

BOROUGH OF FENWICK
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING – MAY 1, 2021
VIRTUAL MEETING, 9:00 AM

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of the Fenwick Historic District Commission was held using the Zoom meeting format on Saturday, May 1, 2021. Notice of the meeting was posted in a timely manner on the Fenwick kiosk and on the website.

Members Present: Matt Myers, Valerie Bulkeley, Patsy Jones, Deborah Neely, Beverly Keeney, Mike Reynolds (Alternate), Ashley Gengras (Alternate), Scott Pulver (Alternate).

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Marilyn Ozols, ZEO and HDC Compliance Official, Brooke Girty, John MacNeil, David Savin, Duby McDowell, Alexa Ashton, Sabrina Foulke, Brooke Girty, Frank Gilhool, Louis & Marla Esposito.

1. Call to order.

Chairman Myers called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum was established (Myers, Bulkeley, Neely, Keeney, Jones).

B. Keeney moved to add renewal of HDC17-006, 10 Pettipaug Road to the agenda at the end of the applications. P. Jones seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

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

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

2. Public Hearing: 37 Sequassen Avenue, map 11, lot 5. Another Ugly Day in Paradise LLC, owner, and John MacNeil, applicant. Application HDC21-006 to replace existing railing.

John MacNeil presented. He stated that there is a deck on the third floor facing the Sound; they had previously replaced the railing with a pipe and cable railing and are now requesting to replace one section with a glass panel; the system for this replacement is called View Rail and includes a section of glass set in a track that is bolted to the deck and a top rail; they are looking to address the obstruction of the view to the Sound.

M. Myers stated that he has a similar cable rail and it does not block the view and this railing can be seen from a public view. D. Savin stated that there are four to five horizontal wires and they 100% impair the view plus they make the house look a lot busier. P. Jones stated it is an improvement over what is there and the panel can also help provide protection from the wind. S. Pulver agreed. D. Savin stated that it is an improvement to the way the house looks and clarified that the proposal is for the third floor deck. M. Myers noted that in the picture, it appears to be a screen railing. D. Savin stated that it is not screen.

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: Myers, Neely, Keeney, Jones.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

3. Possible Action on HDC21-006, 37 Sequassen Avenue.

Based on the discussion in the hearing, **P. Jones moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC21-006, 37 Sequassen Avenue, to replace a section of the existing third floor railing with glass panels. D. Neely seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Myers, Neely, Keeney, Jones.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

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

For: Myers, Neely, Keeney, Jones.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

4. **Public Hearing: 26 Pettipaug Avenue, map 10, lot 36.** Sea Grove LLC, owner, and Duby McDowell, applicant. Application HDC21-007 to add ac units and generator screened by lattice.

V. Bulkeley was not present for this application and S. Pulver was seated in her place.

Duby McDowell presented. She stated that the house does not have air conditioning and they would like to add splits; the condensers would be on the Pettipaug and Agawam sides of the house and would be screened by lattice; the Pettipaug side also has plantings; they will also add a generator in the location on the north side where there already is lattice to obscure it; the only new lattice will be around the new ac; they previously obtained approval to extend the lattice on the north side for the shower.

M. Myers noted that the lattice is in keeping with the rest of Fenwick and B. Keeney added that it meets the criteria. Other members concurred.

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

For: Myers, Pulver, Neely, Keeney, Jones.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

5. **Possible Action on HDC21-007, 26 Pettipaug Avenue.**

Based on the discussion in the hearing, **B. Keeney moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC21-007, 26 Pettipaug Avenue, to add ac units and a generator screened by lattice. D. Neely seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Myers, Pulver, Neely, Keeney, Jones.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

V. Bulkeley resumed her seat at this time.

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

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

6. **Public Hearing: 20 Agawam Avenue, map 10, lot 51.** James & Kecia Greenho, owners and applicants. Application HDC21-008 to add propane tank screened by lattice.

No one was in attendance to present the application. M. Ozols noted that the photo shows an old tank; a second tank was added. F. Gilhool stated that the two tanks are there, side by side, and the Greenho's now want to screen them. Members noted that no site plan was submitted and they would like to see the location shown on a plan as well as the lattice design.

The hearing was continued to the June 5 meeting and the members requested that a site plan and lattice design be provided prior to that meeting.

7. **Possible Action on HDC21-008, 20 Agawam Avenue.**

No action.

