South of the Green Milford Historic District No. 2,

Minutes of Regular Meeting and Public Hearing – Via Zoom – December 8, 2021

Present: Andy Belden, Christopher Bishop, Liz Kennard, Andy Kozlowski, Marc Muller, Walter Ortoleva, Arthur Stowe

Applicants: Ivan Fossesiguarani and Anne Hendershott

Also Present: Neighbors – Pieter Moen, Michael Connolly

Chrmn. Bishop noted the Commission recently lost a dedicated and instrumental member of this body and he asked the members for a moment of silence at this time in memory of Carol Molloy Smith.

Chrmn. Bishop convened the meeting at 6:35 p.m. and declared a quorum present. The regular meeting stood in recess at 6:37 p.m. and the public hearing was called to order at that time.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Application by Ivan Fossesiguarani at 37-39 Pond Street, Milford CT for alterations to the garage**

Mr. Fossesiguarani explained his plan is to add on to the rear of the garage and not change the look of the structure except the roof line which will be the same as the house. He added the changes will not be seen from the street.

Ms. Kennard thought she understood the size of the garage is being changed and it was explained the homeowner’s truck does not fit in the garage as it is now so the plan is to add one panel which will be 8 ft.

Mr. Fossesiguarani noted that is builder was present if there were any other technical questions.

Chrmn. Bishop referred to the diagram noting the roof will be re-oriented by 90 degrees. The builder (Bob) explained they would be taking the gable from one side and making it look like the house and when finished you will be looking at the gable end. He added they are raising the garage door by 6 inches so they will be scaling it appropriately and there will be some sort of gable vent on the side facing the street. He stated he was not sure if they will put in a window or just a gable vent.

Mr. Fossesiguarani noted when this commission first started he was part of that group and he assured the members his intentions were to not change the look of the district with this work. He stated the garage will be the same siding as it is presently and he also noted he personally built this garage in the mid-70’s when the previous structure was damaged by a storm.

Chrmn. Bishop reminded Mr. Fossesiguarani about getting permits and he was told that process had begun.

Ms. Kennard asked if the plans for the permit reflected a vent in the front of the garage.

Bob explained if anything is changed from the original plan we will have to amend the permitting process.

Mr. Fossesiguarani emphasized the fact that the cupola will be kept on the roof of the garage.

Chrmn. Bishop stated he is having difficulty with the fact that the Building Dept. should not have issued a permit until this Commission approves the plan.

Mr. Fossesiguarani stated they want the garage to look as it does in the plans presented to the Commission.

Mr. Stowe felt the only question is the possibility of a window.

Bob stated if they decide to do a window or a vent, they will come back to the Commission.

Chrmn. Bishop stated it is important to indicate to the zoning people that the cupola is okay to remain.

Bob explained they are only applying for what has been presented to this group and if we decide to go with putting the cupola back on or go with a window, we will re-submit plans for that.

Chrmn. Bishop stated we can agree that the existing cupola can be put on the roof and if the window matches the same style and trim as is on the house that would be permissible.

Mr. Muller stated his preference would be to see the cupola remain as it is keeping with the existing roof and if they decide to put in a window, they would need to come back before us and he felt that would be acceptable.

Chrmn. Bishop asked how long it would take for them to come up with new plans showing the window and the cupola.

Mr. Stowe noted the cupola is the same one that presently exists.

Mr. Connolly, neighbor, had not comment.

Mr. Moen stated he formalized the sketch the Commission is looking at.

No further questions/comments regarding this COA.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Application by Anne Hendershott at 8 Union Street for alterations to the garage and for replacement of windows.**

Mrs. Hendershott stated she has lived in Milford for 13 years, most recently on Gulf Street and recently decided to purchase a smaller home in Milford and also live part time in Florida. She stated the house on Union Street needs a lot of work including replacing 46 windows (all the windows in the house) and she would like to replace them with 6 over 6. She stated the bigger part of the project is the garage and she noted when they purchased the house the garage was called a carport but that was not the case, adding it was a garage but the door had fallen off. Her plan was to put a carriage style door on the garage and an entry door near that garage door.

Chrmn. Bishop referred to the picture in the packet.

Mrs. Hendershott stated there is not structural difference planned for the garage except adding an entry door where there was not a door.

Mr. Muller understood that the previous doors had deteriorated and were removed for safety reasons.

It was also noted the garage door will have the look of a carriage style but will open overhead.

Mrs. Hendershott stated the siding on the garage will be the same as is (natural).

Ms. Kennard asked if the entry door in the picture could be put on the side so it is not visible from the street and perhaps install a larger carriage style door to cover that entire space.

Mrs. Hendershott stated it was not possible to get a door big enough to cover that space.

