

BOROUGH OF FENWICK
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING – SEPTEMBER 11, 2021

A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing of the Fenwick Historic District Commission was held at 4 Nibang Avenue and via Zoom on Saturday, September 11, 2021. Notice of the meeting was posted in a timely manner on the Fenwick kiosk, on the website, and in the Harbor News.

Members Present: In Person: Matt Myers, Valerie Bulkeley, Beverly Keeney, Scott Pulver (Alternate), Ashley Gengras (Alternate)

Via Zoom: Deborah Neely

Members Absent: Patsy Jones, Mike Reynolds (Alternate)

Others Present: Marilyn Ozols, ZEO and HDC Compliance Official, Hope Proctor, Brooke Girty (arrived approximately 9:30), Maura Bulkeley, Frank Keeney, Hall and Connie Wilson

1. Call to order.

Chairman Myers called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. and appointed A. Gengras as a voting member. A quorum was established (Myers, Bulkeley, Neely, Keeney, Gengras).

2. Public Hearing: 41 Pettipaug Avenue, map 5, lot 122. Frank Keeney, trustee, owners, Hope Proctor, applicant. Application HDC21-018 to add a second floor deck.

B. Keeney recused herself for this application and S. Pulver was seated as a voting member.

H. Proctor presented. She stated that the proposal is for a small second floor deck off the back of the house over the existing deck. She displayed before and after renderings and stated that the existing window will be replaced with a French door with a sconce light to match the lights below; the deck and railing will be the same PVC material as the deck below; and the deck will be about 12 feet deep but will line up with the deck below because the second floor of the house is set back in this area. F. Keeney added that the columns will be pressure treated wood wrapped with PVC material.

M. Myers stated that it fits in with what is currently there. Members had no questions or concerns.

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

For: Myers, Bulkeley, Neely, Pulver, Gengras.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

3. Possible Action on HDC21-018, 41 Pettipaug Avenue.

V. Bulkeley noted that it fits with the architectural characteristics of the house as they are now. D. Neely added that it unites the two sections of the house.

Based on the discussion in and after the hearing, **V. Bulkeley moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application HDC21-018, 41 Pettipaug Avenue, to add a second floor deck. S. Pulver seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

For: Myers, Bulkeley, Neely, Pulver, Gengras.

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

B. Keeney resumed her seat.

4. **25 Pettipaug Avenue, map 10, lot 22.** Maura Bulkeley, owner, and Brooke Girty Design, applicant. Modification application HDC21-019 to revise driveway; add bluestone walks and terraces, trash enclosure, outdoor shower enclosure, fence, new windows and sloped roof at front bay, gable and shed dormer at east end of front part of house, roof over existing landing at east entry door, ac and generator screened by planting, bay at west on south end, and various windows and doors; rebuild front porch with sloped roof; replace gable dormers with shed dormers; and adjust second floor deck at west side.

V. Bulkeley recused herself for this application and S. Pulver was seated as a voting member.

M. Bulkeley presented. She stated that the house was an 1871 cottage with two additions; that the major part of the work is proposed for the interior area that is only seen from the Schneider house; that they are providing an interior connection where none existed and a master bath and adding French doors to create a main entry; that they are rebuilding the front porch and fixing the bump out as was previously approved; that from the seawall, the difference is in the roofline of the porch on the west side; and that the two-story glass structure was previously shown to be removed but they are now adding a window seat.

D. Neely stated that there is no rendering of the water side straight on so it is difficult to see, but criteria number 6 discourages a high window to wall ratio and the second floor front is proposed as all window. She added that the originally proposed three windows is more balanced and it should actually be just two windows to keep the original look of the house. Members discussed the windows, noting that the criteria does not have a specific numerical requirement.

M. Myers stated that they need to look at the house appearance in totality when applying the criteria and he finds that the three sets of windows is consistent with the rest of the house and reflects the look of the Borough. He added that the same ratio with plate glass windows instead of the double hung design proposed would not be consistent.

A. Gengras suggested that it might be better for the criteria to address balance rather than ratio since ratio implies a specific number.

B. Keeney and D. Neely both indicated that renderings of all four sides of the house should be submitted. M. Bulkeley stated that the back of the house is not changing, but some members noted that the addition of a fence and a change to the driveway change the appearance even if the building is not changing, while other members felt that they had the applicable sides. D. Neely added that the renderings also help track the project as it develops.

