Draft Minutes
(These minutes will not be approved until Wednesday 18th August, 2010)

TOWN OF GUILFORD
Historic District Commission
Minutes – 21st July, 2010

The Historic District Commission held a public hearing and regular meeting on Wednesday 21st July, 2010 at 7:00p.m. in the Town Hall with Chairman William Thompson presiding.


With no quorum present the Commission began its regular meeting with the Public Forum item.

REGULAR MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 7:00p.m.

Public Forum: 1) 180 State Street, Map 46, Lot 129 (garage addition): Architect Karin Patriquin introduced herself and the property owner, John Hodson. Ms. Patriquin said she believed that there had been several applications in the past for a garage and that the most recent had been to locate the garage on the north side with a curb cut on North Street. Instead Ms. Patriquin said she was proposing a detached garage in the rear of the property with the curb cut remaining on State Street. She showed photographs of neighborhood properties with attached and detached outbuildings. Ms. Patriquin noted that the historic ones were mostly detached. She also stated that Mr. Hodson would like a small room on the upper floor of the proposed garage. Mr. Thompson felt a height variance would be needed and Ms. Patriquin agreed. Ms. Street thought the septic system might have to be upgraded. However, Ms. Patriquin replied no, as the upper room would not be a true bedroom. Mr. Thompson replied that he believed the definition in Guilford was different and that the health code included any enclosed space. He recommended discussing this with the Director of Health since certain features could cause a space to be considered to be a bedroom. Ms. Street agreed saying the rules on septic systems had changed. She stated that it appeared as though a barn-like look was being considered. Mr. Hodson replied yes, a sort of rustic look in wood. Mr. Thompson said he liked the concept of the garage being detached. Regarding scale he said these were often carriage house structures. Mr. Thompson also mentioned that in the past the Commission had supported non-conforming proposals but that the Zoning Board of Appeals would make its own decision. Mr. Thompson felt that variances for coverage and area were not easy to obtain. He added that the scale had to be carefully resolved in order to win an argument about the height. Ms. Street thought a request for a variance might be strengthened if some of the other outbuildings were removed. Referring to the design of the garage, Ms. Street said one would have a full frontal view and, therefore, it should not look too rustic. Instead she felt it should have a slightly better finish. Mr. Thompson warned that the structure should not get too big too fast. He suggested masking the entry point with plantings. Ms. Street stated that if the playroom did not have to be a full two stories the proposed garage could be 1½ stories. 2) First Congregational Church, 110 Broad Street, Map 39, Lot 47: Bob Leete reminded the Commission that it had approved an application for restoration of the sanctuary portico which had included guttering. Mr. Leete said it was possible that the gutters were reaching an overload and he asked if a Certificate of Appropriateness would be needed to install larger downspouts. Mr. Thompson thought the answer was yes. He
suggested trying one downspout which the Commission could review on site. Mr. Thompson also recommended talking to the vendor. However, following brief discussion Mr. Thompson then said since the COA for the sanctuary portico project was still valid this issue could be handled by the subcommittee. Ms. Street also recommended trying one downspout to see if this solved the problem. Mr. Leete also asked about repair work at the Spencer House, 122 Broad Street, which he said would not include any upgrades. Mr. Thompson replied that as long as the same materials and profile were used this would be considered a replacement-in-kind and no Certificate of Appropriate-ness would be needed.

**Correspondence:** National Alliance of Preservation Commissions’ newsletter The Alliance Review for May/June 2010.

**Unfinished Certificates of Appropriateness:**

1) **#475 Christopher McManus, 196 Whitfield, expires 2/20/10 – eastern wing/rear porch:** Mr. Thompson reported that Mr. McManus planned to install plantings around the condenser units and stone on the driveway.

2) **#479 Guilford Center for Children, 268 Old Whitfield, expires 4/23/09 – barn rehab (T/RJM):** Mr. Thompson said that the Guilford Center for Children had provided bonds for the condenser unit screening and the plantings. Planting will be done in the fall.

3) **#537 Dan and Joe’s Barbershop, 1060 Boston Post Road, expires 6/16/11 – sign:** Ms. Street said she had inspected the sign bracket and did not feel anything needed to be changed. This project is, therefore, completed.

