

BOROUGH OF FENWICK
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING – MAY 4, 2024

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of the Fenwick Historic District Commission was held on Saturday, May 4, 2024. Notice of the meeting was posted in a timely manner on the Fenwick kiosk, on the website, and in the Harbor News.

Members Present: Deborah Neely, Mike Reynolds, Beverly Keeney, Kim Gilhool, JD Rehm.

Members Present via Zoom: Mimi Brainard (Alternate) (9:29).

Members Absent: Ashley Gengras (Alternate).

Others Present: Marilyn Ozols, ZEO and HDC Compliance Official; Hope Proctor, Steve Savino, Carol Robertson, Brooke Girty, Wiggs Brainard, Doug VanderHorn, Maribeth Brostowski, Matt Myers, Clark and Pari Robertson, Bob Gay, Chuck Chadwick, Ronnie Carmo, Pam Christensen.

Others Present via Zoom: David Milliken, Art Wright, Peter Brainard, Jr., Andrew Popolizo, Anne Schmitt, Duby McDowell, Andrew Kowolenki, and others.

1. Call to order.

Chairman Neely called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum was established (Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm).

2. Public Hearing: 44 Sequassen Avenue, map 11, lot 2. Owner: Lighthouse Point LLC; Applicant: Robert Gay Application HDC24-003 to replace windows and slider.

A. Popolizo presented. He stated that the proposal is to replace a three panel slider and a number of double hung windows, some with transoms, with like color and style, but a change in material from wood to composite. He clarified that the transoms are not true transoms, but trapezoids above the windows. He also clarified that the images submitted are computer generated and do not correctly represent the design of the windows to be installed, which will look the same as what is there.

K. Gilhool stated that the sliders are different from what is there and suggested adding mullions.

After asking for public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by B. Keeney, seconded by K. Gilhool, it was voted unanimously to close the public hearing and go into regular session.**

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

3. Possible Action on HDC24-003: 44 Sequassen 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 HDC24-003, 44 Sequassen Avenue, to replace windows and a door. K. Gilhool seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

B. Gay clarified for the record that there may be a little less glass in the windows than there is now because of hurricane resistance requirements.

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

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

4. Public Hearing: 8 Nibang Avenue, map 10, lot 2. Owners & Applicants: Christopher & Penelope Jones. Application HDC24-004 to install detached golf cart shed.

P. Jones presented. She stated that she is proposing a 12x24 Atlas pre-built shed to store golf carts; it will be on the right as you pull in the driveway; it is behind existing plantings and more will be added.

JD Rehm expressed concern that the design does not appear compatible with the existing house.

P. Jones stated that she did not want matchy-matchy; the dormer at the top matches the house; it is a more traditional barn design.

K. Gilhool stated that barns at the definitive houses are simple or more complementary to the house; this house is very simple and the proposed shed has more detail.

M. Reynolds stated that the curved glass in the doors is not typical and the siding is atypical of houses; batten is not appropriate for Fenwick; and the paint should weather but this will not.

It was noted that there are other curved windows in the Borough, and that these windows are on the side of the building facing the house so are not visible from a public way and not in HDC jurisdiction. It was also determined that this house is a contributing house in the district.

K. Gilhool referred to page 10 in the Criteria relative to the rhythm of the house line, which in this case is the house on the same property; the design is attractive but not compatible; it does not look old or customized to match the house; the design should be simpler than the house or unique and married to the house; although paint color is not in HDC jurisdiction, this will not weather; simpler doors would be more compatible with the house; this is the first auxiliary building and will be setting a precedent.

B. Keeney stated that this location is removed from the main street and when the barn was moved to Sam Jones' house on Pettipaug Avenue, people thought it did not fit, but it is quite charming; the windows on the door face the house and are not a concern; transom windows are used in many locations in the Borough; and they are adding landscaping to make the shed less visible.

D. Neely noted that the fact that this is a new structure should not be the issue, the style is what should be reviewed, and that the sides that are visible from the road are plain and two empty walls are what are visible from Fenwick Yacht Club.

