

**WETHERSFIELD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
PUBLIC HEARING  
MARCH 9, 2004**

The Wethersfield Historic District Commission held a public meeting on March 9, 2003 at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Conference Room of the Town Hall, 505 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

Members present:

Billye Logan, Chairperson  
Douglas Ovian, Vice Chairperson  
Jennifer Wolf, Clerk  
Vacek Miglus  
Robert A. Garrey  
Eric Hart  
Paul Courchaine  
John Toomey

Also Present:

Robert Cook, Wethersfield Historic District Coordinator

Chairperson Logan called the hearing to order at 7:30 pm and Clerk Wolf, read the Legal Notice as it appeared in the Hartford Courant on February 27, 2004.

**APPLICATION NO. 3172-04.** Fran Dupuis seeking to install a shed in the rear at 21-23 Hartford Avenue.

Mr. Fran Dupuis 23 Hartford Avenue appeared before the Commission and told them that he wanted to install a tool shed in his backyard. He submitted a brochure which showed a picture of the Carefree building with a single window and Craftsman-style swinging door he hoped to erect at the end of his driveway on the SW side of the property. He explained that he planned to lay down crushed stone to level the area and lay it upon cement blocks and intended to roof it to match the house. He said that he had spoken to Mr. Cook and was told about the side yard setbacks.

Ms. Kathleen Ahern 15 Hartford Avenue stepped forward and looked at the plot plan asking to see where the shed would be placed since she lived next door.

Ms. Maureen Hayes 29 Hartford Avenue stepped forward and said that as the neighbor on the other side; she had no objections to the application.

There being no one else who wished to speak in favor or against this application, this portion of the hearing was declared closed.

**APPLICATION NO. 3173-04.** Julie Sapia seeking to install replacement windows at 136 Main Street.

Ms. Julie Sapia and husband Tom 136 Main Street appeared before the Commission and presented a sample of the type of aluminum clad wooden replacement window they proposed to replace the bottom floor front windows of their home with. They explained that although they would probably replace all the windows in the clapboard area of the first floor, the windows in the shingled sided bump-out area would be restored.

Commissioner Miglus asked if these replacement windows would be placed inside the frame of the old windows. He was told that they would. He then asked what the stop on the window frame would butt up to and was told that the trim would come right up to it.

Mr. Cook pointed out that the replacements would be slighter smaller than the present windows.

Commissioner Miglus asked how large the existing windows were, because the windows proposed would be a minimum of 1 1/2" smaller on each side. He was told that the present windows were approximately 2 1/2' X 5'.

Commissioner Ovian said that he would be more concerned about the protrusion of these windows.

Commissioner Miglus noted that the protrusion would be more or less evident depending on size of the window stop. Mr. Sapia said that contractor would put a piece of trim between the windows that would match with the color of the window to make it blend in.

Commissioner Ovian said that the window could be installed so as not to extend any farther to the outside than the present window. Any extra protrusion could be handled by the retrim on the interior. But he said it was hard to know since they didn't know how thick the wall was.

Ms. Sapia commented that if they did not use the screens provided but instead installed storm windows, those would stick out as well.

Commissioner Ovian said that it all depended on the window or the situation and pointed out an example where the window was somewhat recessed so that the storm window did not stand proud of the casing. He then asked the applicant what color the windows would be.

Ms. Sapia answered that they had not made up their mind yet on the color.

Commissioner Ovian explained that the reason he was asking about the color was because he wanted to see some sort of relationship between these new windows and the other windows and if they were intending to put on storm windows then they might want to make them all match. He added that the Commission does not usually regulate color on surfaces that are wood because they can be repainted and the color changed, but because of the aluminum exterior of these windows they will typically stay that color.

Ms. Sapia said that they were leaning toward a greenish-grayish color like slate. Chairperson Logan explained that if they decided they preferred a slight change in color they could talk to Mr. Cook.

Commissioner Logan asked if they planned to replace all the windows at some point. Ms. Sapia said that their original intention was to do the first floor but then thought that it would look funny if the front windows on the second floor were not new to. So what they are now hoping to do is replace the windows in the first floor but also the 6 second floor windows in front for now.