The regular meeting was adjourned at 7:20p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

With a quorum present the meeting was called to order at 7:40p.m. Mrs. Bunting read the legal call of the meeting.

**#539 - William Pitt Sotheby’s International Realty, to modify an existing outdoor advertising sign on property located at 73 Church Street, Assessor’s Map 46, Lot 16:** Kathy Mitchell stated that the sign was blue and no-one could see it because it blended in. Ms. Mitchell said she wished to add a white frame around the outside of the existing signboard so it caught one’s eye. Ms. Street thought this would make the sign bigger. Ms. Mitchell said she would try and keep it small. If the frame did extend she thought it would be no more than 1”-2”. Mr. Thompson felt the post would need to be substantial for this sign. Ms. Mitchell said the post was approximately 2”-3”. She added that the edge may be beveled. Ms. Street asked if the sign would be two-sided and Ms. Mitchell replied yes. Mrs. Bunting suggested that a mock-up could be made out of paper or cardboard for review by a subcommittee. Ms. Mitchell mentioned that her sign maker would adjust the dimensions as he did the edging. Ms. Street felt if the sign was too large it would extend beyond the bracket. No-one spoke for or against the application. Later, during the regular meeting, Ms. Street made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Bunting, to approve the application as submitted with the following stipulations: 1) A mock-up of the sign is to be created on site so that the sign does not project beyond the horizontal support member. This is to be reviewed with the subcommittee before any changes are made to the sign. 2) Possible removal of the main brace may also be allowed following review of the mock-up. 3) Subcommittee appointed is Rebecca Bunting. The motion to approve was carried unanimously with Bunting, Street and Thompson voting in favor.
#541 - First Congregational Church, to install a gas meter on the west wall of the church sanctuary located at 110 Broad Street, Assessor’s Map 39, Lot 47: Bob Leete stated that he wished to put the gas meter in the most unobtrusive location possible. He added that he had received a strong recommendation from the Building Inspector to have the shortest possible gas line. Mr. Thompson asked if there were any code issues with the adjacent window. Mr. Leete replied yes, that the meter had to be 3ft. from any opening and that this could be done. Ms. Street felt the meter should blend in with its background. No-one spoke for or against the application. Later, during the regular meeting, Mrs. Bunting made a motion, seconded by Ms. Street, to approve the application with the following stipulations: 1) If possible, the gas meter should be painted to blend in with its background. 2) Subcommittee appointed is Rebecca Bunting. The motion to approve was carried unanimously with Bunting, Street and Thompson voting in favor.

#543 - Barbara L. Stuart, to install new aluminum storm windows on a dwelling located at 44 Fair Street, Assessor’s Map 39, Lot 21: Ms. Stuart said she needed new storm windows. She added that she had a total of 31 windows of which 18 have rot. Ms. Stuart said she was considering replacing the storm windows on all her windows. However, the estimate for Allied was twice that of Guilford Glass and Ms. Stuart said cost was a factor for her. She mentioned that 11 windows on the rear of the house were modern reproduction windows. Ms. Stuart said aside from cost another issue for her was opening the storm windows. Guilford Glass windows slide up and down in winter and summer whereas Allied’s windows have to be taken in and out. Mr. Thompson asked about replacing the 9 windows on the front of the house with Allied. He pointed out that the house was very close to the street and that Ms. Stuart had gone to a lot of trouble to restore it. Mr. Thompson noted that it was an important building on the street and that he would not be comfortable with triple track storms on the front façade. Ms. Stuart mentioned other houses on her street that had triple track but Mr. Thompson said this may have been done before the formation of the historic district. He added that the Commission had to seek what was appropriate for the building that would not have a negative impact on the street while still accommodating Ms. Stuart’s needs. Ms. Street suggested replacing the front façade with Allied windows and then replacing the wood windows with triple track as they rotted out. However, Ms. Stuart pointed out that she received a quantity discount if she ordered a certain number of windows. Ms. Street asked why double track windows could not be installed. Ms. Stuart replied that there was not enough width. No-one spoke for or against the application. Later, during the regular meeting, Ms. Street made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Bunting, to approve the application as submitted with the following stipulations: 1) Allied-style storm windows must be installed on the front (east) side of the house, and good quality triple track storm windows may be installed elsewhere. 2) Subcommittee appointed is: Ann Street. The motion to approve was carried unanimously with Bunting, Street and Thompson voting in favor.