M. Reynolds noted that the elevation drawings do not match the pictures and the elevations are more simple than the pictures. P. Jones clarified that the pictures represent what is proposed. She added that the stone around the building will look pretty; there will be more landscaping; the building can be painted to match the house; and the doors on the end can be changed to doors without windows.

P. Christensen, 34 Pettipaug Avenue, stated that a new building should meet or be compatible with the Criteria; the original outbuildings have simplicity in common; there are existing outbuildings and HDC has approved outbuildings (e.g. Arneault, Duncan, McDowell, Jones) but they have a barn look or are married to the house.

C. Chadwick, 17 Pettipaug Avenue, noted that the Commission appeared to be struggling with the batten and because this is a new building with a utility use, which may not be clearly addressed in the Criteria. He

reminded the Commission that they should be evaluating based on what is appropriate and that people can do whatever they want when something cannot be seen from a public way.

After asking for public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by B. Keeney, seconded by JD Rehm, it was voted unanimously to close the public hearing and go into regular session.**

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

5. Possible Action on HDC24-004: 8 Nibang Avenue.

D. Neely summarized that it appeared that members were okay with the location and the plantings but that they wanted a simpler design more compatible with the house design.

JD Rehm stated that, in his opinion, the proposal does not meet the Criteria.

Based on the discussion in and after the hearing, **JD Rehm moved to deny Application HDC224-004, 8 Nibang Avenue to install a detached golf cart shed the application as presented and waive the application fee for a reapplication. M. Reynolds seconded the motion and it was approved 4-1-0.**

For: Neely, Reynolds, Gilhool, Rehm.
Against: Keeney.
Abstain: None.

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

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

6. Public Hearing: 20 Fenwick Avenue, map 10, lot 52. Owner: Riversea Trust, Applicant: Carol Robertson. Application HDC24-005 to install split rail fence and gate, wire fence inside hedge.

C. Robertson presented. She stated that

- they would like to install a fence for the safety of the kids and dogs;
- pictures had been submitted;
- they will trim the existing bushes in order to get the wire in and then let the bushes grow into the wire;
- split rail fence is proposed in two locations;
- there had been fence there previously but it has deteriorated although there are some pieces left.

In response to a question from JD Rehm, she clarified that there will be split rail fence on the Agawam side – it was there previously.

K. Gilhool stated that she was glad that the greenery will grow into the fence.

After asking for public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by B. Keeney, seconded by K. Gilhool, it was voted unanimously to close the public hearing and go into regular session.**

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

7. Possible Action on HDC24-005: 20 Fenwick Avenue.

Based on the discussion in the hearing, **M. Reynolds moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC24-005, 20 Fenwick Avenue, to install**

a split rail fence and gate, and wire fence inside a hedge. B. Keeney seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

On a motion by JD Rehm, seconded by M. Reynolds, it was voted unanimously to go back into public hearing.

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

8. Public Hearing: 52 Sequassen Avenue, map 11, lot 4. Owner: Anne Schmitt, Applicant: Hope Proctor. Application HDC24-006 to relocate and raise house; add addition for elevator and storage.

H. Proctor presented. She stated that

- this is a true Fenwick beach cottage and the owners don't want to change it;
- there is an element of simplicity in the existing house;
- it's a project of need, not want because the site has lost almost an acre of land and is completely in a flood zone;
- the house needs to be raised 5' and they also want to pull it away from the water as best they can;
- it will be moved about 70' towards the road and raised 5';
- there will be breakaway walls under the house with horizontal, cedar slats;
- the existing house has vertical siding and more vertical boards would accent the height;
- there are a lot of different skirt boards in Fenwick (photos were provided to demonstrate this);
- the fence does have a vertical look.