There being no one else who wished to speak in favor or against this application, this portion of the hearing was declared closed.

**APPLICATION NO. 3174-04.** Paula Larsen seeking to install a fence and one handicap parking space at 271 Main Street.

Ms. Paula Larsen 271 Main Street appeared before the Commission and said that she was withdrawing her application for the parking space and produced a letter from Fred Valente which said that the State had released her from the requirement to supply any off street parking. She then submitted a brochure which showed different styles of fencing that she liked one of which she proposed to erect on 3 sides of her property. Although the brochure showed vinyl fencing, she explained that her contractor had supplied the brochure and assured her that these styles were available in wood.

The 6' flat board lattice topped wooden fence would begin in front of the garage on the side of her property continue all the way to the rear, across the back and up the other rear side of the property next to the Legion Hall. It would enclose only the rear portions of the yard.

Mr. Fran Dupuis 23 Hartford Avenue asked to see the plot plan to see exactly where the fence would be placed.

Ms. Elizabeth Foran 447 Main Street said that she was in favor of the fence and thought that it would be an improvement for Old Wethersfield.

Ms. Leslie Weis 17 Rosedale said that she also supported Ms. Larsen and the Creamery.

Commissioner Oviañ wanted to make sure that the public was aware that this application was concerned only with a fence and not the other proposed plans to the property.

Ms. Shirley Alderman 265 Main Street said that she was opposed to the style of the fence. She did not want to see a vinyl fence which she said absolutely glared in the sunlight. She was told that the applicant was proposing a wooden fence. She then expressed concern about how the fence would create a sharp and narrow angled corner at the intersection where her property borders the applicant's property, due to the unusual and non perpendicular way the properties were divided. It bothered her that this triangle of yard would be difficult to perform routine maintenance upon. Commissioner Miglus pointed out that between the 6' fence and the height of Comstock Ferry beside it there would not be any grass to worry about.

Commissioner Oviañ pointed out that the Commission only regulated the view from the public way and that area of fence would be so far back he doubted that there would be any public impact caused by it although it might impact Ms. Alderman.

Ms. Alderman said that she would have to speak to Ms. Larsen about the point at which the fence would start so as not to negatively impact her property. She also asked how many feet from the property line the fence would need to be placed.

Chairperson Logan said that the distance from the property line placement was a zoning concern; the Historic District Commission could only regulate its appearance.

Ms. Alderman also asked that the good side of the fence face her property. She was told that the style of fence proposed was good on both sides.

Ms. Kathleen Ahern 15 Hartford Avenue stepped forward to say that she was very happy to hear that there would be no parking in the back yard. She then pointed out after looking at the plot plan that it was drawn incorrectly and while the drawing showed a nearly perpendicular intersection to the properties it was in fact much more wedge shaped and would result in a sharp corner of fenced yard on the one corner. She also pointed out that the trees shown on the plan were placed incorrectly.

Commissioner Oviañ said that if the plot is in fact incorrect they would have Mr. Cook check into it, and if it would result in the fence creating a strange situation then he would like to know about it.

Mr. Cook pointed out that the drawing had a professional surveyor stamp on it and should be accurate. Pipes marking property borders could be moved and it would be advisable for Ms. Ahern to have a survey done of her property if there was any question to make sure that the pipes have not been moved and he recommended that she do it sooner than later. He also added that the trees could have been placed where they were not out of actual placement but for a more general feeling of a treed property.

Commissioner Oviañ said that he was relying on the drawing to help him decide how the fence would look from the road.

Ms. Ahern also said that she would prefer to see a 4' fence rather a 6' fence because of her garden located on the rear border.

Mr. Fran Dupuis also said that he had looked at the property and it did appear to him from the placement of the marker pipes that the angle was more like 75 degrees than 90 degrees.

Ms. Leslie Hayes 29 Hartford Avenue said she would prefer to see a 4' fence rather than a 6' fence because she would

hate to see a barrier and added that he had a 4' fence and one could still see all the way up Main Street.

