South of the Green Milford Historic District No. 2,

Minutes of Regular Meeting and Public Hearing – Via Zoom – September 14, 2022

Present: Andy Belden, Chris Bishop, Liz Kennard, Marc Muller

Applicants: Thomas and Julia Naclerio, 31 Green Street, replacement of the fence around the yard.

 Zane Rooney and Carmel Lynn, 31 Pond Street for the replacement of gutters, siding and rear fencing.

Chrmn. Bishop convened the meeting at 6:35 p.m. and declared a quorum present. The regular meeting stood in recess at 6:36 p.m. and the public hearing was called to order at that time.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Application by Thomas and Julia Naclerio, 31 Green Street, replacement of the fence around the yard**

Mrs. Naclerio explained three panels of their fencing has been installed by the fence company but it does not match the specs that were previously approved by this Board. She added she is not happy with the service of the contractor who explained to the them they do not recommend fence with pickets below the bottom bar because it is not structurally sound and this was not what they were told back in June. At that time they were told they would be able to match the fence but now the contractor are claiming they have no recollection or documentation of such conversation. Mrs. Naclerio explained they have been told by the contractor they can order the pickets as originally requested but will incur additional cost but they did not know what that cost would be. Further, she explained they like the fence that is presently installed though they are displeased with what the contractor has since told them; however they would like to close the book on this and move forward with the fence as installed. She added they wanted to come back to this body first before moving forward.

Mrs. Naclerio shared pictures of the gates noting the double gate image is not the exact gate design as originally proposed. She explained the hinges on the gate are basic black steel which was not our proposal last spring.

Mr. Naclerio explained he had researched what constitutes a Cape Cod style fence and feels he has become a fence design expert. He stated in his research he found there is a broader definition of the particular style depending on fence companies. He explained the fence they have is a bit different in design from a traditional Cape Cod fence. He expressed their frustration with the contractor and that was why they halted the project. He noted the fence is a good looking fence but is not the fence originally proposed.

Mrs. Naclerio explained they were specific as how the fence should look but is not what they now have.

Mr. Muller questioned if the fences were 2 different sizes (front and back) and he was told yes, they were.

Ms. Kennard had no further questions but added the Naclerio’s had done their best to try to get what is included in their original contract.

Mr. Belden explained he had a problem hearing much of the conversation shared about the fence tonight and therefore will recuse himself to any discussion/action.

Mr. Muller asked if the hinge hardware will be on the outside or inside of the gates and Mrs. Naclerio explained they can make that choice and Mr. Naclerio added it will be n the interior.

Mr. Muller recalled the previous fence had the gate hardware on the exterior if he remembered correctly.

Mr. Naclerio stated they will double check the old fence and make sure it is as close to what was there before.

Being no further questions, Chrmn. Bishop invited Mr./Mrs. Naclerio to stay for the remainder of the meeting and reminded them there could be no further discussion on their part.

Mrs. Naclerio thanked the Commission for their time and stated they would be leaving the meeting at this time.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Application by Zane Rooney and Carmel Lynn, 31 Pond Street for the replacement of gutters, siding and rear fencing.**

Mr. Rooney explained the primary reason they are coming forward with this project is the remediation issue as they have sustained a significant water damage on the southeast facing side of their home. He explained they have consulted with a contractor for gutters and siding and it has been determined there is an egress issue with regard to the water damage. He explained primarily some of the water is coming off the gutters but more importantly when it is particularly windy, the rain hits that side of the house and is not being shed adequately from off the side of the home. He directed comments to the picture included in the application which reflects the sections retaining the most water. He stated that after consulting with several contractors there was a consensus the water retainment issue seems to be linked to the blue detailing along the side of the house. He added the drip edge that runs along the top causes the water to stay against the side of the home and angles in so the water retains rather than shedding out as the clapboards do. He explained the clapboards above those details have the most damage. Mr. Rooney added the detailing around the windows would remain but the drip edges along the side would be replaced by clapboards. Further he noted they have been advised to go with 6-inch gutters which are larger than the current 4-inch gutter as the larger gutter would do an adequate job of redirecting some of the moisture on the home. Mr. Rooney noted they would also be adjusting the gutters on the other side of the interior corner to be a little more parallel with the ground which should also remove some of the water that runs along the side of the house on heavy rainfall days.