She displayed drawings of before and after as seen from the bridge and stated that

- the bushes will not be removed;
- even from the lighthouse property, the house will barely be seen;
- because of the increased height, they need to add an elevator;
- the house currently has symmetry and is simple, so they are adding the same roofline shape for the elevator/mudroom addition and a porch with the same shape at the other end of the house to maintain the symmetry;
- they are turning the house a little to give better views and avoid a "wall" look from the bridge;
- they are trying to keep a low profile;
- all the details will carry through;
- the existing house will stay the same and the new materials will match.

M. Reynolds asked about the current railing. H. Proctor stated that they are proposing a cable rail in order to meet current building code; glass would be more visual; cable disappears and takes a back seat to the house.

K. Gilhool expressed concern with the railing and stated that the Criteria discourages metal; the materials encouraged in the Criteria would be more in keeping; the metal makes it look contemporary; following the Criteria works better with the look of the house; the breakaway walls create a lot of mass; other raised houses have lattice.

M. Reynolds stated that he preferred some wood in the rail.

H. Proctor stated that the posts and railing will be wood; wood pickets will take away from the elegance of the house and change the look of the house; it will be more busy and your eye will go up and down; in contrast, you won't see the cable; the house is pretty contemporary in style; she would not want to sacrifice

design just to add wood; she could do wood on the stairs, but the eye loses sight of the rail cable and would see wood; the houses with lattice are more traditional houses; the wood will on the breakaway walls will gray to match the house. She added that she respects the rules but also wants to respect the look of the house.

D. Neely stated that lattice would not look good on this house; the bushes will cover most of the horizontal siding; all of the houses don't need to be the same.

D. VanderHorn, architect for 21 Neponset Avenue, stated that the horizontal rail goes with this house; the designer has it right.

C. Chadwick, 17 Pettipaug Avenue, asked about the current siding (cedar board, no batten) and clarified that the only metal on the house is the wire.

M. Reynolds noted the bench on the existing deck and asked if it could be carried through. He stated that adding it in the same section might give more depth to the design.

H. Proctor stated that the bench makes a wall, but she could include it in the design.

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

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

9. Possible Action on HDC24-006: 52 Sequassen Avenue.

M. Reynolds stated that he would like to see them keep the bench.

Based on the discussion in and after the hearing, **B. Keeney moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC24-006, 52 Sequassen Avenue, to relocate and raise the existing house and add a porch and an addition for storage and an elevator with the stipulation that they keep the vertical bench at the same location and height. JD Rehm seconded the motion for discussion.**

JD stated that they need to be careful not to go by what looks good but to go by the Criteria.

B. Keeney stated that the architectural flow works and, in this case, the wire fits and makes sense.

D. Neely agreed that it makes sense with the design of the house.

The Commission proceeded to a vote and the motion failed 2-3-0

For: **B. Keeney, D. Neely.**

Against: **M. Reynolds, K. Gilhool, JD Rehm.**

Abstain: **None.**

Members declined to make a new motion but further discussed their vote.

M. Reynolds stated that he would like to see a design with an alternative to the wire.

JD Rehm stated that the Commission is tasked with criteria and needs to be disciplined.

K. Gilhool stated that raising the one story house creates a lot of mass.

D. Neely stated that the Criteria discourages metal as in metal roofs or metal siding; this is just a wire, not a big mass of metal; wire isn't prohibited; the building was not massive.

K. Gilhool stated that she thought they had 65 days and voting against it would allow them more time with it.

M. Ozols clarified that they do have up to 65 days, but they closed the hearing and they voted. If they wanted more time, they would have needed to continue the public hearing.

H. Proctor stated that the only way to avoid the mass would be to not put anything under the house and it would be worse.

M. Reynolds stated that a little bit of vertical below the porch decking might help break it up a little bit.

B. Keeney stated that with all of the vegetation, most of the house won't even be seen.

H. Proctor noted that if they don't want to see metal rails, they will see something a little more substantive.

On a motion by JD Rehm, seconded by M. Reynolds, it was voted unanimously to go back into public hearing.