Commissioner Ovian said that while a 4' fence was certainly more inviting it was not unusual to approve 6' fences for back yards.

Ms. Hayes said that she did have a section of 6' fence on her property in order to shield the view of the pool next door and for a reason like that she could more easily see it than the whole property.

Commissioner Ovian asked whether she thought the view of the fence from the sidewalk of Hartford Avenue would be as imposing. Ms. Hayes said that she couldn't see it unless she was on Main Street.

Commissioner Ovian said that although the fence might be closer to Hartford Avenue, the view from Main Street would not appear as tall or imposing. If the view was imposing from Hartford Avenue he would be more concerned.

Ms. Samantha Juskowski 285 Main Street stepped forward to see the plot plan and the height of the fence.

Ms. Maureen Hayes 29 Hartford Avenue stepped forward and commented that 6' seemed to her very tall and if there was a concern about a neighbor's garden, then perhaps a lower fence could be considered.

There being no one else who wished to speak in favor or against this application, this portion of the hearing was declared closed.

**APPLICATION NO. 3166-04.** Bobi Molchan & Wayne Holcombe seeking to install a vinyl fence at 164 Hartford Avenue.

Ms. Bobi Molchan 164 Hartford Avenue appeared before the Commission and explained that her neighbor Brian McGee supports the vinyl fence, in addition she pointed out that she did not live in a purely residential neighborhood. Her property was bordered by the McGee property which was 80% parking lot, was across the street from a park and the Stillman property which was being developed and would further increase the traffic as well as the need for privacy. Security was also an issue and that was why she wanted to erect a fence. She said that she had walked around Old Wethersfield and noted that a great many of the wooden fences were falling down. While she knew that the Commission did not like vinyl fencing she was not so sure that chain link was a great solution. After looking at the dilapidated fences around the District she felt that vinyl should not be considered so bad just because it was plastic. She said that it has a life time guarantee and looks good for a long time and not just right after paint jobs and felt that they needed to at least consider alternatives. Her house she said was a different consideration since the house was almost 50% over the building line, the fence if placed behind the building line would start pretty far back. At the last meeting she had discussed bringing the fence along the driveway, but because of the Commission's concerns they were now proposing to put up a gate at the driveway and then start the fence after the gate. In the front of the gate where the chain link fence currently stands she proposed removing the fence and planting evergreens like arborvitae and azaleas. But she felt putting up a wooden fence would require a month every year to maintain. She also added that she regularly passes a fence in Simsbury that always looks as is it were just painted, and she finally realized that it was because it was vinyl.

Commissioner Logan said that what they were talking about was that a vinyl fence does not ever look like a wooden fence. Vinyl fences she explained are a product of the 1990's and 2000's, and do not have a place in the Historic District and they had never been approved there before.

Mr. Cook noted that there are new products and technologies being developed every day.

Ms. Molchan said that she was not suggesting putting it up close to the street but she didn't feel that historic should have to be old and dilapidated.

Commissioner Ovian said that all of her comments will be discussed in the public meeting, and that ever Commissioner did not feel the same way. He for one was somewhat intrigued by vinyl fencing.

Ms. Molchan said that from her standpoint as a homeowner when considering the investment of thousands of dollars of fencing only to realize that in 10 years she would have to replace it again or that it must be repainted every 2-3 years on both sides in order to keep her neighbors and herself happy, she thought that there was a lot of money and control the Commission had over the residents of the District. She was not proposing changes to the house, they had hired an architect and spent a lot of money to assure that the work was kept looking period, so that when it's looked at it will look like a historic home. But when she looked at the fences in town she thought that there had to be more alternatives than wooden fencing or chain link. She didn't feel that new necessarily was always for the worse. She said that her house was not 350 years old, it was not on Main Street, she had a park a school and a commercial business next door and she could not afford the maintenance on a wooden fence and did not want to replace it in 10 years as her neighbors had had to do. She hoped that during the public meeting it would be discussed that if they could not be approved for all the fencing proposed that maybe they could at least do the part in back. Her neighbors had put up fencing without approval at least she had not received notice for it.

