

RIDGEFIELD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Lower Level Small Conference Room
Town Hall, 400 Main Street
Ridgefield, CT 06877
August 1, 2019

APPROVED MINUTES

A Special meeting of the Ridgefield Historic District Commission (“HDC”) was held in the lower level small conference room of the Town Hall, 400 Main Street, Ridgefield, CT 06877, on Thursday, August 1, 2019, and beginning at 7:30 p.m.

The following members were present:

Dan O’Brien, Chair
Briggs Tobin, Vice Chair
Sean O’Kane
Joe Gasperino
Kam Daughters (Alternate for Rhys Moore)
Mark Blandford (Alternate)
Harriet Hanlon (Alternate)

AGENDA

- 1) 17 Main Street – Revised plans for garage addition**
- 2) 63 High Ridge Avenue – Installation of a new fence**
- 3) Approval of the HDC meeting minutes – July 18, 2019**

MEETING

The meeting was called to order by Mr. O’Brien at 7:42 p.m.

- 1) 17 Main Street – Revised plans for construction of a new three-car garage**

Gary Doski of Doski Building & Remodeling was present along with the property owners, Mrs. Jill Rae and Mr. Rob Rae.

G. Doski distributed updated plans to the Commission. K. Daughters asked if the A9 drawing showed the 2 ft overhang above the garage doors. G. Doski said yes. The plans also showed the windows lowered 4 inches. Page A10 drawing was a blowup around the window areas. D. O’Brien asked looking at the A9 drawing, was the approved plan on the lower left. G. Doski said yes. S. O’Kane asked if on the right-hand side showed the proposed plan. G. Doski said yes. S. O’Kane asked if there was a difference between the top left and lower left? G. Doski said they were the same. He also prepared another plan showing a 3 ft roof overhang. S. O’Kane asked if page A8 was the 2 ft overhang. G. Doski said yes. D. O’Brien asked the group if the 3 ft overhang was a noticeable feature. S. O’Kane asked G. Doski if the current home was a 2 ft overhang. G. Doski said it was approximately 28 inches, but definitely more than 2 ft. H. Hanlon said she thought the new plan looked better. S. O’Kane said with the 3 ft overhang, there would be a different look as one walked towards the garage. There would be a different look because the original roof underneath slopes up and the rafters are exposed on the main roof whereas the new section would look boxy. G. Doski said from the road, one wouldn’t

be able to see the boxiness. B. Tobin said he liked the 3 ft overhang because of the view from the road. H. Hanlon said it did look symmetrical. B. Tobin asked Mr. Rae what he thought. Mr. Rae said that at this point, he was thinking as few changes as possible. However, he was open to whatever needed to get this done. D. O'Brien said they were down to minor differences. Mr. Rae said from his perspective, he was living with the unfinished work. If it looked awkward, he'd rather do that then continue making changes. D. O'Brien asked S. O'Kane if he had seen other 3 ft soffits. S. O'Kane said he had seen them in arts and crafts home. S. O'Kane said when he had raised the question of changing the sloped soffit, G. Doski had said the homeowners didn't like sloping soffits.

D. O'Brien said either a 2 ft or 3 ft overhang was being proposed. He asked if the asbuilt was a 1 ft overhang. G. Doski said yes. M. Blandford said he saw the merits of both overhangs. However, he worried about the heaviness of the 3 ft overhang. He was not voting but wanted to state his opinion. He trusted S. O'Kane's opinion. K. Daughters said she thought the 3 ft. overhang looked better because it came to the top of the windows. Mr. Rae said he didn't care. But if it was awkward, he would be concerned about that.

S. O'Kane said he believed they were 90% of the way. There was a lot of work done to get to this point. D. O'Brien said even at 2 ft, they were talking about 8 inches of clapboard above the window which was not substantial. S. O'Kane said there was a significant height reduction proposed on the roof ridge. G. Doski said the windows could be dropped 2 inches more, in order to center them. S. O'Kane said he was going with the A9 plans, right hand side. H. Hanlon said what about symmetry. S. O'Kane said windows closer to the garage shed roof would look better. D. O'Brien said he agreed with S. O'Kane. B. Tobin said there were two options being presented. They could take a poll on both. D. O'Brien asked who was happy with the 2 ft overhang. Four commissioners agreed with the 2 ft overhang plans. Only one commissioner agreed with the 3 ft overhang plans.

S. O'Kane moved and K. Daughters seconded a motion to approve proposed changes as per the lower right hand A9 drawing dated 7/24/19, exterior elevation east, which includes the lowering of the main high ridge line of the garage as shown in the plans; the lowering of the three transom windows 4 inches so that the windows are 4 inches above the shed roof directly over the garage doors; and, the eave extended from one foot to two feet so that the new lowered soffit is 8 inches above the aforementioned transom windows. Final approval is contingent on the applicant submitting professional certification that the work completed was in compliance with revised plans approved by the Historic District Commission. Motion passed 5-0.

G. Doski asked if the windows on pages A7-A8, two smaller windows were included in the approval. The commissioners all agreed there were no issues with these two smaller windows. No HDC member objected.

2) 63 High Ridge Avenue – Installation of a new fence

M. Blandford is representing the property owner on this matter and is recused as a Commission member on any voting or determinations regarding the matter.

A site visit was held at the property earlier this evening starting at 6:30 p.m. B. Tobin said they spent time on the location of the fence but not on the nature of the fence. The balusters were thick, which were prominent. The fence around the Lounsbury House had a much thinner baluster. He would suggest slimming the material down, to be more appropriate to the area's character. D. O'Brien said the Commission had not to date reflected on the design of the fence. D. O'Brien advised the Commission that the application for this fence had been denied by the Commission on July 24, 2019 and, accordingly, the existing fence is in violation. D. O'Brien indicated to M. Blandford that a new application should be submitted by the property owner showing a proposed change in the siting of the fence, as well as providing information on the proposed design of the

fence with consideration to B. Tobin's comments about the thickness of the balusters. Assuming a new application is submitted, the Commission would plan to consider the application at its regular September meeting. M. Blandford said he would advise B. Diamond. B. Tobin said it would be good to minimize the view from the street as much as possible. S. O'Kane said a fence company would be able to do a real drawing with grade dimensions and that it would behoove B. Diamond to have this done. Thinner balusters of 5/8th inch instead of 1 inch would be worth exploring and more appropriate.

3) Approval of the HDC meeting minutes –July 18, 2019

B. Tobin moved and K. Daughters seconded a motion to approve the July 18, 2019 HDC meeting minutes, with Commission members who did not attend such meeting abstaining. Motion passed 4-0.

J. Gasperino moved and S. O'Kane seconded a motion to adjourn the Historic District Commission meeting at 8:10 p.m. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy L. Fields
Recording Secretary