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

10. Public Hearing: 21 Pettipaug Avenue, map 24, lot 7. Owner: Jeremy Schneider, Applicant: Platinum Square Construction. Application HDC24-007 to install outside shower.

R. Carmo presented. He stated that the proposal is to add an outside shower; it will be a simple design with tongue and groove siding, an Ipe floor, and gravel underneath; the wood will be cedar which will weather to match the house.

Members had no further questions or issues with the application.

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

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

11. Possible Action on HDC24-007: 21 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 HDC24-007, 21 Pettipaug Avenue, to install an outside shower. JD Rehm seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

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

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

12. Public Hearing: 35 Pettipaug Avenue, map 9, lot 64. Owners: Kimberly & Francis Gilhool, Applicant: Kim Gilhool. Application HDC24-009 to remove lattice enclosure, add lattice wall panels and privet hedge on north and add lattice wall panel and pea stone terrace on south.

K. Gilhool stepped down and M. Brainard was seated for this application.

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

K. Gilhool presented. She stated that on the north side, they propose to remove the existing lattice enclosure and replace it with a hedge that will be part of the garden; they will put up lattice and plant hydrangea; the

bluestone is existing. She continued that on the south side there was a previous C of A that has lapsed; the proposal is for a pea stone terrace and lattice to enclose an air handler that cannot be seen from a public way. In response to questions, she stated that the lattice is red cedar and the hedge in the front is a privet hedge.

D. Neely stated that the height of the hedge should not exceed 4 feet.

P. Christensen stated that as the property owner across the street, she thinks this will be a big improvement.

After asking for public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by JD Rehm, seconded by B. Keeney, it was voted unanimously to close the public hearing and go into regular session.**

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

13. Possible Action on HDC24-009: 35 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 HDC24-009, 35 Pettipaug Avenue (aka 10 Sequin Avenue), to remove the lattice enclosure, add lattice wall panels and a privet hedge on the north side of the house with the stipulation that the hedge not exceed 4' in height, and add a lattice wall panel and pea stone terrace on the south side of the house. JD Rehm seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Brainard, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

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

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Brainard, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

K. Gilhool resumed her seat at this time.

14. Public Hearing: 21 Neponset Avenue, map 11, lot 14-1. Owner: Daybreak Holdings, Applicant: VanderHorn Architects. Application HDC24-010 to demolish existing house and pool, construct new house and gravel driveway.

JD Rehm recused himself for this application and M. Brainard was seated in his place.

D. VanderHorn presented. He presented photo simulations and reviewed the design, stating that

- the existing house is inappropriate for Fenwick and the proposed house is more appropriate;
- the new house will sit in the same location as the existing house;
- the driveway will change somewhat;
- there will be a small parking area with a 4' hedge;
- they will hide the garage doors along with the utility area and golf cart door on the side;
- the front of the house will feature a front porch as on many other houses in Fenwick;
- it will be a welcoming front with an octagonal library;
- the shingles will be Alaskan yellow cedar which will turn silver gray and weathers more consistently than red cedar;
- the trim will be painted;
- the quality will be the same as other houses they designed in Essex, Watch Hill, and Greenwich (pictures provided);

- the back of the house will have an open porch and a second porch that has been enclosed with large glass windows to maintain the look of an open porch;
- there are a number of balconies, porches, details, overhangs, and rooflines to add interest;
- there is a full chimney which will be traditional red brick with ivory colored mortar;
- the foundation will be Connecticut stone – rounded fieldstone;
- the rooflines are varied because all gables would be a little much; there are other instances of curved rooflines in Fenwick;
- the driveway will be metal edged, not Belgian block as shown in part of the submission.

K. Gilhool expressed the opinion that there is a lot of hardscape; losing the Belgian block is good; the existing brick makes it look less formal; the southern exposure has a lot of windows; mullions across the top of the picture windows and muntins in the balcony windows would be more consistent with the Criteria. She questioned whether there are other curved (jerkinhead) rooflines in Fenwick.

C. Robertson stated that the driveway location close to the intersection should not be an issue – traffic is slower in this area; and he agreed to muntins in the balcony doors.

