South of the Green Milford Historic District No. 2,

Minutes of Regular Meeting and Public Hearing – Via Zoom – August 11, 2021

Present: Andy Belden, Christopher Bishop, Liz Kennard, Marc Muller, Carol Smith

Applicants: Greg and Deb Carman

Chrmn. Bishop convened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. and declared a quorum present. The regular meeting stood in recess at 6:31 p.m. and the public hearing was called to order at that time.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Application by Greg and Deb Carman 25 Lafayette Street for construction of an expansion to their house, the construction of additional porches and for the replacement of all existing windows throughout the house**

Mr. Carman explained the existing dining room is very small and it was their hope to expand it by pushing out one side 13 ft. and include a porch at the beginning of the addition just to add more of a colonial look to the house. He noted this will help with the roof line of the existing dining room which was at some point a porch. He added it will keep the roof line matching at the front and on the kitchen side.

Mr. Carman stated he did not have his package of drawings and plans with him.

He made reference to the picture which reflected the side addition which shows a gable facing the front of the addition and another roof gable facing the back yard. He stated the roof line at that point is already a gable facing rear which is over the kitchen and to get the pitch to blend in well with the existing roof, the roof would blend in over the porch and fit with the existing roof. He stated if they attempted to do it without a porch the roof line would not meet and it would not look right. Further, he stated the porch would have colonial style railings and columns and a wood deck. The door would remain a colonial style and he felt it would not be possible to match the front door unless they went to an architectural salvage yard which may be a possibility. Mr. Carman stated the entry way is an addition as he found a print which shows a 2/3 porch on the front that was removed. With regard to the front door in the entry way, he noted it is not original and they could find doors similar for the porch but would not match exactly.

Chrmn. Bishop asked if they were not doing overhead or transoms and he was told they were not.

Mr. Carman added the windows are old and cannot be raised, have very little insulation and they are considering a modern thermal window 6 over 6 tops and bottoms. He stated framing would remain the same look and the roofing material would match the architectural shingles on the remainder of the house and they would not be re-roofing the whole house but just the addition.

Chrmn. Bishop asked why they have not tried to keep and maintain the symmetry of the house.

Mr. Carman explained the only other way to extend the dining room would be straight out the back which would then minimize the deck area, perhaps cut it in half.

Ms. Smith noted the house is square and if they tried extending the dining room to the back what would happen.

Mr. Carman stated they would lose 14 foot of deck, cutting that space in half and if they went to the other side it would cover the cellar hatchway which they could not do as well as cut into the driveway.

Ms. Smith stated the concern of the Commission is that you suggest or plan to add this addition off the side of the house. She noted the Commission has had similar requests in the past and such an addition would significantly change the style of the house. She added several residents who have made similar requests have been denied. Ms. Smith stated it is the hope of this body that the addition can be in the rear of the house so the appearance from the street looks the same.

Mr. Carman noted there are other houses in the District with the same shape that have add additions coming off the side of the house. He added the sewer line comes out the side and that can’t be covered over so they had to move the plan toward the back.

Ms. Kennard asked if they would be losing one window with the creation of this addition and Mr. Carman explained there is one window that would be on the porch and that would remain and all three windows on the side of the house would remain.

Chrmn. Bishop referred to the drawings submitted noting they do not show three windows but show two, one at the beginning of the stairs and one in the bathroom and he was told it was the owners’ intent to keep those windows.

Chrmn. Bishop made reference to the previous comment regarding other houses in the District and he explained the reason for the formation of this Commission was to allow residents to live as they want to but also to recognize the historic design of the district. He added they are aware that other houses have had additions prior the forming of this Commission.

Ms. Smith noted this Commission requires a house to remain in the same architectural style as when the commission was formed. She stated she felt the only way the look of the house would not be changed is to put the addition on the back of the house.

Ms. Kennard asked if the dining room was put on the back, would it be possible to reconfigure the deck.

Mr. Carman stated it would be necessary top push the deck back further.

Mr. Muller asked how wide the existing deck is and he was told 16’ x 20’.

Mr. Muller referred to the drawings and noted the addition is approximately 14 ½ ft. wide and the existing deck looks 20 ft. wide or more. He suggested replacing the deck with the addition and it would keep the view from the street the same; adding the house would have a side entrance and then plan the deck in the back and that looks like it would not impact the driveway or garage.

Mr. Carman stated they were trying to copy a look of other colonials and he felt Mr. Muller’s suggestion would also take away a good deal of their yard.

Ms. Smith explained this Commission works under governing ordinances and based on that the plan presented could not be accepted. She stated this body would be happy to look at this in any way possible in order to develop a plan that would not change the façade of the house adding the plan presented would definitely change the house and would not maintain the architectural integrity of the neighborhood.

She added other residents previously came forward with similar plans and were told they could not be accepted and would have to come up with another plan and this Commission worked with them to make it acceptable.

Mr. Carman stated it would be necessary to take this back to our architect and hope to come up with a plan that would work.

