

BOROUGH OF FENWICK
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING – September 7, 2019
4 NIBANG AVENUE, 9:00 AM

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of the Fenwick Historic District Commission was held at 4 Nibang Avenue, Old Saybrook, Connecticut on Saturday, September 7, 2019. Notice of the meeting was posted in a timely manner on the Fenwick kiosk and in the Borough office.

Members Present: Deborah Neely, Beverly Keeney, Patsy Jones, Valerie Bulkeley, Lucy Borge (Alternate), Suzanne Webster (Alternate).

Members Absent: Matt Myers.

Others Present: Marilyn Ozols, ZEO and HDC Compliance Official, Brooke Girty, Frank Sciamé, Frank and Kim Gilhool, Peter and Rownie Brainard, Tom Riggio, Joe Shea, Robin Gengras, Bill Webster.

1. Call to order.

Vice Chairman Bulkeley called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., reviewed the procedures for the meeting, and seated L. Borge as a voting member. A quorum was established (Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge).

2. Public Hearing: 10 Old Fenwick Avenue, map 5, lot 105. Victoria Baker & Susan Noble, Trustees, owners; Vicki Graboys, applicant. Application HDC19-013 to replace screen doors (change material).

V. Graboys presented. She stated that she is proposing to replace seven screen storm doors that are falling apart with similar doors; some of the existing doors are wood; all of the proposed doors will be a heavier aluminum; the doors have a full-size storm window with a screen replacement.

After asking for public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by D. Neely, seconded by L. Borge, it was voted unanimously to close the public hearing and go into regular session.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

3. Possible Action on HDC19-013, 10 Old Fenwick Avenue.

Members had no issues. Only the storm doors are to be replaced, not the interior doors.

Based on the discussion in and after the hearing, **D. Neely moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC19-013, 10 Old Fenwick Road, to replace the screen doors changing the material from wood to aluminum. P. Jones seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

On a motion by D. Neely, seconded by L. Borge, it was voted unanimously to go back into public hearing.

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

4. Public Hearing: Fenwick Avenue Beach, map 10, lots 1 and 17. Borough of Fenwick/Park Commission, owner & applicant. Application HDC19-014 for new playground equipment.

R. Gengras presented. She stated that both she and Margaret Wade had researched playgrounds with the additional goal, beyond improving safety, of reducing the amount of color in favor of natural wood; the proposal is almost the same as what is there now but with less color – only a little bit of yellow; they are replacing what is there in essentially the same locations but moving the swings to the front by the picnic table in order to be farther from the tick grass; a small roof is also added to one apparatus and the locations of the two jungle gyms are switched to move the younger children closer to their parents at the picnic table; a third “pull up” bar has been added; the new playground will be handicapped accessible including mobi-mats that can be placed on the sand.

Members inquired as to whether there is a slide on the apparatus for older children. R. Gengras replied that she believed so but would verify.

Members noted that the sand base has become very fine. R. Gengras replied that they were not intending to bring in new sand except for what is required for installation, but she will look into this.

Members asked if the swings could be moved to a different location. R. Gengras replied that this location was recommended by the consultant based on the space needed for swing safety.

After asking for public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by D. Neely, seconded by P. Jones, it was voted unanimously to close the public hearing and go into regular session.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

5. Possible Action on HDC19-014, Fenwick Avenue Beach.

Members indicated that the proposal looks nice; the baby apparatus is much nicer than the current one. V. Bulkeley stated that they might want to consider a slide on the older child apparatus and members agreed.

Based on the discussion in and after the hearing, **D. Neely moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC19-014, Fenwick Avenue Beach Playground, for new playground equipment with the stipulation that there is a slide on the larger structure. B. Keeney seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

On a motion by L. Borge, seconded by P. Jones, it was voted unanimously to go back into public hearing.

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

6. Public Hearing: 539 Maple Avenue, map 5, 102. Thomas & Louise Riggio, owners & applicants. Application HDC19-015 to replace exterior wood window molding with Azek.