M. Bulkeley continued to describe the changes indicating that the ac units will be screened by lattice with bushes; the driveway will be pea stone; they will change the window heights to align them and remove the current incongruity; there will be a fence along the back of the house but it will not obstruct anyone's view; they will be reusing most of the windows; in the front, they will be replacing the sliders and windows except for the small windows and will be adding new windows; the sliders will not have mullions much like the existing sliders; they are creating a main front door with lattice around it; the lattice will be cedar to blend with the shingles; they will be removing two chimneys – one is interior, and for the exterior one, the siding will be continued in its place; the roof will be wood shingles, the same as it is now; Azek will be used for all trim including the railings; and no screens are currently proposed for the front porch. She stated that she will return to HDC when light fixtures are selected and if screens are proposed for the porch.

B. Girty joined the meeting during the continued presentation.

B. Girty added that the gutters are existing; that a lot of the pillars under the house have already been replaced and there will be no change to the look of the base of the house. In response to a concern that the landscape plan was difficult to read and a rendering would be more clear, she requested that only those people who can read plans vote.

M. Bulkeley stated that the generator will be near the well on the west side and will be screened; and that the rear of the house is not attractive and the fence and pea stone driveway will make it look prettier.

M. Myers stated that it is a terrific remodel. D. Neely and B. Keeney repeated that the Commission should have a rendering of each side.

Based on the discussion, **S. Pulver moved to approve the application as presented and to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for Modification Application HDC21-019, 25 Pettipaug Avenue, to revise the driveway; add bluestone walks and terraces, a trash enclosure, an outdoor shower enclosure, a fence, new windows and a sloped roof at the front bay, a gable and shed dormer at the east end of the front part of the house, a roof over the existing landing at the east entry door, ac units and a generator screened by plantings, a bay at the west on the south end, and various windows and doors; rebuild the front porch with a sloped roof; replace the gable dormers with shed dormers; and adjust the second floor deck at the west side. A. Gengras seconded the motion.**

D. Neely and B. Keeney reiterated their concerns relative to the glass to wall ratio and the lack of renderings for all four sides of the building.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried 3-2-0

For: Myers, Pulver, Gengras.

Against: Keeney, Neely.

Abstain: None.

B. Keeney stated that her no vote was because she believed there should be stipulations relating to the need for additional renderings.

V. Bulkeley resumed her seat at this time.

B. Girty stated that each rendering costs about \$1500 and a rendering to show the driveway would be onerous and that this is a historic review commission, not a design review commission. B. Keeney stated that the plans should be clear in order for the commission to make a decision and to protect the client.

5. Approval of Minutes: July 10, 2021.

V. Bulkeley moved that the minutes of the previous HDC meeting on July 10, 2021 be accepted as written.

B. Keeney seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

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

Against: None.

Abstain: None.

6. Old Business / Other Business.

- a. **Hybrid Meetings, Meeting Schedule, and Submission Deadlines.** M. Ozols stated that unless the members request a change, next year's meetings would be scheduled for the first Saturday of every other month beginning in January with an extra meeting in June for any work that needs to be completed before the Hammer Law. She added that because of the legal notice deadlines for the Harbor News, next year she will be moving the submission deadline up one day and changing the time to noon, which is when the office closes. The Commission concurred.

She also suggested that the Commission set a hard deadline for submission of additional material, after which the information cannot be considered since changes or documentation submitted late or at a meeting will not be available to those attending remotely. Members set noon on the Tuesday prior to a meeting as the deadline for submission of any additional material to be considered.

- b. **Application Review.** Members reminded each other that they have to do their homework on large projects; they need to review the criteria and see all four sides of the building; and they should not be reluctant to table an application if something is unclear or if more information is needed. V. Bulkeley added for the benefit of the newer members that the Commission has been burned in the past with changes or details that were not clear, and although it may seem nitpicky, all of the details must be clear and must be reviewed. She added that the proper procedure if someone would like to

see additional stipulations is to move to amend the motion; then a vote on amending can be taken before the final voted on the motion.

In the discussion of renderings of all sides of a building, it was noted that if no change is planned, a picture of the existing will be sufficient.

- c. **34 Pettipaug landscape lights.** V. Bulkeley noted that there are new landscape lights by the fence at 34 Pettipaug, but she did not know if they met the exemption criteria or not. M. Ozols will check.
- d. **11 Pettipaug planters.** Members asked about the planters on the porch at 11 Pettipaug. These may be technically moveable and considered exempt.

7. Adjourn.

On a motion by A. Gengras, seconded by V. Bulkeley it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 10:18 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn M. Ozols, Acting Clerk