8. **Public Hearing: 3 Old Fenwick Road, map 5, lot 107.** Louis & Marla Esposito, owners, and Point One Architects, applicant. Application HDC21-009 to extend second floor south dormer and add split rail fence, lattice, and stone paths.

Louis and Marla introduced themselves and stated that they love the house but want to make some minor alterations to better suit their family; they would like to convert a space upstairs to a bedroom and small office and have hired the same architect in order to design a plan in keeping with original design.

Alexa Ashton, architect, stated that the proposal is to expand the dormer on the south side that is visible from Maple Avenue for a short distance and from the neighboring property; they will expand the dormer in width and add a shed dormer to the side; the dormer will not get taller; the design is in keeping with the style of the house.

Members noted that the design is appropriate and they had no issues.

A. Ashton withdrew the landscaping portions of the application. Landscape changes will be submitted at a later date.

After asking for public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by V. Bulkeley seconded by M. Myers, it was voted unanimously to close the public hearing and go into regular session.**

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

9. **Possible Action on HDC21, 3 Old Fenwick Road.**

Based on the discussion in the hearing, **P. Jones moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC21-009, 3 Old Fenwick Road, to extend the second floor south dormer. V. Bulkeley seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

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

10. **11 Pettipaug Avenue, map 10, lot 52.** Eniotna LLP, owner, and Brooke Girty, applicant. Modification application HDC21-010 to add light fixtures, gutters; delete pergola, bluestone, bluestone terrace, shower enclosure, stone walk, 2 windows on west side, trellis, louvers at gable peaks; relocate ac; change metal railing to wood, section of first floor roof to copper; postpone first floor porch and railing.

Brooke Girty presented. She stated that the project is over budget because of impacts from Covid; they want to make changes to reduce the cost. She reviewed the changes for each elevation:

West Elevation

- remove the pergola but keep the lattice and the columns with the beam across the top
- remove the window at the stair
- remove the window and lattice towards the south, but could do the espalier in the future if they need to
- change the small roof to the right of the window to copper to avoid leaks
- delete the screens and railing in the porch and leave it open except for the pillars
- add a shorter white wood railing at the metal rail for aesthetics
- delete the louvers in the gables because they are not needed for venting and are not charming
- add a light fixture

Relative to the window and lattice at the southern end, D. Neeley stated that it was discussed at the meetings on 11/3/18 and 5/2/18 and was kept because it is in keeping with the original house and provides continuity. B. Girty stated that the window to the left is an original window.

V. Bulkeley stated that the back door is different from the one that was approved. B. Girty stated that it is a temporary door so that the house can be locked.

South Elevation

- delete the rose arbor at the cart shed
- delete the trellis by the pool
- delete the screen and rail on the porch and change the 2nd floor railing (same as on west)
- add light fixtures
- change the sliding door to a similar looking French door with mullions
- delete the gable louver

East Elevation

- same changes to screen porch, 2nd floor rail, and gable louvers
- delete the pergola at the outdoor shower and pool
- move ac from west to east side where it faces the neighbor's ac
- delay the generator which will be in this area in the future
- add light fixtures

North Elevation

- delete pergola at outdoor shower (same as east)
- modify 2nd floor railing (same as previously noted)
- add light fixtures on both the house and the cart shed
- delete the pergola attaching the cart shed to the house (same as on west)

B. Girty stated that she does not believe that the cupola will be lit.

Landscape Plan

- simplify the site to be all grass
- eliminate the bluestone at the pool
- delete all pergolas
- delay the generator
- move the ac from the west to the east
- eliminate the bluestone next to the Arute house
- delete the stone walk
- eliminate the gravel area

In response to questions, B. Girty stated that the garage doors are overhead doors but are designed to look as if they swing open; no lights are proposed for the walkways; they will come back if they want to add them; there were no railings on the front porch when the Wilsons lived there.

Members clarified that the hedge is 6 feet tall only at the pool; it is a maximum of 4' everywhere else; the 6' section ends at the shed.

B. Keeney stated that she would like to see a simplified landscape plan showing what is actually proposed without all the changes. M. Ozols requested that a stipulation be added to any approval that a final landscape plan be submitted.

M. Reynolds and S. Pulver noted that the only things being add are light fixtures; all of the other changes are deletions. Members had no issues with the light fixtures.