T. Riggio presented. He stated that there is currently wood molding on several of the windows and it is rotting; the proposal is to replace it with identical looking Azek. He noted that he had submitted pictures and that there is currently some Azek on the house.

Public Comment:

B. Webster, 112 Sequassen Avenue, asked why this required an application and hearing since the windows will look the same and the application creates an expense for the applicant.

M. Ozols responded that according to statutes, an application is required whenever there is a change in material.

After asking for public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by D. Neely, seconded by P. Jones, it was voted unanimously to close the public hearing and go into regular session.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

7. Possible Action on HDC19-015, 539 Maple Avenue.

Members stated that they had no issues but indicated that they were sorry people had to come before the commission for a change in material when that material has been approved previously.

Based on the discussion in and after the hearing, **P. Jones moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC19-015, 539 Maple Avenue, to replace exterior wood window trim with Azek. L. Borge seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

On a motion by L. Borge, seconded by P. Jones, it was voted unanimously to go back into public hearing.

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

8. Public Hearing: 27 Pettipaug Avenue, map 10, lot 21. Peter Brainard, Trustee, owner & applicant. Application HDC19-016 to replace garden enclosure.

P. Brainard presented. He stated that there has been a garden fence there for many years and they upgraded the chicken wire and 1x1 construction to something more substantial; the wire is similar to what is seen in many pool fences in the Borough.

P. Jones stated that it looks better than the previous one.

Public Comment:

F. Sciamme, 102 Sequassen, stated that he was in favor of the better-looking fence.

After asking for public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by D. Neely, seconded by P. Jones, it was voted unanimously to close the public hearing and go into regular session.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

9. Possible Action on HDC19-016, 27 Pettipaug Avenue.

Members agreed that this looks better than the old one and the old one needed to be updated. They added that it looks like a garden and the wood will gray and weather.

V. Bulkeley stated that the application is after the fact and the fee schedule allows for an after the fact fee. M. Ozols noted that the fee is there because of the increased work related to after the fact applications for major construction. In this case, the applicant could easily withdraw, remove the fence, and reapply to avoid the fee. This makes no sense and would create more work than the current application.

Members noted that the fence can be seen from the seawall. L. Borge and B. Keeney stated that a garden fence has always been there, and you don't notice it. P. Jones stated that it would look neater and be nice

to have plantings outside the fence. V. Bulkeley stated that even though the stakes will gray and blend with the houses, the fence will be noticed. She added, as an example, that the fence at the Christensen's is planted with privet and you don't see the wire. It was noted that wire fence inserts that are not screened were already in place, but new wire inserts have consistently been screened.

Based on the discussion in and after the hearing, **D. Neely moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC19-016, 27 Pettipaug Avenue, to replace the garden enclosure. L. Borge seconded the motion.**

Members further discussed the motion. P. Jones noted that the criteria calls for screening of structures such as this. L. Borge stated that when the garden grows, it grows against the fence and this will soften the look. B. Keeney stated that she would support a stipulation requiring plantings to soften the look.

The motion failed 2-3-0.

For: D. Neely, L. Borge.
Against: B. Keeney, P. Jones, V. Bulkeley.
Abstain: None.

Based on the discussion of the previous motion, **P. Jones moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC19-016, 27 Pettipaug Avenue, to replace the garden enclosure with the stipulation that there be some planting around the perimeter of the garden to obscure the wire. B. Keeney seconded the motion.**

The motion passed 3-2-0.

For: B. Keeney, P. Jones, V. Bulkeley.
Against: D. Neely, L. Borge.
Abstain: None.

V. Bulkeley stated that in order to be consistent with other decisions, they should not be flexible and make one person cover wire fencing and not another.

P. Brainard stated that he will do something similar to what is planted around the generator.

On a motion by P. Jones, seconded by L. Borge, it was voted unanimously to go back into public hearing.