Chairperson Logan said that if it could not be seen from the street or public way, they did not need to approve it.

Commissioner Ovia said that plantings were not considered a permanent block and should not be considered when deciding if it could be seen from a public way.

Commissioner Miglus said that when something is right up against the street the Commission it will fall under a different category than something that is only served glancing views from neighboring streets.

A short break was taken at this time.

**APPLICATION NO. 3170- 04.** Paula Larsen seeking to construct an addition to the front of the house at 271 Main Street

Ms. Paula Larsen presented a brochure showing doors that she proposed for the addition, other than that there were no changes from the drawings previously submitted. She would accept whatever door from those indicated that would match. She said that she had discussed various changes suggested with her architect and they decided that they could not afford to lose 200 sq. ft. from the 690 sq. ft proposed. Nor could they push the space into the house because then the outdoor seating would have to be in the rear of the building instead out front as proposed and the machines would be in front instead of being able to look out of the windows. These changes would change the whole atmosphere.

Ms. Laurie Demoto 456 Main Street said that she was here to support Ms. Larsen and the Creamery project. She said that Ms. Larsen was absolutely meticulous with her window treatments and the landscaping well maintained and had added a lot of character to the center of Town and was sure that she would do the same for the new Creamery.

Clerk Wolf read a letter from Leslie Weis 17 Rosedale Street which said that she had attended the evening's meeting but could not stay and wished to express her support for the project.

Another letter was read from Kelly Weinberg 480 Brimfield Street expressing regret that she could not be there in person to say that she supported the proposal to relocate the Main Street Creamery to Ms. Larsen's personal property. She went on to say that the addition of the Main Street Creamery has been an asset to the community and that Ms. Larsen was one of the most professional, personable and dedicated individuals she has ever known. Her shop reflects an atmosphere of friendship, warmth and community and the residents have been receptive. She and other shopkeepers have diligently tried to resolve parking issues on the block, and her plans are a bold initiative to assist in the resolution of this problem. She has continually provided activities for the enjoyment of the community and her future plans to have creative and cultural activities only enhance the nostalgia of what Old Wethersfield is all about. She concluded that it can only add to the quality of life in Old Wethersfield and she asked that they approve the application.

Ms. Maureen Hayes 29 Hartford Avenue said that she too loved the Creamery and thought that it was one of the better things to happen to Old Wethersfield, however she had some concerns. She thought that the house itself was a very charming 19th century home, and incredibly well maintained, but she worried about putting a commercial addition on the house even though it is zoned for commercial, because then it limits its ability to be lived in. She pointed out that

there are a number of commercial buildings in town that are empty. She hesitated to take a house that could be lived in turned into a commercial building. If the Larsen's left or the ice cream shop closed, then there would be holes created. Also she said that the parking was in no way resolved, but instead it would move it down to Comstock Ferry who is already struggling.

By taking up more of the meager parking any possible patrons for Comstock Ferry will just keep going instead of stopping to shop. She felt that they really should consider keeping it accessible even though she realized that parking was not the prevue of this Commission.

Chairperson Logan said that this issue should be brought up the ZBA.

Ms. Hayes said that even though she could not talk about the parking and potential problems created for the dance school or other businesses, she said that she loved the Creamery and would love to see it move to a large empty building rather than take up one of the few remaining residential houses.

Ms. Samantha Juskowski stepped forward to say that she was all for welcoming businesses to Old Wethersfield and she enjoyed seeing all the little businesses that made up the center. But she did not think that bringing this building onto the street was going to be pleasing to the eye, it would protrude and be a sore spot. She just didn't think they needed so much space, which could ultimately end up empty space.

Ms. Rosalyn Hayes 29 Hartford Avenue said that she wanted to repeat what the previous speakers had said, that she thought that the Creamery was wonderful but where it was. She said that the house itself is charming right now and she would not want to see the building coming out so far. She also was concerned about the additional traffic it would generate and the safety of the children coming and going from the dancing school.