Based on the discussion, **P. Jones moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC21-010, 11 Pettipaug Avenue, to add light fixtures; delete the pergola, bluestone, bluestone terrace, shower enclosure, stone walk, 2 windows on west side, trellis, and louvers at the gable peaks; relocate the ac; change the metal railing to wood and a section of the first floor**

roof to copper; and postpone the first floor porch and railing with the stipulations that a final landscape plan be submitted and any landscape lights will require a future application. V. Bulkeley seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

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

11. 10 Sequin Avenue, map 9, lot 64. Francis & Kimberly Gilhool, owners, Francis Gilhool, applicant. Modification Application HDC21-011 to add hedge along south property line.

V. Bulkeley, P. Jones, and B. Keeney indicated that although they are abutters, they can review the application objectively. V. Bulkeley noted that she cannot see the proposed hedge location from her house.

Frank Gilhool presented. He stated that they had hired Rick Worcester who recommended planting a length of about 40' along the south property line with Nellie Stevens Holly; they will keep a tight limit on the length so that it does not impact the view of the water from any adjacent property or from the street; it is truly only screening for privacy. He cited numerous other screen hedges in the Borough for precedent and members noted additional locations. In response to a question on the height, he stated that it will be 10 feet tall, will be this height at planting, and will not impede views or be any danger to pedestrians, bicyclists, or cars.

Members expressed concern with the height but noted that it will not impact safety, has limited impact on views, and helps in a location where the abutting house is higher. D. Neely reminded the members that they wrote into the criteria that hedges higher than 4 feet are discouraged so they need a good reason on the record to allow a higher hedge.

F. Gilhool stated that the hedge is simply to create privacy at an appropriate level, is not blocking any view, is limited in length, and is a pretty addition to the property; that the Wilson house is attractive but he stares into their garage from his house; that given the elevation, 10 feet will not dwarf the property; that it will not grow beyond the 10 foot height that they are bringing it in at; that the elevation of the adjacent property is increased by 8 feet; that the hedge starts even with the edge of the eastern portion of the Wilson garage and runs west for the balance of the driveway for about 40 feet; that it is straight and does not wrap around; and that the hedge will be moved in two feet from the property line so that it can be maintained from both sides.

Members noted that this hedge only affects the Gilhools while many others affect neighbors; that this hedge is for privacy without taking away any views of Long Island Sound for either the public or the neighbors; that its base is about two feet below the Gilhool terrace; that this is a different situation than other hedges that have been kept at four feet; and that each application is looked at individually.

Based on the discussion in, **B. Keeney moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC21-011, 10 Sequin Avenue, to add a hedge along the south property line with the stipulation that it is no taller than ten feet. P. Jones seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

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

12. 10 Pettipaug Avenue, map 10, lot 38. B. Girty, P. Christensen, K. Gilhool, owners, B. Girty, applicant. Application HDC21-012 for renewal of HDC17-006 for various modifications.

B. Girty presented. She stated that most of the work on the old C of A is done, but they still need to add the lattice around the base of the house; that they have let contractors on various jobs over the years park in the driveway area and it was all compacted, so one of the excavators has started to dig it up in order to address the compaction; that the surface can either be grass or shells as originally approved; that if it is shells, it will be gravel for this season in order for it to compact properly to add shells; and that the gravel will be the same color as the shells.

B. Keeney stated that work was performed on the driveway prior to application and members noted that work should not have started prior to renewal of the C of A. B. Girty stated that to date nothing has been completed that requires HDC.

V. Bulkeley asked for clarification of which items in the original C of A have not been completed besides the lattice and driveway. B. Girty replied the garage doors, second floor windows, and porch posts not yet shingled.

Members discussed crushed shells as a surface material noting that it is not typical of the Borough but was used most recently at 6 Neponset.

B. Girty stated that if she decides to change to a gravel driveway, she will submit an application for a modification.

Based on the discussion in, **P. Jones moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC21-012, 10 Pettipaug Avenue, to renew HDC17-006 with no changes. D. Neely seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

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

13. Approval of Minutes: March 27, 2021.

V. Bulkeley moved that the minutes of the previous HDC meeting on March 27, 2021 be accepted as written. D. Neely seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

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

14. Old Business / Other Business.

- a. Legal Notices and Deadlines.** M. Ozols stated that the Executive Order is expiring and unless there is new legislation allowing the municipal website as an option for publication of legal notices, all legal notices will be published in the Harbor News. Because the Harbor News deadline is 9:00 a.m. one week before the edition where the notice will be published, all applications must be received by the deadline. Late applications will not be able to be accommodated.

The next meeting is scheduled for June 5, 2021.

15. Adjourn.

On a motion by B. Keeney, seconded by P. Jones it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 10:47 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn M. Ozols, Acting Clerk