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

10. Public Hearing: 100 Sequassen Avenue, map 11, lot 17-1. Richard & Vicki Rosenthal Trustees, Owners; Brooke Girty Design, applicant. Application HDC19-017 to add garage with living space above, enclose entry, & revise driveway.

B. Girty presented. She stated that when the Rosenthal's bought the house, they lived in it for a season before determining what improvements to make; the porch will be enclosed to make an interior entry to the second floor living space; there is currently no room for a golf cart so a two car garage is proposed to provide a place for a golf cart, bikes, etc. She reviewed pictures of the existing house noting that the house has a unique feel and they would like to make it more "Fenwick". She indicated the location of the proposed garage on a photo and used the floor plan to indicate the location of all the proposed work, adding that this is the only location possible for the garage because it is a long, skinny lot.

Members clarified the inconsistencies between the north arrow on the site plan and the elevations labels.

B. Girty described the elevation drawings noting that the river side is unchanged until the additions; the new window is similar to Fenwick types; the roof slope is different but with a little tweaking (adding mullions and lattice), the house will look more like Fenwick; the elevator will go from the ground level to the first floor, but not to the second floor in order to avoid having the shaft extend above the roofline.

D. Neely stated that the changes would have been much more clear with a model.

P. Jones stated that it is a much prettier house.

B. Girty stated that in order to comply with flood requirements the house would need to be lifted but this would put the living level on the third floor, so they need to keep the cost below 50% of the value in order to avoid this requirement; they would like to change to wood shingles, but this will depend on the cost.

Public Comment:

F. Sciame, 102 Sequassen Avenue, stated that it is a great addition; it looks more like a Fenwick house.

B. Webster, 112 Sequassen Avenue, stated that it will look better than it does now.

D. Neely asked if the plans had been shared with the neighbors. B. Girty stated that notice had been provided as required.

After asking for additional public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by D. Neely, seconded by P. Jones, it was voted unanimously to close the public hearing and go into regular session.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

11. Possible Action on HDC19-017, 100 Sequassen Avenue.

D. Neely stated that she would have liked to see a model, which would make it easier to see the existing and proposed proportions. Otherwise, members had no issues.

Based on the discussion in and after the hearing, **D. Neely moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC19-017, 100 Sequassen Avenue, to add a garage with living space above, enclose the entry, & revise the driveway. B. Keeney seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

On a motion by P. Jones, seconded by B. Keeney, it was voted unanimously to go back into public hearing.

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

12. Public Hearing: 6 Mohegan Avenue, map 10, lot 13-2. A Piece of Paradise LLC, Owner; Brooke Girty Design, applicant. Application HDC19-018 to enclose ground floor open area, add front addition, & allow seasonal tent.

B. Girty presented. She displayed a photo of the pond side of the house and stated that it was first planned as a guest or carriage house for the main house, but this is no longer the case, so it can use more presence as a stand-alone house. She added that the first floor cannot be used for living space because of flood zone requirements.

D. Neely stated that it was built as a carriage house and that is how it was approved.

B. Girty disagreed and stated that they now need an additional bedroom and more of an entryway; this will provide more focus and interest and will better match the house next door; the proposal will add a gambrel to the front of the building similar to the sides of the house, will have inset windows, and will be a change from the shed roof that is currently in that location; they are not expanding the house lengthwise, but are extending out about 10 feet toward the pond.

B. Girty stated that on the sound side of the house, they are adding screen panels and added that the other part of the application is for a seasonal cabana for summer use.

D. Neely stated that she has an issue with the cabana, noting that it is so “there”.

Public Comment:

B. Webster, 112 Sequassen Avenue, stated that the proposal is generally fine, but the cabana looks “tacky”.

P. Christensen, 34 Pettipaug Avenue, stated that she is in favor of the cabana; it provides shade and the alternative would be a permanent structure.