Chairperson Logan said that they just couldn't discuss the traffic; they were concerned only with the looks.

There being no other business to come before the Commission, the public hearing was declared closed.

**WETHERSFIELD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
PUBLIC MEETING  
MARCH 9, 2004**

**APPLICATION NO. 3172-04.** Fran Dupuis seeking to install a shed in the rear at 21-23 Hartford Avenue.

Upon motion by Commissioner Miglus, seconded by Commissioner Garrey and a poll of the Commission it was unanimously voted to APPROVE the subject application.

Commissioner Miglus commented that the small outbuilding would make a small impact on the neighborhood, the general streetscape and the District on the whole.

**APPLICATION NO. 3173-04.** Julie Sapia seeking to install replacement windows at 136 Main Street.

**INFORMAL DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Miglus was concerned about the 15% reduction in glass size due to the type of window being proposed. He was also concerned about the additional profile created to allow the screen to be mounted which he felt resulted in "visual noise".

Upon motion by Commissioner Miglus seconded by Commissioner Ovian and a poll of the Commission it was unanimously voted to TABLE the subject application to allow the applicant the opportunity to explore other options.

Other Commissioners did not feel that the reduction of glass would be as noticeable due to the larger size of the windows.

Commissioner Oviau wondered if the same manufacturer made sash replacement kits which would offer the same operating convenience but would address the loss of glass size as well as probably be less expensive than a replacement window. He also wanted to say that he thought it was a wonderful project and he did not want to impose any additional trouble on the family. However he would be in favor of Tabling the application in order to allow them the opportunity to check out alternatives.

Ms. Sapia said that they had looked at alternatives and he thought that sash replacements were all vinyl. This window seemed like the best option for them.

There was a discussion about modern window construction and while it was noted that the track which held the sash was vinyl the rest of the sash did not have to be vinyl.

Mr. Cook felt it fair to explain that he went by the specifications in the Historic District handbook to help advise the Sapia's with their window selection which they had taken in good faith. He felt that their selection was very high quality and perhaps the Handbook should be modified to include dialogue about sash replacement if they wanted the public to consider them.

Commissioner Oviau said that sash replacements have been among the most successful replacements in the District. He added that they tend to save the applicant money but still provide energy saving features.

Commissioner Garrey said that he did not feel the reduction of glass was important with such large windows.

Commissioner Logan asked if sash replacements were ever discussed with the applicant. Mr. Cook said that he had not. Commissioner Miglus said that he had discussed many different things and given sources for different products and let the applicant pursue what would work best for them.

Commissioner Wolf said that she did not recall there being an issue with any damage to the wood frames. Commissioner Miglus said that as far as he knew there was not.

**APPLICATION NO. 3174-04.** Paula Larsen seeking to install a fence and one handicap parking space at 271 Main Street.

## **INFORMAL DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Oviau felt that the lattice at the top of the fence would soften the look and effect of the height of the fence. Although he thought that there was some argument that could be made for approving the fence on only the 2 sides to leave the Alderman property with better sight lines, and preserve the garden on the Ahern property but while he was sympathetic to the neighbors, the Commission could only regulate the view from the public way.

Commissioner Garrey agreed that setting the fence farther back would soften the impact on the Alderman property which was very narrow. He had also thought the angle was somewhat sharper than the one represented on the drawing when they had made their site visit. But he felt that the angle however sharp would read as a flat fence from the public way.

Commissioner Courchaine still was unsure as to why they were moving the fence back from the proposed point. Commissioner Oviau explained that by moving the fence back slightly the view of the Alderman buildings would be preserved from the public way while also preserving Mrs. Alderman's view.

Commissioner Logan said that it worked both ways. While she personally would prefer to look at a fence than the side of a garage, it would also allow the public to see the buildings beyond the garage.

Commissioner Courchaine gave a short history of the property before the current owners and explained that when Mrs. Alderman had come forward with her proposal to build on her property, the owners of the Larsen property had held major objections as to what her buildings would do to their sight lines but she went ahead and built. If he were voting he would not be in favor of moving the fence back.