Ms. Kennard suggested centering the carriage door and put the same shingles on either side of that door, remove the entry door from the front and put it on the side of the garage. She felt the entry door is not keeping with the style of the house.

Mr. Muller agreed and felt the entry door should be on the side.

Mr. Stowe felt the driveway made more sense for the entry door to be in the front.

Chrmn. Bishop referred to the replacement of the windows on the house and if that included the arch window in the front (stained glass on 3rd floor).

Mrs. Hendershott explained that will remain as is.

Ms. Kennard noted 46 windows to be replaced not including the one on the top floor or on the front porch and she was told those are French doors on the front porch and will not be replaced.

Mrs. Hendershott again stated all the windows will remain the same size as they are now and the windows on the 3rd floor will be replaced but not the arch.

Chrmn. Bishop noted the windows will be 6 over 6 with the exception of the bump outs. He noted the windows on the houses in the neighborhood do not have the small pane windows.

Mr. Ortoleva suggested not going with replacing the windows but put in new windows and that might be a better option.

Mrs. Hendershott noted that she may consider a change to the storm door and Ms. Kennard noted that the applicant would have to come back to the Commission if that was to be changed.

Mr. Stowe stated the 6 over 6 windows seem to be okay and the plan for the garage is okay but he questioned the bump outs which have smaller windows. He suggested having the applicant come back after making a final decision on those windows.

Mrs. Hendershott stated the bump out windows would be 2 over 2.

Mr. Ortoleva questioned if the narrow windows had a divider and it was the consensus to not divide the bump outs.

Mr. Muller noted that neighbors have made comment regarding the pile of scrap the contractor has on the edge of the driveway and he suggested it be removed before someone files a formal complaint.

Mr. Connolly, neighbor, had questions regarding the garage door and he suggested having a remote control open a 1 ½ wide garage door. He felt a larger garage door and no entry door may be better solution.

Mr. Moen stated a larger door would also project a more balanced presentation. He suggested an entry door on the side of the house.

Ms. Kennard asked for clarification from Mr. Moen who explained emergency egress doors are ones that have to swing open in the direction of travel. He felt it would make sense to have a manual door on the side which would provide for a 1 ½ wide garage door in the front.

Mr. Ortoleva suggested a single garage door in the center and the entry door on the side.

Mr. Moen stated in looking ahead, that option would not provide enough room to get a wheel chair out.

Chrmn. Bishop asked if the members wanted to continue with the application before us at this time.

Mrs. Hendershott stated she would like to move on with the application as it is now.

Being no further questions or comments, the public hearing closed at 7:33 p.m. and the regular meeting reconvened at that time.

Ms. Kennard and Mr. Stowe made and seconded a motion to accept the Certificate of Appropriateness Application by Ivan Fossesiguarani at 37-39 Pond Street, Milford CT for alterations to the garage for purposes of discussion.

Mr. Ortoleva stated he understood what the owner wants to do but he was not pleased with the steep roof line.

Mr. Muller stated he did not have a problem with the addition off the back of the garage but he did have a problem with the height which would be going from 12 ft. to approximately 18 ft. He noted the garage will look to be the same height as the house.

Mr. Belden stated the height is not a problem with him and the garage is quite a distance off the road and he did not feel the height of the garage will stand out as peculiar.

Chrmn. Bishop agreed that the garage is far enough back that the 18 ft. height will not be an issue.

The motion carried with Mr. Belden recusing himself from voting on this application.

Ms. Kennard and Mr. Muller made and seconded a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness Application by Anne Hendershott at 8 Union Street for alterations to the garage and for replacement of windows as submitted. ( 6 over 6 to all windows except the bump outs, and no change to exterior trim, all narrow windows or bump outs will be 1 over 1 and the 3rd floor windows facing the street shall remain unchanged in appearance or if replaced they must be replaced as exists now. With regard to the garage, a single overhead carriage door and an entry door as reflected in the plan.

Ms. Kennard felt the entry door should be on the side and Mr. Muller agreed.

Mr. Belden felt the circumstances the owners are dealing with should direct the commission to consider the plans as presented.

Ms. Kennard felt that the Commission will have to make allowances in the future when it comes to special needs such as a ramp. She felt that is something that does not match the style of a home in the district.

Chrmn. Bishop suggested splitting the application and have one motion for the garage and one for the windows.

Ms. Kennard and Mr. Muller made and seconded a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness Application by Anne Hendershott at 8 Union Street as it applies to the replacement of windows provided that all windows are 6 over 6 except the bump outs’ narrow windows which will be 1 over 1.  The 3rd floor windows facing the street shall remain unchanged in appearance and if any panes are replaced, they must be replaced in the size and design and with mullions as exist now.

Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Kennard and Mr. Muller made and seconded a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness by Anne Hendershott as it applies to alterations to the garage at 8 Union Street, including a single overhead carriage door and an entry door as reflected in the plan.

Motion carried with Mr. Belden, Mr. Stowe and Mr. Kozlowski voting yes and Ms. Kennard and Mr. Muller voting no.

**Consideration of Minutes** –Mr. Belden and Mr. Muller made and seconded a motion to waive the reading of the minutes from the 9/8/2021 meeting and approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

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

**Clerk/Treasurer’s Report** – Mr. Ortoleva stated the current balance is $6,068.51.

**Unfinished Business**

* 1. Review Study Report Booklet and consider allocating funds to print some copies –

Ms. Kennard suggested that before additional copies of the existing booklet are printed, perhaps it should be reviewed for updating purposes.

Mr. Ortoleva felt members would benefit by having a copy of the current booklet.

Mr. Kozlowski offered to review the current booklet and note recommendations for any changes.

Matter will remain on the table as the booklet is being reviewed.

* 1. Attorney Berchem’s advice as to Airbnb’s, ground mounted satellite dishes and signage – item will remain on the table for further recommendation from Attny. Berchem
  2. Solar panels – remain on the table until discussion with Attny. Berchem.

**New Business** –

a. Discuss replacement and expansions of driveways and parking areas – with regard to 3 houses on Center Street and the two expanded driveways, Chrmn. Bishop has had discussion with Permitting Dept. and was told driveways only require zoning permits not building permits. He noted within the district residential parking should not exceed a coverage ratio of the property as defined in the zoning restrictions. He stated he will check this further with the city attorney and he also questioned when a zoning permit is issued, if there is a change to parking ratio the owners must come to this Commission. It was also noted that P & Z and Building Depts. Claim that multi-family homes are residential and not business. Also, parking language in our state may not give the Commission any rights with regard to any of the multi-families that exist.

Discussion ensued regarding this Commission having any say in a driveway ruling. Mr. Belden did not feel a driveway constitutes structure and did not see where this Commission has much leeway.

b. Ms. Kennard explained a visit she made to one of the homes on Lafayette Street where a new roof was put on and the owner explained they needed a roof and didn’t have time to go through the application process. Ms. Kennard stated at this point should we follow up with a letter to the owners.

Mr. Muller asked if a permit is needed for a roof and he was told it is.

Mr. Muller stated if home owners are not getting permits, we should then refer to the building inspector and zoning officer.

Chrmn. Bishop noted that if the owner does not have a permit, steps should be taken to stop the work until a permit is obtained. As well he stated if a roof has been put on a house without a permit, this Commission should notify permitting that we need to be noticed when these people come back for any future permits for other projects and at that time consider how to act on future projects.

c. Ms. Kennard referred to the house on 15 Reed Street who are looking to replace a white picket fence and partial stockade fence and would like to change the stockade to white vinyl. It was noted 2 commissioners have gone out to this property regarding this change.

Chrmn. Bishop stated when 2 commissioners go out to visit homes they are considering only whether changes are “like for like” and that is all they should expect to accomplish by the visit. He noted even though the end product will look much better then what is presently there, as in this instance, is not the issue.  He stated 2 commissioners may recommend but they are not giving approval unless it is “like for like”.

Chrmn. Bishop felt we need to agree that moving forward changes that are not “like for like”, even if improvements, should come before the Commission where a change of appearance and materials is not “like for like”.

Mr. Stowe stated when you change material and appearance it is not like for like.

Chrmn. Bishop noted it is necessary to consider “exterior” look of the material.

Ms. Kennard expressed concern that the owners of this property may have been misled.

Mr. Belden felt there was not much of a difference in the material.

Mr. Belden felt it should come down to appearance.

Mr. Kozlowski added how much is visible from the street should be considered as well.

Ms. Kennard felt she has changed her thinking on this instance and should we ask the owners to come before the Commission.

Mr. Stowe felt he would support his fellow commissioners who visited the home.

Ms. Kennard stated going forward we need to keep this guidance on our mind.

Chrmn. Bishop stated he would put together a letter to the property owners.

* 1. Mr. Ortoleva noted one of the signs in the district (Rogers Avenue) is coming down and

suggested we get heavy duty brackets to repair the sign.

Motion was made by Mr. Stowe and seconded by Mr. Kozlowski to authorize purchase of heavy duty brackets to repair the district sign on Rogers Avenue. Motion carried unanimously.

Being no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Mr. Stowe and seconded by Mr. Muller to adjourn the meeting at 8:33 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Recorded by Diane Candido