F. Sciamme stated that the cabana is in a special spot on the property; the alternative would be European umbrellas which would look similar to a cantilever. B. Girty noted that these would also need HDC approval and that whatever is used will need to withstand the wind. F. Sciamme added that they need the shade, but if the Borough does not like the cabana, he is not married to it. He stated he could use a different color or add plantings so the cabana is not seen from Agawam Avenue.

L. Borge questioned whether a similar structure would be looked on favorably in other places in the Borough. P. Jones expressed concern that if a cabana is permitted here, cabanas could go in other places. B. Girty stated that a cabana would not look right on a lawn, but is more appropriate for the beach.

V. Bulkeley stated that a letter in opposition to the application was received from the Haviland’s and that all members had received a copy to review.

After asking for additional public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by D. Neely, seconded by L. Borge, it was voted unanimously to close the public hearing and go into regular session.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

13. Possible Action on HDC19-018, 6 Mohegan Avenue.

P. Jones stated that it looks busy on the north side for a house this size, but it looks fine; it totally changes the look of the house. D. Neely stated that the bay window makes it looks heavy. V. Bulkeley reminded the members to look at the window to wall ratio. B. Keeney agreed that it looks heavy, adding that your eye gravitates to the addition. L. Borge stated that it looks better; the extension does not obscure any view; it may be heavier, but it is not out of character; and the south side screening is not an issue. She added that she did have a concern with the cabana. D. Neely and V. Bulkeley agreed that the house changes make it look prettier and more finished.

Based on the discussion in and after the hearing, **P. Jones moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC19-018, 6 Mohegan Avenue, to enclose the ground floor open area and add a front addition, but to deny the seasonal cabana. L. Borge seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

P. Jones noted for the record that the cabana is not consistent with Fenwick and that the applicant will need to return with light fixture selections.

Recusal

V. Bulkeley reminded the members that according to statutes, anyone with a financial gain or close family relationship should recuse themselves from hearing an application.

Modifications

F. Gilhool asked about the lack of public hearing for modifications, expressing the opinion that the Wilson modification is substantial and should require a hearing. M. Ozols stated that this has been the policy of the Commission, but that all meetings are public and the chair has the authority to allow the public to speak. V. Bulkeley added that modifications are frequently for details and smaller items; a substantive change could still

require a hearing. P. Christensen added that things happen during construction and frequently the modifications are positive changes, but the applicant might be discouraged from making them if it required a new public hearing.

14. 29A Pettipaug Avenue, map 10, lot 20-1. Robert & Ann Pulver, owners; Brooke Girty Design, applicant. Modification Application HDC19-019 to move pool flush with house, add pool guardrails, gate, & alarm.

V. Bulkeley and P. Jones indicated that although they are abutters, they can review the application objectively.

B. Girty presented. She stated that this is extremely similar to the prior application but includes changes required by the building code and adds additional deck space / platform area adjacent to the house to allow for maintenance and window washing. She pointed out the changes on the elevation drawings and stated that the deck is not coming out any farther than the existing deck and the height of the deck and pool does not change from the previous application.

Public Comment:

F. Gilhool, 35 Pettipaug Avenue, stated that he had looked at the plans and thinks they look fine.

Members stated that the application is very similar to the prior application and they have no issues.

Based on the discussion, **D. Neely moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC19019, 29A Pettipaug Avenue, to move the pool location relative to the house, and add pool guardrails, a gate, & an alarm. P. Jones seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

15. 37 Pettipaug Avenue, map 5, lot 120. Hall Wilson, owner; Brooke Girty Design, applicant. Modification Application HDC19-020 to revise grading, garage, & driveway.

B. Keeney indicated that although she is an abutter, she can review the application objectively.

B. Girty presented. She stated that the house is staying the same as the last application but because the datum changed from the original survey to the current site plan, they need to modify the driveway and access in order to adjust for grading. She stated that she believes this is better for the neighbors since cars will not be in their view to the water; that when they moved the garage doors they added pretty windows and lattice to the front; that there will be a small wall (1' to 18") which can easily be hidden with bushes; that the grading provides a more graceful access to the house; that the other option would have been a more square house which would have blocked the view from the Gilhool's so the owners wanted a long, thin house; and that mechanicals have been moved from the north side to the Keeney side and they will be planted.