Commissioner Hart said that he would accept the fence wherever the applicant proposed it as long as it conforms to the regulations and doesn't trample the public view.

Commissioner Ovian felt that by moving the fence slightly back it would diminish the sense of narrowness created by the close proximity of the fence to the buildings as well as preserving the view of the Alderman property.

Commissioner Toomey felt that fences only diminish neighbors and he would like to keep the sightlines as much as possible and would prefer to see the fence placed back as suggested.

Mr. Cook suggested that perhaps a transitional piece of fencing starting at the pulled back area would soften the impact that much more. Commissioners Logan, Toomey and Garrey agreed.

Commissioner Wolf said that while they did not know the intent of the applicant in proposing the start of the fence where she did, it was not their concern. She did not feel the sight lines were affected as the applicant had proposed it.

Commissioner Miglus said that the start of the fence was some 100' back from any public way and viewed head on it would appear as a stick. But as far as any consideration for the neighbor on the south side, he pointed out that they put up their building knowing just how narrow their lot was and how close to the property lines. He did not think starting the fence before or after the garage would change the impact from the public way.

Upon motion by Commissioner Ovian seconded by Commissioner Garrey and a poll of the Commission it was voted unanimously to APPROVE the subject application with the following stipulation:

1. The fence shall start even with the front of the Larsen garage beginning with a transitional piece.

**APPLICATION NO. 3166-04.** Bobbi Molchan & Wayne Holcombe seeking to install a vinyl fence at 164 Hartford Avenue.

## **INFORMAL DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Ovian felt that since the applicant was willing to forgo the part that would have been least authentic, the picket and the attached tops which he believed would ultimately blacken with time. He thought that the panel fence style had seams in all the places that a wooden fence would have them and was worth trying it on the property. If they noted that this was an experiment to see how it performs and stipulated plantings as part of the installation then they would get a chance to see how the product would perform in the District. He also added a 6' high panel fence would be no less imposing in wood, but plantings would make it less imposing.

Commissioner Logan said that it would be an experiment that would be there for 30 years.

Commissioner Garrey agreed that without the top picket piece which has a seam at each top, this style would be a lesser issue especially in such a non public place.

Commissioner Courchaine felt that because there is nothing at all in the Handbook prohibiting vinyl fencing, a denial of this request would appear as personal bias.

Commissioner Wolf said that the problem with printing a blanket negative statement about vinyl is that a new product could come onto the market tomorrow which replicates wood and performs well and then they would be precluding themselves from considering those products.

Commissioner Ovian agreed.

Commissioner Logan said that she has never seen an enamel paint that was as shiny as a vinyl fence, not to mention the fact that the panels are joined by screws.

Commissioner Courchaine said that given the location he did not have a problem with it.

Mr. Cook noted that he was surprised that there had not been a lot of public disapproval for the fence. Commissioner Ovian thought that once this fence was approved they would hear a lot from the public.

Commissioner Miglus said that people show up when an application is controversial or high impact. He asked how often they came in to dispute a vinyl window or even vinyl siding, or a roof. He thought that public comment was not a good indicator. He also added that he had yet to see a fence with a high gloss finish. If a product came in that did not have sheen he would be happy to look at it, he also objected to the way it was joined together.

Upon motion by Commissioner Miglus, seconded by Commissioner Ovian and a poll of the Commission it was voted unanimously to DENY with out prejudice the subject application as submitted.

### **REASON FOR THE DENIAL**

The high gloss-finish of the fence, and the method by which the panels are attached.

**APPLICATION NO. 3170- 04.** Paula Larsen seeking to construct an addition to the front of the house at 271 Main Street.

The Commissioners held a lengthy discussion about the various concerns that they had about the project and the members of the public who had spoken to it. Commissioner Logan thought the front area would be so cramped that there wouldn't even be room for planters or window boxes and there would be nothing to soften the space. After much verbal redesigning of the addition it was felt that the massing in the front yard was a problem that most of the Commissioners shared.

