavern by the Historical Society (a little of the original was left but not much and they had significant issues to deal with being in a flood zone). The applicant’s approach is to have it as historically correct and appropriate as possible.

Mr. Heagney said that on the plans that were handed out there was a request at the last meeting to have a comparison of the two structures. The first sheet is the first and second floor plans, then you have the elevations. We are showing a basement that is part of the reconstructed design with layout and dimensions. And then all four elevations showing how the hipped roof works with the mansard. Mr. Heagney described that the approach is to have it appropriate with scale and design of the mansard roof, windows, dormers and first floor height. And the windows and the barn door as the front door (which is already on the existing structure). Lastly, Mr. Heaney added that there is also a proposed new building – a one-car garage that would be a gable roof but including the same barn door and windows that are on the carriage house itself.

Finalizing, Mr. Heagney said that we are dealing with a structure that over many decades that was not well maintained. The floor joints on the first floor and on the ground are problematic (rot and infestation). The reconstructed carriage house would be almost the same dimensions with the façade that faces Strickland Road (although about three feet wider). It is the same height to the eave with just the hipped roof which would not be completely visible. And we are looking to have this as architecturally significant to the carriage house that parallel the significance of the one related to the Tomes-Higgins property.

Mr. Bishop outlined the meeting and asked if anyone from the public wishes to speak.

Peter Alexander asked about the architectural context was it thought to replicate something on Strickland road itself? He didn’t see the context related to Strickland road.

Debra Mecky, Executive Director of the Historical Society, passed out the nomination form for the Strickland road District for the National Register of Historic Places and identified the buildings therein stating that there contributing buildings and non-contributing buildings. So a garage is considered a non-contributing. But a carriage house built in 1873 is considered a contributing structure in a Local Historic District. It was a major structure in the 1870s especially as it related to its main dwelling (#31 Strickland
road) - typical of this particular era. Therefore this is important to the history of the
district. Where do you find streets like this with the original width, early 18\textsuperscript{th} century
through early 20\textsuperscript{th} century buildings? Strickland road is about the evolution of the actual
community.

Dr. Mecky also passed out the criteria that should be considered when you rehabilitate a
building and are highlighted in yellow. She identified the relevant standards and
commented:
A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal
change. Is the conversion to a single-family house the best use? The second is the
historical character of the property will be retained and preserved. The removal of
distinctive material will be avoided. Think about this property, if you enlarge and
heighten it, its spatial relationship will be affected. Third criteria, each property will be a
record of its time, place and use. Dr. Mecky also brought attention to the fact that
deteriorating historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Replacement of
missing features must be substantiated. Finally, new additions (new construction) will not
destroy historic materials.

Ms. Suzanne Branch Martin read comments written by Faith Toraby (resident 31
Strickland road):
1) hdc should hire its own engineer to determine structure viability and not take the word
of the applicant's expert. There is an hdc budget and they can request more funds if need
be. It should not be a "given" that the structure must be demolished.
2) other barns in far worse condition have been rescued and repurposed. See: red barn
behind Hyland's property - gorgeous restoration.
3) scale of proposed structure is out of keeping with the original: 1200 sq feet to more
than 2400 sq feet - NOT including a basement and detached garage.
4) HEIGHT increase from 17 feet to 21 feet or more will be an enormous addition to
mass. If the applicant requires more ceiling height by code for the second floor, let them
apply to planning and zoning for a variance. - (with an HDC recommendation for
approval of the height variance).
5) Design: it cannot look like the Thomas Higgins house. It must look like it was
designed to belong to the Amos Mead Brush House- a modest-carriage house /barn with a
mansard shaped roof - at least on 3 sides. It must be true to the history of Strickland
Road- As Stephen Bishop said: it should look more "barn-y".
6) Model - applicant should have to construct a scale model so that the requested
increased in size and height can be appreciated.
7) Voting: selection of alternates- voting members chosen from non- regular member
pool must be chosen by something like a lottery or by a sequential ranking method and
not chosen by the chairman without a proper procedure set in place.
8) Blasting- not required. The applicant can use other methods of excavation- surely the
protection of #31 and #34 Strickland should be of paramount concern.

Thank you,
Faith Toraby
Mr. Bishop closed the public comment period now asked the regular and alternate HDC members to ask questions.

Mr. Bishop did begin and asked Mr. Heagney if there was there any thought about replicating any other house on Strickland road?

Mr. Heagney responded that the reason why the applicant is using the Tomes-Higgins house as an example is to relate to the Amos Mead Brush house and we are looking to replicate what details there are on the Brush house so that there is a relationship ad context between the carriage house and the main house.

Mr. Bishop asked if the height indeed was going to increase from 17 feet to 21 feet?

Mr. Heagney responded that the height when taken from grade to the top of the flat roof currently is 19 feet.

Mr. Bishop interrupted saying then the difference is going from the present 19 feet to 21 feet.