B. Keeney stated that the north side looks prettier now and that the only other possible access would have been across 41 Pettipaug.

Public Comment:

F. Gilhool, 35 Pettipaug Avenue, stated that he is not aware of any precedent in the Borough for this type of configuration; he is concerned about the changes in topography which might cause run-off onto his property; and a retaining wall has been added and there is no historic precedent for this.

V. Bulkeley stated that she is sympathetic about run-off, but it is not the jurisdiction of HDC.

B. Girty stated that garages are raised all the time, but it is not noticed because of the grading.

P. Christensen, 34 Pettipaug Avenue, stated that it is typical for the garage to be at the level of the road and she could not think of any house which has the garage raised to the level of the house. She asked for a comparison of the level of the garage with the level of the Gilhool house.

B. Girty stated that the wall is one to two feet tall with a hedge; people raise the grade all the time on a new house; and the Gilhool house is a lot higher than the garage.

F. Gilhool, 35 Pettipaug Avenue, asked if he could continue to speak.

V. Bulkeley stated that the Commission wants to give him full opportunity to have a say and to discuss the proposal openly.

F. Gilhool, 35 Pettipaug Avenue, stated that he disagreed; that it is not historic and there is no precedent – this would set a new one.

L. Borge stated that they have started to accept things that are not historic such as “fake” wood and elevation to prevent flooding.

D. Neely stated that the plans look great and most of the garages in the Borough are add-ons, not designed as part of the house.

F. Gilhool, 35 Pettipaug Avenue, stated that he is just considering historic guidelines that have not been changed in this respect.

K. Gilhool, 35 Pettipaug Avenue, stated that the only other garage at the same level as the house is the Sbriglio garage.

B. Girty stated that there are four steps down to the garage and the grade is much higher in the rear of the house. She added that people don’t know which garages may have been raised because the grade has been changed.

L. Borge questioned how lowering the grade would be better for the neighborhood.

F. Gilhool, 35 Pettipaug Avenue, referred to the sensitivity to views and stated that the driveway will be higher, cars will be higher, and the grade is 2’ higher on the edge of the property where he always had concerns.

V. Bulkeley asked what 2 feet would do to the view from the Gilhool property and noted that views in the second row are always compromised.

B. Girty stated that most of the grade on the Gilhool property is at elevation 9 which is the highest grade on the Wilson property.

P. Jones stated that the reason she had asked about alternatives was to see how an alternative design might have affected the view.

Based on the discussion, **D. Neely moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC19-020, 37 Pettipaug Avenue, to revise the grading, garage, and driveway. P. Jones seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

16. 20 Nibang Avenue, map 10, lot 3. Joseph Zubretsky, Trustee, owner; Brooke Girty Design, applicant. Modification Application HDC19-021 to change roof pitch on west addition, remove pergola & window, add French doors & awning, infill porch, replace columns.

B. Girty presented. She stated that the changes are minor and accommodate modifications requested by the owners. Additionally, the roof pitch on the addition was depicted incorrectly on the original elevation and this has been corrected. She demonstrated to the members the vanishing point on a hip roof and how

the 2d depiction makes it appear higher than it is, and she reviewed the western elevation to identify the peak heights.

D. Neely noted that the pergola has been removed in the current plan and stated that it had provided visual depth that softened the mass. P. Jones and B. Keeney added that it broke up the mass and provided balance to the front elevation. Members expressed concern that the building is a big mass and looks long, like a train or hotel. B. Girty reminded the members that she had provided comparisons to other houses in the Borough at the previous presentation and stated that the length is similar to the Millard house. D. Neely noted that the mass isn't seen in the same way there. B. Girty displayed a photo of the existing house to demonstrate that a drawing never looks as rich as the actual. Members recommended adding a pergola back to help with the mass.