Mr. Muller reviewed the drawings submitted and suggested making the addition on the back and that might slightly impact the driveway.

Mr. Carman stated their concern was with regard to consuming the back yard and felt it would not look good but they will go back to the architect to see what he can come up with adding nothing off the side.

Ms. Kennard also expressed concern about the mass that would be added to the site and changing the look of the house is a big issue.

Mrs. Carman noted if the addition is to go off the back it would make the house look longer and she asked if that would be acceptable.

Chrmn. Bishop explained it would be necessary to look at the plans and the Commission would definitely take into account that you are working with us to follow guidelines and we in turn would work with you.

Ms. Smith emphasized the importance of keeping the street scape the same and this Commission would work with the owners in every way they could.

Chrmn. Bishop explained if necessary a special meeting could be scheduled and the members would make themselves available to work with you.

Mr. Carman felt it would be next month before they would be back and Chrmn. Bishop explained this Commission is bound to come up with a decision within 60 days from this date so it would be necessary to have something to present by our October meeting. He thanked them for their cooperation and stated consideration of this application will remain on the table at this time.

The public hearing closed at 7:10 p.m. and the business meeting immediately reconvened.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Application by Greg and Deb Carman 25 Lafayette Street for construction of an expansion to their house, the construction of additional porches and for the replacement of all existing windows throughout the house**

Motion was made by Ms. Kennard and seconded by Mr. Belden to table the COA Application by Greg and Deb Carman 25 Lafayette Street until the September 2021 or October 2021 meeting, or whenever the applicants are able to come back with a revised plan.

Mr. Muller felt the Commission attempted to accommodate the applicants and if they can come back in September or at a sooner time, we should make an attempt to do so.

Mr. Belden noted he had to solve a similar problem which became something bigger than anticipated. He stated he did not feel as strongly as other members and felt it is clear what all of the members’ intentions are. He added you see many houses in the District with “boxes” added on the side. He stated he is comfortable with the applicants coming back but he wrestled with the messing with the symmetry of the house and he did not think the lines have to be absolutely the same.

Chrmn. Bishop stated he would have considered this if the expansion was smaller in width and farther back so the effect on the front of the house is minimized.

Ms. Kennard referred to the addition on the house on 19 Reed Street noting it is a big addition on the side of the house.

Ms. Smith felt if we approved this COA as is people will be coming forth with similar requests.

(Ms. Smith excused herself from the meeting at 7:18 p.m.)

Mr. Muller felt just cutting a smaller area off the driveway would be okay. He added this addition would also be going right up to the property line. He noted it is important we be forward looking in the decisions we make as a Commission.

Chrmn. Bishop noted that Ms. Smith was very helpful with her explanations.

Mr. Muller added they are willing to work with us and that is positive. He added replacing the windows would be an improvement also.

Ms. Kennard expressed her concern about finding the same door and Chrmn. Bishop noted the porch itself with the door and the window was awkward.

It was the consensus that Chrmn. Bishop will call the applicants and explain the procedures that must be followed.

Motion carried unanimously.

**Consideration of Minutes** – Motion was made by Ms. Kennard and seconded by Mr. Belden to dispense with the reading of the minutes and approve the minutes of the July 14, 2021 meeting as presented. Motion carried.

**Chair’s Report including Correspondence** – none

Chrmn. Bishop noted 2 commissioners will be meeting with Mr. Muller tomorrow and also meetings next week regarding 12 Center Street as that applicant wants to take down and rebuild access to the 2nd floor apartment. He added this body is bound by the statute that says “like for like”.

Ms. Kennard stated many of the stairways are on the back of a house so that must also be considered.

Chrmn. Bishop stated he has seen porches with overhead hanging over every doorway. He added it makes sense for safety reasons and if it is like for like which is required we do not have much to say in the matter.

Ms. Kennard suggested we check on that code.

Mr. Belden pointed out that it would definitely be a safety matter.

Ms. Kennard will check with the Building Dept. regarding exterior staircase and if there is a requirement for a protective roof or some kind of cover over the doorway.

**Clerk/Treasurer’s Report** – Mr. Ortoleva was not present and therefore a report was not presented.

**Unfinished Business**

* 1. Review Study Report Booklet and consider allocating funds to print some copies – Chrmn. Bishop offered to get the name of the printer who has recently done some work for the Historical Society and get a quote for printing 25 copies of the booklet, printed as is.

Discussion ensued regarding printing the existing copy or keeping it digital including pictures of every house in the district.

* 1. Attorney Berchem’s advice as to AirBnBs, ground mounted satellite dishes and signage
* Chrmn. Bishop has not had conversation with City Attorney on these matters.
	1. Solar panels

**New Business**

Chrmn. Bishop noted tonight’s application was a first for him in dealing with an extension of that size and listening to Ms. Smith and Ms. Kennard was helpful.

Ms. Kennard agreed that Ms. Smith is helpful and also strong in holding the line on such requests.

Being no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Ms. Kennard and seconded by Mr. Muller to adjourn the meeting at 7:36 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Recorded by Diane Candido