Commissioner Courchaine mentioned that this was a mercantile/commercial area and buildings were designed higgledy-piggledy and without consideration of site lines or such ideas. This proposed addition would not be out of place in such a location regardless of the modern thoughts about it.

Commissioner Garrey commented that they all loved the Main Street Creamery and noted that Ms. Larsen had bought the building knowing that it was zoned for business it wouldn't be fair to not allow it.

Commissioner Courchaine reminded the Commissioners that they should not be redesigning the addition but voting on the application before them.

Upon motion by Commissioner Miglus, seconded by Commissioner Wolf and a poll of the Commission it was unanimously voted to keep the subject application TABLED to give the applicant the opportunity to address massing issues.

**APPLICATION NO. 3095-03.** Debra & Joseph Hammer seeking to construct an addition to the rear of the house and demolish a shed at 65 Broad Street/

Mr. Cook said that he had received a phone call from the applicant requesting that they be allowed to change the double windows approved for the kitchen to a single window. He had told them that they would have to put in an application as an addendum to their application and had requested that they not install it but it had been done.

Ms. Debra Hammer and husband Joseph 65 Broad Street appeared before the Commission. Ms. Hammer apologized for the mistake and explained that their contractor was a wonderful man and very thoughtful of the fact that they have 2 small children and before they knew it he had framed in the window and installed it. That had not been their expectation, but it was done. Then she said that when they had originally been approved their plans for the kitchen had not yet been finalized. Once they had, they realized that a single window would be more functional than the 2 that had been approved. The new window is 38" X 48" 1/1 aluminum clad wood. They would paint in the trim and once they repaint the house it would blend right in with the rest of the house. They are also considering replacing the old aluminum storm shutters with white energy saving ones.

The Commissioners noted that the windows on the house were all different widths and heights and this window would

not look out of place.

Mr. Cook said that while he was in favor of this application he would request that procedures are followed as they have been stipulated. He told them to call or have their contractor call when they have questions before they act on them.

Upon motion by Commissioner Garrey, seconded by Commissioner Wolf and a poll of the Commission it was unanimously voted to ACCEPT as an amendment to the original application the single window with trim to match the other windows.

#### **APPROVAL OF [MINUTES OF: February 24, 2004](#)**

Upon Motion by Commissioner Garrey, seconded by Commissioner Wolf, and a poll of the Commission, it was unanimously voted that the above minutes BE APPROVED as submitted.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. Cook said that it had been brought to his attention that there was a color of asphalt roofing that had been approved in all the brand booklets but one. He wanted to know if there a reason it was not approved or had it just been an oversight. After some investigation it was found to have just been a mistake, and the color should be an approved color also.

Mr. Cook then turned the discussion to the electric panel at 26 Marsh Street and told the Commissioners that he had received an email from Fred Valente who had been told by Town Attorney Bradley that the regulations refers to above the ground utility structures but not those attached. He urged the Commission to be consistent in their approach.

Commissioner Ovian said that he was interested in what the Connecticut Historical Society has to say about it.

Mr. Cook had called all the utility companies and asked them what they usually do in Historic Districts. He was told that they don't get involved.

Commissioner Ovian announced that perhaps they should consider hiring their own representation. He told Mr. Cook said that a letter should be written asking that the property owner paint it in, in the interest of the Historic District.

The Commissioners then discussed the Hammer home and the situation with the removal of their slate roof without prior approval. Commissioner Logan researched the meeting tapes and records and noted that their approval for an addition had requested that the roof shall match the existing house. The problem being that they decided to remove the slate off of the house and match the roof of the addition. There is a stop order but they have already removed and broken the slate from 1/2 the roof. At the meeting Commissioner Ovian had asked about the roofing material and Mrs. Hammer had said on the tape that they would match the color and if they could not match it with a perfect color, they would come back.

Commissioner Garrey asked if there had been any other situation where a slate roof was replaced with asphalt. He was told of a situation where the roof was beyond repair, but they were not aware of one where as perfectly good roof was replaced.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

TOWN OF WETHERSFIELD  
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Jennifer Wolf  
Clerk