B. Girty continued to review the proposed changes.

- Most of the front is the same but, on the right, a pair of doors have been added and centered under the porch and it is shingled between the two end columns to add interior space. Both of these are hard to see under the porch.
- On the west side facing the woods, the pergola is removed; there is a change in the first floor roof line; and the left shingled columns are changed from round to square.
- Facing the water, there were tiny shingles around the windows, and this is now trimmed out with white trim; an awning was added between the two pieces that come out; and the columns are changed to remove the shingles.
- On the east side, the center windows are changed to doors; the end is enclosed between the columns the same as in the front; the existing "funky" walls over the garage will be cut back. She submitted a photo with this change drawn on.

D. Neely asked if the change to square columns in the front is so that screens can be accommodated in the future and B. Girty confirmed that this is the case.

Members continued to discuss their concern about the length and massiveness of the house and expressed disappointment that the property owners were not able to attend the meeting and be part of the discussion.

B. Girty reminded the members that they are dealing with a house that is only room deep and is long. She stated that proposed lighting has not yet been submitted and she pointed out the location between columns for the previous pergola, adding that, if it is put back, it should be shortened from the previously proposed depth. She stated that the site design is being done by Rick Worcester and he can attend a future meeting to present it; and that the pool will be changing from kidney shape to rectangular, but this is not included in the application since the pool cannot be seen from a public way.

Based on the discussion, **D. Neely moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC19-021, 20 Nibang Avenue, to change the roof pitch on the west addition, remove the pergola & a window, add French doors and an awning, infill the porch, and replace columns with the stipulation that a pergola be added to the front elevation.**

P. Jones seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

B. Girty stated that she will return with the design for the pergola.

J. Shea, contractor, stated that the owners are very committed to this project and that he will try to keep the property looking as nice as possible during construction. He added that there will be a gravel parking area added during construction to keep vehicles off the road, but this will be removed when the work is complete.

At this time L. Borge left the meeting and S. Webster was seated as a voting member.

17. Approval of Minutes: July 13, 2019.

D. Neely moved that the minutes of the previous HDC meeting on July 13, 2019 be accepted as written. B. Keeney seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

18. Old Business / Other Business.

a. Draft 2020 Meeting Schedule

M. Ozols stated that the draft schedule has been distributed and requested that people let her know if they are aware that any of the proposed dates will be a conflict for them. If any date looks like it might have a quorum issue, a different date can be selected before the schedule is set.

b. Commission Vacancy

V. Bulkeley noted that the Burgesses have not appointed anyone for the alternate vacancy created by Chris Duncan's resignation. She stated that is important that this vacancy be filled as soon as possible as alternates are seated for quorum.

c. 34 Pettipaug Avenue C of A Expiration

D. Neely moved to add the expiration of the C of A for 34 Pettipaug Avenue to the agenda. B. Neely seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

P. Christensen explained that the C of A had expired but they would now like to proceed with the work. There are no changes proposed to what was previously approved.

B. Keeney moved to grant a two-year extension of the C of A for 34 Pettipaug Avenue in accordance with the previously approved plans, pending submission of the appropriate application and fee. P. Jones seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

For: Bulkeley, Neely, Jones, Keeney, Borge.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

d. Requirement for Models

Members discussed extensively the need for models in order for them to effectively consider new construction or extensive remodels/additions. Although, in many instances, models have been requested both at and prior to meetings, they have not been submitted. Members were reminded that they have the authority to table action on any application where they believe that a model should have been submitted and defer review to a new meeting, likely a special meeting, after they have received the model. Applicants will be reminded of this requirement and warned that the application will likely not go forward without it. Members added that are not looking for a computer generated 3d model, but an actual foam core, or similar, model.

e. Design Criteria.

M. Ozols reminded the members that they should be sending her their thoughts on items that should be considered when the Design Criteria is updated.

19. Adjourn.

On a motion by D. Neely, seconded by B. Keeney, it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn M. Ozols, Acting Clerk