Mr. Rooney shared the pictures of the side of the interior corner which shows the original home and addition built in 1999 and the significant wood rot was visible. He noted the contractor felt the drip edge is not shedding the water as had been expected and the biggest concern is that as we go into the winter season some of the frost would make its way into the home. He also pointed out a few other areas on the pictures that have some water damage and the wood detail at the base would match the original base but will be better angled.

Ms. Kennard asked if the area around the bay windows had any damage. Mr. Rooney speculated that the drip angles could have been better angled when first put in. He noted there has been some replacement on that bay window area which looks different so they suspect a similar issue has been happening there as well but that area gets better sunlight than the other areas do.

Ms. Kennard referred to the picture of the 6-inch gutter that runs across the 1999 addition and Mr. Rooney explained those gutters will be re-angled from the bay toward the front of the house.

Mr. Rooney explained that side of the house has been holding up significantly better and he is hoping to extend the life of that siding be reducing some of the run-off that may hit against it.

Ms. Kennard expressed concern with the 1999 addition tucked into the bump out where the old meets the new.

Mr. Rooney explained there is an issue there as well and the contractor has proposed putting a splash guard which sits over the gutter which may further enhance the ability to capture the interior corner. He added it is hopeful angling will significantly help but the real issue is the pitch of the roofs which is steep so when they meet it creates significant water with a heavy rainfall.

Further Mr. Rooney noted the detailed blue will not change and the scalloping will remain the same. He emphasized all of the work is on the exterior of the addition.

Ms. Kennard asked if the drip edge was taken off and replaced with clapboards, would they be blue or gold and she was told gold to keep with the look of the original home. He also noted the look of the windows will be consistent with the front of the house.

Ms. Kennard asked if the drip edge above the window on the side will be clapboard and she was told they will be clapboard.

Chrmn. Bishop noted it would look like the body of the main house in the picture of the “Original Structure 1900”.

Chrmn. Bishop questioned the telephone contact which appeared on the meeting asking if they had any questions or comments but there was no response.

With regard to the fence issue at this home, Mr. Rooney stated it is a similar problem with water noting the fence is on the southeast corner and there are two style of fences; one being the Victorian Picket which spans 34 feet into the yard and flows into the existing tongue and groove panel fence which extends to the back. He pointed out this side of the property does not get much sunlight due to the shade of the trees.

Further, Mr. Rooney explained they would like to take the Victorian Picket fence and extend it all the way back to the rear of the house which will allow for a better wind flow and reduce some of the moisture build up as well as hopefully extend the life of the fence. He added they are looking to have the exact same design, pickets will be 1 ½ in wide, posts 4 ft high, 6 in. wide with pyramid style caps at the top.

Ms. Kennard asked if he had seen a sample of this fence and was told they have seen the material and made sure the measurements are exact and have been able to confirm dimensions are exactly as advertised. (Eastern Fence Co. is the contractor).

Chrmn. Bishop questioned the wood to be used and he was told it will be cedar, same style and dimensions.

Mr. Belden noted as long as they are working with wood, there should not be a big challenge.

Mr. Muller asked if there will be fencing across the front of the property and Mr. Rooney explained there will not be a fence in the front as they like the present look.

Being no further questions, Chrmn. Bishop invited the Mr. Rooney to stay for the remainder of the meeting and reminded them there could be no further discussion on their part.

Before leaving the meeting, Mr. Rooney thanked the members for their time.

The public hearing portion of the meeting closed at 7:12 p.m. and the regular meeting convened at that time.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Application by Thomas and Julia Naclerio, 31 Green Street, replacement of the fence around the yard**

Chrmn. Bishop noted for informational purpose only, he had looked into vinyl fencing and the fencing that did not have pickets below the spine are noted to withstand kicking, power tools. With regard to the few places who have wooden Cape Cod style fences, they end at the rail as opposed to below the rail.