Mr. Heagney confirmed. He also added that the proposed façade is to be three feet wider than the existing carriage house. The rest of the development is behind the structure so that the street presence remains of the historic structure. Mr. Heagney also noted that the bungalow located in the lot between the carriage house and the street does block some of the view of the carriage. The present design does allow for/continue of still seeing a portion of the carriage house seen by the road.

Mr. Bishop stated that the concern here is the possibility of taking the entire carriage structure down – a complete demolition. Has there been any consideration to saving any part? Saving say the first floor? Even if you have to lift it and put it back. Mr. Bishop continued saying that he did not believe the second floor was salvageable, is not attractive or well done and does not add anything for anyone. But he felt that the first floor has some nice doors, windows to be redone. Mr. Bishop specifically asked whether the applicant considered removing one or two or three sides then building a foundation and then putting the sides back. Mr. Bishop would like to see more of a historic reconstruction and not a complete demolition. Then some of the original building would be retained and incorporate more of a “barny” look.

Mr. Bishop identified on the east elevation a door above as well as on the south elevation. The window – those windows can be replicated and be energy efficient and can work. Putting the dormers that extend rather than using recessed windows would be a big improvement. If we can incorporate some of those things and salvage one, two or three of the sides . . . this proposal has to be a house. The applicant has the right to have a house. You can’t have a lot and then say you cannot have a house. It is challengeable.

Mr. Heagney also added that you cannot only have an accessory structure without a primary structure and presently, there is only an accessory structure.
Mr. Bishop reminded that we are only dealing with the exterior of the house and make it fit into the historic district and use as much of the historic fabric as possible.

Ms. McGinnis offered a few other suggestions saying that overall she is not concerned about the massing from the street the additional two feet will hardly be noticed. But it doesn’t really look so much like a barn. To accomplish that, we need to get rid of the shutters. The proportion of the window is not quite right – they are very long especially on the second floor. They needs to be squarer proportion and look more like the original structure. And perhaps the doors themselves can be the same size as what you have there - some can be functioning and other not. But again trying to replicate and have the feeling of the existing house.

Mr. Bishop agreed. He further stated that the windows ought to be replicas of what is there. Continuing, if you drive by, it looks like a barn and still looks like a barn and it will relate to the Brush house next door. All the detail that you can get from that house would be a great thing. Lastly, Mr. Bishop stated that we are not getting into the fine-tuning of the plan. We would expect you to come back with those type of details.

Mr. Heagney responded that what is being presented is a schematic design at best and those details are extremely important and we anticipate coming back. Mr. Heagney hoped to settle on the structure itself and have a direction and what details (barn door, window sizes, materials) the commission would want to see. Mr. Heagney identified that what is of value here: the doors, the windows are worthy; the floorboards, particularly on the second floor are fine examples and would be used on the exterior in some fashion so the period is carried through.

Ms. Smith asked if the application was two parts - is it a tear down or not AND then go into the design. Ms. Smith continued saying she came away from the site visit feeling surprisingly optimistic about the structure and said that there are certain ways you can handle the foundation. Ms. Smith also addresses the comment of the old building not meeting the building code. But there is one for historic structures. Ms. Smith suggested that if the carriage house were picked up and moved and the new foundation placed and then the really new construction in the back is now code dependent. Ms. Smith stated that the structure was a lot more solid than she expected.

Mr. Bishop asked Ms. Smith if she would want to keep the second floor mansard the way it is?

Ms. Smith replied that she would want some type of hip for the water run off from the pitch.

Mr. Bishop stated he was looking more at the shape.

Ms. Smith answered that when she was over at the site she compared it to #31. On #31 it looked like the kick is about a foot off the wall. When compared to the carriage house – it is not as nice a slope as on 31. It looks like it is being put in the design.
Mr. Bishop said that with the mansard the way it is now, the insets are not like those on 31.

Ms. Smith said that she didn’t have a problem changing the windows – not against adding windows for more light.

Mr. Bishop did ask Ms. Smith if she agreed if a new foundation was needed.

Ms. Smith replied yes. Continuing, if you lift the building up you can get in there and work and put it down.

Mr. Kagan offered that he had two comments. One, is the correct footprint 748 square feet? Mr. Kagan continued saying that the proposed addition is 1,610 without the garage (which adds another 346) and this is almost adding 200%. What is going around this – the plantings? Are they looking to hide the building? How are the neighbors looking at the new structure? If you double the size, it will affect the neighbors. I am concerned about what goes on there and how it fits on to the lot.

Mr. Bishop commented that it is going to be hard to see the addition in the rear.

Mr. Kagan said what we have not seen is how much asphalt, how much grass, is there going to be a yard? I am concerned how things fit on the lot.

Mr. Heagney responded saying that right now you have the shared drive and we are proposing to extend it here to have the one car garage. The southerly drive is dedicated only to bungalow in front. There would be lawn area on the south side of the house.

Mr. Bishop said that the part that now is asphalt in front of the house would go away.

Mr. Heagney confirmed.