#540 - Peter Jelley, Architect, to add a first floor window on the north side of an existing dwelling located at 16 Fair Street, Assessor’s Map 39, Lot 18: Jonathan Wuerth stated that he was representing architect Peter Jelley. Mr. Wuerth added that nothing had been changed from the informal presentation made at the June meeting. The plan is to create an ensuite area on the first floor and the request was for one window only in the bathroom. Ms. Street asked if the trim material would match and Mr. Wuerth replied yes. She then asked if the window would be a wood single pane style. Mr. Wuerth replied that it would probably be a Marvin window and if it was wood then a storm window would be installed. Ms. Street felt a full triple track storm would be very unattractive. Mr.
Thompson suggested insulated glass. No-one spoke for or against the application. Later, during the regular meeting, Ms. Street made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Bunting, to approve the application as submitted with the following stipulations: 1) The window is to be one over one and must be reviewed with and approved by the subcommittee prior to purchase and installation. 2) The window must be installed so that the exterior head trim lines up with the clapboard course. 3) Subcommittee appointed is Ann Street. The motion to approve was carried unanimously with Bunting, Street and Thompson voting in favor.

The public hearing was adjourned at 8:15p.m. and the regular meeting was reconvened.

REGULAR MEETING  (Continued)

COAA#534 – Erik and Anna Forselius, to install a bicycle shed on the driveway (after the fact), a gable addition on an existing shed, to install a new shed, and to install a perimeter fence, all on property located at 24 High Street, Assessor’s Map 33, Lot 76 (tabled from June meeting, decision due 7/22/10): Erik Forselius submitted photographs of the bicycle shed, the existing chicken coop (proposed gable addition), area for new wood storage shed and carport, and a neighbor’s split rail fence (Exhibit #534A[1-9]). Mr. Forselius also submitted a letter from his tenant, John Floyd, in support of the bicycle shed (Exhibit #534[B]). Mr. Thompson said he had understood that the bicycle shed was going to be used for trade shows and, therefore, was temporary. Mr. Forselius replied that he had never reached that point. Instead his children began using it for bicycle storage and so he had left it in situ and placed it on cinder blocks. Ms. Street queried size. Mr. Forselius replied 6ft. x 8ft. Ms. Street felt it looked bigger than that in the drawings. Mr. Thompson asked if a setback variance had been sought and Mr. Forselius said he was in the process of applying. He added that originally he had not sought the proper permits because he was not sure that he was keeping the shed. Mr. Forselius said he also wished to have a shed for storing the lawnmower, etc., with a carport off the side and he showed a sketch of this. He added that his neighbors had planted arbor vitae to hide the view of this. Mr. Thompson stated that by law the Commission was required to make a decision on this application tonight. The Commission had asked Mr. Forselius for details and drawings on which to base a decision which was put into a letter dated 5/20/10 to Mr. Forselius so it would be clear. Mr. Thompson also pointed out that the COA application contained a checklist of what needed to be submitted. He said that the information which Mr. Forselius had provided tonight did not provide thorough enough information since it was not to scale and did not show all sides of the proposed structures. Mr. Forselius replied that he did not see why these details could not be handled by a subcommittee. Mr. Thompson said the Commission needed more detailed information in order to make a judgment on what Mr. Forselius was proposing. He explained that this was why criteria were included with the application form.