Ms. Kennard noted the Naclerio’s stated they like the new fence and she personally felt strongly about getting the gate situation corrected. She also noted she failed to mention there are some gates that have the crossbar (“Z”) and perhaps they could make this point with their vendor and suggest they find those type gates. She also stated this was not what was represented in their original contract but it will not be an abomination to the neighborhood.

Mr. Muller referred to the original approved application and the crossbar was described at that time. He expressed concern that their fence contractor is being difficult noting the new gate is similar but missing the crossbar and there is no structural aspect but only aesthetic.

Ms. Kennard stated she personally would like to have the contractor pushed somewhat with regard to the crossbar.

Mr. Belden stated he was not concerned with the crossbar issue.

Mr. Muller stated he personally has had his frustrations with fencing and he felt the Naclerio’s have gone down the path of frustration and he felt we should let them put the fence in as modified adding we would like to see the crossbar on the gates.

Chrmn. Bishop suggested including wording similar to this in the letter to the Naclerio’s: “the Commission would appreciate your attempt to use any effort to get the crossbar (“Z”} on the gate which reflects the gate on the original design”.

Mr. Muller moved and Ms. Kennard seconded a motion to approve the application as presented with the Commission’s note to use any reasonable efforts to have the diagonal crossbar on the single and double gates as reflected in the original fence design. Motion carried unanimously.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Application by Zane Rooney and Carmel Lynn, 31 Pond Street for the replacement of gutters, siding and rear fencing.**

Ms. Kennard and Mr. Belden made and seconded a motion to approve the fence application for 31 Pond Street as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Kennard and Mr. Muller made and seconded a motion to approve the house restoration and remediation as presented (gutters, horizontal drip edge, downspout) and to accept repairs and replacement to the clapboard siding to remediate the water damage to the 1999 addition on the house.

Ms. Kennard questioned if the clapboard and drip edge work will make a positive change to the home and Mr. Muller felt if it is done correctly it will definitely make a positive change.

Ms. Kennard asked if they had the drip edge done correctly in the beginning of the restoration would this have happened and Mr. Muller stated once the water gets in it is difficult to stop it. He felt they could replace the drip edge and reseal it but the problem could reappear.

Mr. Belden expressed concern that the framing behind the clapboards could be rotted.

Discussion ensued regarding how far the owner would need to go with replacement of the clapboards.

Motion carried unanimously.

**Consideration of Minutes** – Mr. Belden and Ms. Kennard made and seconded a motion to waive the reading of the minutes of the regular meeting held 8/10/2022 and approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

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

**Clerk/Treasurer’s Report** – not available

**Unfinished Business**

1. Attorney Berchem’s advice as to Air BnBs, ground mounted satellite dishes and signage – remain on the table.
2. Replacement and expansions of driveways and parking areas – remain on the table.

**New Business**

Ms. Kennard directed comments to the members recent attempts to accommodate our neighbors and noted visits to their homes to review their issues. She added as was the case with the Rooney proposal, it was determined it was not a simple decision and must go before the Commission. She raised the issue of having special meetings for review of applications.

Chrmn. Bishop stated he personally is against having special meetings and sees no reason for one when it is to consider an original application. He added short of an emergency, an applicant can time their requests according to the Commission’s regular meeting schedule.

Discussion ensued regarding timing of an original application to be presented at our regular scheduled meetings vs. a special meeting.

Ms. Kennard added we, as a Commission, must realize timing is what will put pressure on this board for a special meeting vs. regular meeting.

Chrmn. Bishop noted once the zoom era is behind us, we must then adhere to newspaper ad for meeting and posting of the meeting.

Chrmn. Bishop informed members that he intends to step down as Chair by year end or when another chair is appointed but he would like to remain a member of the Commission. He added he felt the Chair should be someone who lives in the district.

Ms. Kennard referred to house within the district that has stripped off siding and uncovered gingerbread and scallop design. She noted if someone uncovers historical detail she would hope they would have their contractor restore it. She asked if this Commission would have any influence on that issue. Discussion ensued regarding Commission’s responsibility to maintain the original integrity of a home.

Being no further business, motion was made by Ms. Kennard and seconded by Mr. Muller to adjourn at 8:15 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Recorded by Diane Candido