Ms. Sheridan stated that she felt that the HDC was at a disadvantage that the architect could hear this and comment.

Mr. Heagney said that a member who serves on a town commission and are involved in a project that is being considered by that same commission, that member is not in the room during that time. It is appropriate for the architect not to be here. A transcript is being provided for the architect to consider ALL comments.

Ms. McGinnis wanted to bring attention to trying to preserve at least the first floor saying she could understand if this were a pristine structure but there is nothing on the inside to salvage so what are we going to see that is salvaged? And we don’t see the inside.

Mr. Bishop felt that his suggestion having three walls, kept but doesn’t see that having the second floor especially with the work to have the right pitches and dormers – you
need to build a second floor. Mr. Bishop continued saying that he does not care for the present roof - it clearly wasn’t well done and it has been bastardized since then. Mr. Bishop imagined the State saying “why did you save that for?” Having a roof like #31 is a big improvement.

Ms. Smith said that it looks in better shape than what I was expecting so I think you can retrofit it. That back wall – if that’s where you are adding, that’s coming off any way.

Mr. Heagney said speaking to the roof issue – when you look at the existing roof, it is one straight line and a break. With the mansards’, it is not just a straight line. That’s an important architectural detail that Aris has been working on.

Ms. Smith said if you are stripping off the roofing you can fix that. There aren’t a lot of people fixing/making real mansards.

Ms. McGinnis stated that if the goal is to make it fit, why are we trying to change it?

Mr. Bishop said that we are not trying to continue this style element as it currently exists.

Mr. Heagney reminded that this is the subordinate structure and would not have the embellishment of the main house.

Ms. Brown offered that she would like to see the east side windows replicated and wants to preserve as much as possible. She further added that she would like something more authentic in the front. Even if the house were raised two feet, it would not be that noticeable from the street.

Mr. Bishop stated that the application does have a deadline. HDC must either approve or deny it and personally wants to see something approved.

Mr. Heagney then spoke about the dialogue had between himself and the owner focusing upon what significant features of the building can be preserved or replicated. The windows and doors can be preserved. Mr. Heagney also understands the HSC comments of maintaining the carriage/barn façade so that it is not an exact copy of #31. You looking at it with barn door above and below and windows more in keeping with windows that are on the second floor now. It can be done – rebuilt with these elements in the reconstruction with the building moved 7 ½ feet to the east.

Mr. Bishop asked if there was a possibility to incorporate what he suggested – take the front floor on front side – remove it; salvage as must as you can. Put the foundation down and then reconstruct with what was saved of the front wall. But two walls is preferred – the front (east) and south wall.

Mr. Heagney said that if this is approved in concept then construction drawings (with more details) can be brought for a better understanding of the project.
Mr. Kagan asked if we want to see in any future designs the second floor recessed?

Mr. Bishop said no.

Motion to approve the design concept/general plan that was presented with the following stipulations to the proposed and presented design for the single family dwelling structure:

- That the south and east first/ground floor walls on the present standing structure (referred to as either “barn”/”carriage house”/”accessory structure”) be retained and incorporated into the proposed and presented design
- That the door on the second floor on the present standing structure (referred to as either “barn”/”carriage house”/”accessory structure”) must be retained and incorporated into the proposed and presented design
- That the windows be revised so that they are more in keeping and in proportion with what is there today
- That there not be any shutters
- That as much of the exterior siding be salvaged as possible on the present standing structure (referred to as either “barn”/”carriage house”/”accessory structure”) and incorporated into the proposed and presented design (Certificate of Appropriateness 0 Strickland road continued)
- That the corner between the two sides on the present standing structure (referred to as either “barn”/”carriage house”/”accessory structure”) be kept and incorporated into the proposed and presented design and the extension be placed on the north side

Moved by Ms. McGinnis  
Seconded by Ms. Sheridan  
Voting to approve: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. McGinnis, Ms. Brown  
Abstained: Ms. Smith

Further, the Historic District Commission requires that the applicant return with construction documents as well as material samples for their review and approval.

DEMOLITIONS

54 Oneida Drive  
Greenwich, CT

118 Havemeyer Place  
Greenwich, CT

MINUTES  
Motion to approve November 19, 2019 minutes  
Moved by Ms. Sheridan  
Seconded by Mr. Kagan  
Unanimous vote
Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Williams, Ms. McGinnis, Ms. Smith, Mr. Kagan, Ms. Brown

Motion to end the meeting at 9:35p.m.
Moved by Mr. Kagan
Seconded by Mr. Bishop
Unanimous vote
Voting in favor: Mr. Bishop, Ms. Sheridan, Ms. Williams, Ms. McGinnis, Ms. Smith, Mr. Kagan, Ms. Brown

The Town complies with all applicable federal and state laws regarding non-discrimination, equal opportunity, affirmative action, and providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. If you require an accommodation to participate, please contact the Commissioner of Human Services at 203-622-3800 or alan.barry@greenwichct.org as soon as possible in advance of the event.