Regarding the proposed gable addition to the existing chicken coop, Mr. Forselius stated that he wished to make this into a potting shed and so he wanted to have a gable off the front to create more room. Ms. Street asked what the current use was. Mr. Forselius replied that he stored lawnmowers, etc., but had things he could not get through the door. He showed a rough drawing of this proposal. Mr. Thompson said if the Commission felt that a proposal made sense for a property then it might recommend it but that it usually tried to abide by the zoning rules. He said he did not understand why everything Mr. Forselius did was non-conforming when he had such a large lot. Mr. Thompson said he seemed to be locating all his structures up against the edge of the property. Ms. Street felt that the
bicycle shed might make sense but not the other structures. She said she wished to go back to what the Commission was required to do by law and the schedule that it had to follow. Ms. Street said the level of discussion that the Commission was having tonight was the level that it liked to have before an application was formally filed. She added that the statutes required that the Commission rule on what was provided in an application and if there was insufficient information then the Commission had to deny the application. Mr. Forselius said that it seemed as though he had to pay someone to provide drawings and he felt this was a burden on the homeowner. He added that there were three or four other properties on his street that had sheds in the driveway. He also said that he was unaware that he could discuss proposals informally with the Commission. With reference to Mr. Forselius’s comment about the burden on homeowners, Mr. Thompson said that the criteria was a little different when one lived within an historic district, and that the statute was tied to this with a formal process. He also noted that if Mr. Forselius applied for a building permit he would need more information than he had provided so far and HDC had an even higher standard. The application was filed with insufficient information, the Commission had asked for more and now it was at the end of its process. Mr. Thompson pointed out that the Commission did not create the current situation, that there was a proper process to be followed and everyone else also followed this process. Ms. Street also pointed out that the information which Mr. Forselius had provided did not match from one drawing to another. Therefore, if this application was approved what exactly would the Commission be approving? Ms. Street said there needed to be a basal level of consistency from drawing to site plan so that the Commission could see a picture which it could approve. As an aside Ms. Street noted that the proposed French door would not be appropriate for a potting shed.

Mr. Forselius asked the Commission to rule on the after-the-fact bicycle storage shed and the split rail fence. He stated that he would like to withdraw his request for a wood storage shed, a carport and a gable addition to the existing chicken coop. Referring to the withdrawn items, Ms. Street recommended Mr. Forselius take photographs over the winter when the leaves were gone so one would get a clear picture of the property.

With reference to the split rail fence, Mr. Forselius said he would be copying an adjacent neighbor’s split rail fence. Ms. Street queried the height and Mr. Forselius replied approximately 42”. Mrs. Bunting asked if the fence would be on the property line, adding that she was unsure of the codes. Mr. Thompson replied that the fence had to be all on one’s own property.

Later in the meeting, during discussion, Ms. Street felt the bicycle shed was fine. Mr. Thompson said if it was approved then it would be for that location only and any other location would require a new application. However, he added that he was not in favor of the bicycle shed especially since there were many other places on the property where it could be located and meet the zoning codes. Ms. Street pointed out that zoning was not the Commission’s criteria and that lot line buildings were a fact in the downtown area. Mrs. Bunting said her first impression was that the shed did not look good and it obstructed the view of the barn from the street. She felt it was not where an historic building would go. Ms. Street said she was less inclined to take a hard line regarding the shed. She felt it was bigger than it needed to be but that a good job had been done to match it to existing, and that the location was acceptable if the neighbors did not object. Mr. Thompson replied that he did not feel endless outbuildings were appropriate. Mrs. Bunting then made a motion, seconded by Ms. Street, with the following stipulations: 1) The split rail fence is approved as submitted. The fence is to match the height, size and shape of the adjacent split rail fence that borders this property. 2) After-the-fact approval for the bicycle storage shed is denied because it is not appropriate. Considering the size of
the property and current structures, it would be more appropriate to propose a possible addition to an existing structure. This would also preserve more of the green space. In its current location the shed obstructs the view of the existing accessory dwelling/garage structure. The shed is also not appropriate in form or scale. It is at odds with the several other building forms already present on the property. Looking forward, the Commission feels that care needs to be taken in proposing any additions to existing structures for this property. 3) Since the applicant withdrew his request for a new gable addition to an existing chicken coop, the wood storage shed, and the carport for boat storage the Commission did not rule on these three items. 4) Subcommittee appointed is William Thompson. The motion was carried unanimously with Bunting, Street and Thompson voting in favor.

The regular meeting was adjourned at 8:50p.m. and the public hearing was reopened.