M. Reynolds indicated that he likes the plate glass in this location because it creates a porch feeling.

D. Neely stated that the plate glass windows work in this location; looking at the wall to glass ratio, the rest of that façade is dark; the design works to make this look like a porch.

D. VanderHorn responded to the comments noting that overall this is an improvement; when you hide the garage doors on the side, you have to pass by the front door; this is a difficult property with three public sides and they worked at creating three attractive facades; they have only made minor tweaks to the grading; they could try mullions across the top of the plate glass windows but this is the right thing for this element of the design; they can add muntins over the balcony doors;

P. Christensen, 34 Pettipaug Avenue, stated that she thinks the design is amazing and meets all of the Criteria; and asked about the copper roof on the south side.

D. VanderHorn stated that it is a small copper roof in an area where shingles will not work; it will go green; they could lead coat it so it would be gray, but they prefer the copper and it is a small area that won't be very visible.

JD Rehm, 19 Neponset Avenue speaking as a member of the public, referred to three similar windows on the north side of the house and stated that as an abutter he is thrilled by the upgrade in the design of the house.

M. Myers, 12 Neponset Avenue, suggested more green in the front instead of driveway.

C. Chadwick, 17 Pettipaug Avenue, stated that the Commission should review its Criteria relative to the use of metal and window to wall ratio. Relative to this project, it is fine. He also asked if the demolition was part of the application.

JD Rehm, 19 Neponset Avenue, speaking as a member of the public, requested clarification that the demolition is part of HDC's discussion.

The Commission confirmed that the demolition is part of the application.

K. Gilhool stated that the plate glass windows are stunning here, but it is a slippery slope.

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

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Brainard.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

15. Possible Action on HDC24-010: 21 Neponset 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 HDC24-010, 21 Neponset Avenue, to demolish the existing house and pool, construct a new house and gravel driveway with the stipulation that muntins are added to the three French doors at the second floor balcony. M. Reynolds seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Brainard.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

JD Rehm resumed his seat at this time.

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

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

16. Public Hearing: 7 Old Fenwick Road, map 5, lot 109. Owner: Arnold Chase, Applicant: Stephen Savino. Application HDC24-011 to add sunshade.

S. Savino presented. He stated that the proposal is to install a fabric sunshade on the back porch; it is not retractable; it will extend from the house to two metal posts attached to the deck and is easily removable.

D. Neely stated that it looks like a sail; it will be visible from the water but not from the road; and it covers an existing porch area.

K. Gilhool inquired whether this is considered a temporary structure that does not come under HDC jurisdiction. M. Ozols stated that they have jurisdiction over anything in place for more than 30 days in a calendar year.

S. Savino stated that they discussed installing something more permanent but they have no plans currently to replace this in the future. He clarified that the columns will be either round or 1" square and will be fixed; the photo shows what they will look like.

K. Gilhool stated that HDC has discussed tents, canopies and cabanas in the past and has not allowed them, and that the metal posts do not meet any criteria. S. Savino stated that they had considered 4x4 posts.

C. Chadwick, 17 Pettipaug Avenue, stated that the criteria should have a better category and that they could design this so that the posts could be removed offseason.

K. Gilhool suggested using a heavier quality umbrella.

Some members expressed the opinion that there might be an option more consistent with the Criteria.

After asking for public comment and any additional input, **on a motion by B. Keeney, seconded by JD Rehm, it was voted unanimously to continue the hearing to the June 1 HDC meeting in order to allow the applicant to explore other options.**

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.
Against: None.
Abstain: None.

17. Possible Action on HDC24-011: 7 Old Fenwick Road.

No action; hearing was continued.

18. 15 Pettipaug Avenue, map 10, lot 25. Owner: Maribeth Brostowski, Applicant: Brook Girty. Modification Application HDC24-008 to redesign porch, revise various windows and doors, add lattice and lattice yard, revise column at golf cart door, add panels and overhang at garage doors.