**PUBLIC HEARING**  
(Continued)

#542 - Alec W. & Teresa Anne M. Buchanan, to remove a deck attached to the garage, sun room and entry porch on the east side and replace with a covered porch; remove and replace metal storm door with a wood door, all on property located at 2 Market Place, Assessor’s Map 40, Lot 101: Mark Couet stated that the deck attached to the garage would be removed and he showed photographs. The sun room and entry porch on the east side will be removed and replaced and will be slightly larger. Mr. Thompson asked if the pitches would be the same and would it work with a regular hip roof. Mr. Couet replied yes, but that Ms. Buchanan wanted more room. There will be no gutters. Ms. Street asked if the shingles would be wood or asphalt. Mr. Couet replied that he believed asphalt. Ms. Street felt the proposed columns were a bit thin and Mr. Couet said he could size them up a little bit. Mr. Thompson asked if a railing was needed and Mr. Couet said yes. Ms. Street said she was not sure how she felt about railings going into a classical column and recommended omitting the railings. Mr. Thompson suggested rectilinear columns but Mr. Couet said Ms. Buchanan wanted round ones. Mr. Thompson liked the larger overhang. The Commission questioned the diameter of the columns and railing detail. An increase in the size of the columns should be proportional and a catalogue cut should be provided. There should also be a catalogue cut for the doors. Mr. Couet said the doors and windows would match existing as much as possible. Porch deck will be tongue and groove with a painted floor. The underside of the porch roof will be bead board. It was estimated that the eave depth was 8½ ft. but Mr. Couet said Ms. Buchanan had thought 9ft. Mr. Thompson said none of the drawings showed a 9ft. footprint. Ms. Street did not feel this changed anything except the pitch of the roof. Mr. Thompson replied that it could reach a point where it would matter. Ms. Street thought that the flatter the roof got the more inappropriate the rail would look. Mr. Couet showed a drawing of the proposed railing and Ms. Street felt this would require different columns. Mr. Thompson said to keep in mind that a lot of the project would be seen obliquely. Ms. Street asked if the foundation would be visible. Mr. Couet replied probably the footings on grade. Mr. Thompson asked if the steps would have wood tread and Mr. Couet replied yes. In response to another question, Mr. Couet said the door would be wood clad. He mentioned that Ms. Buchanan had had a question about storm windows. Mr. Thompson replied that these were not part of this application. No-one spoke for or against the application. Later, during the regular meeting, during discussion Mr. Thompson felt the columns should be 8’ x 8’ and rectangular. There also needed to be resolution of the base where the columns land. Ms. Street felt it was critical which way the decking was laid. She then made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Bunting, to approve the application with the following stipulations: 1) The following items must be reviewed with and approved by the subcommittee before work begins:
a) resolution of the base where the columns land; b) the whole deck edge, direction of the decking and the dimensions of the deck; c) catalogue cuts for the doors and exterior lighting.  2) The Commission recommends using 8’ x 8’ columns. Other sizes or shape should be approved by the subcommittee before proceeding.  3) Subcommittee appointed is Ann Street. The motion to approve was carried unanimously with Bunting, Street and Thompson voting in favor.

The public hearing was closed at 9:35 p.m. and the regular meeting was reconvened.

REGULAR MEETING  (Continued)

Approval of Minutes: Ms. Street made a motion to accept the Minutes of 16th June, 2010 with the following corrections: on page 4, the eighth sentence in the first paragraph should say “He added that the Commission needed to be given…..”. Also on page 4, under “COA#416-08, Christopher McManus, 196 Whitfield Street, expires 2/10/10 – eastern wing/rear porch”, the second sentence should say “…..finished driveway such as oil with crushed stone on top which would be….”. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion and it was carried with two votes in favor. Mrs. Bunting abstained since she was not present at the June meeting.

Certificate of Appropriateness #470-10, 91 Church Street, Assessor’s Map 46, Lot 14: Revisions to COA (tabled from June meeting): Tabled to the August meeting.

Certified Local Government Issues: There were no issues to be discussed.

Green Committee: Mr. Thompson reported that he had received a telephone call from Chairman Doug Williamson asking for an HDC representative on the Green Committee. Mr. Thompson said he had told Mr. Williamson that HDC never knew when the Green Committee met and meetings were usually at an inconvenient time.

Public Relations: Mr. Thompson said he had organized additional frames for new awards.

Approval of Bills: Mrs. Bunting made a motion to approve the following bills: Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation, membership renewal for 2010-2011, $75; Katharine Stewart, secretarial services. Ms. Street seconded the motion and it was carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

The next meeting of the Historic District Commission will be held on Wednesday 18th August, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Katharine Stewart
Recording Secretary