B. Girty presented and reviewed each elevation:

South:

- went back to columns that were on the house end but they can't be as thin as before because of structural codes;
- added the detail that was on the existing porch;
- made changes to provide better views and mix it up;
- created more contrast by changing some double hung windows to cottage style;
- made some additional refinements.

In response to questions, she stated that they are not tied to a brick foundation but it is old brick, not new brick, and the shingles are classic red cedar. M. Reynolds stated that he would like the shingles to be able to weather. B. Girty stated that these are not dipped.

B. Girty noted that the original presentation had some placeholders and continued reviewing the elevations:

East:

- added a bay similar to the one on the Wade house;
- fixed the porch to make it more classic;
- changed the front door to be more wide and tall with panels similar to Munn;
- added a slight box bay with corbels;
- added dormers reminiscent of the dormers on the other side that were removed;
- added more panels to the garage door;
- removed lights and added shingles around door to make it more continuous;
- added lattice to enclose the pool mechanicals, outdoor shower, and generator.

North:

- remains similar to the previously approved;
- breaking up the windows to create a better flow;
- added refinements.

West:

- added a bay with a shingle flair above the garage;
- changed to a single door where there were previously two doors;
- added a box bay window;
- included lattice where there was no window;

In response to a question, she stated that there is no change in height or location from what was previously proposed.

D. Neely stated that this design is much less fussy. Members stated that it is much less formal and balances better. K. Gilhool added that this meets the Criteria better than the previous design.

Based on the discussion, **M. Reynolds moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC24-008, 15 Pettipaug Avenue, to redesign the porch, revise various windows and doors, add lattice and a lattice yard, revise the column at the golf cart door, add panels and an overhang at the garage doors. B. Keeney seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

19. HDC Training and Conversation with Mary Dunne, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Stacey Vairo, Preservation Connecticut.

M. Dunne and S. Vairo summarized the charge of the HDC with a short presentation and answered questions from the members.

20. Reports on Current Projects.

- a. **24 Pettipaug Avenue** (B. Keeney) – Members noted that large stone blocks had been placed in the apron area of the parking turnoff in the driveway. M. Ozols stated that these are reclaimed granite curbing and the oil and stone will be placed around them. After discussion, the members agreed that this is a change from the approved plan and will require an application for modification.
- b. **10 Pettipaug Avenue** (A. Gengras) – D. Neely read a report from A. Gengras discussing progress to date and indicating that the construction is consistent with the C of A plans.
- c. **19 Neponset Avenue** (D. Neely) – JD Rehm stated that they expect construction to be complete by Memorial Day.
- d. **15 Pettipaug Avenue** (K. Gilhool) – The existing house section is still raised. M. Reynolds was assigned to assist in monitoring the project.
- e. **28 Fenwick Avenue** – (JD Rehm) – The construction is consistent with the C of A plans.
- f. **52 Sequassen Avenue** – to be assigned. No assignment. C of A was denied.
- g. **21 Neponset Avenue** – to be assigned. M. Reynolds was assigned to monitor this project.

21. Approval of Minutes: March 2, 2024.

B. Keeney moved that the minutes of the previous HDC meeting on March 2, 2024 be accepted as written. M. Reynolds seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

For: Neely, Reynolds, Keeney, Gilhool, Rehm.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

22. Old Business / Other Business.

Architectural Historian. JD reminded the Commission that he had talked in the past about hiring a consultant. To that end he had spoken with an architectural historian at Yale and he and Chairman Neely will be meeting with him on Thursday to discuss ways in which he might assist them.

Regulations and Design Criteria. B. Keeney stated that the Regulations and the Criteria are good references, especially page 2 in the Regulations relative to their charge and their jurisdiction. She added that hedges are discussed on page 14 of the Criteria.

23. Adjourn.

On a motion by M. Reynolds, seconded by B. Keeney, it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 12:28 p.m.

The next meeting is Saturday, June 1, 2024.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn M. Ozols, Acting Clerk