

**WETHERSFIELD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
APRIL 13, 2004**

The Wethersfield Historic District Commission held a public meeting on April 13, 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
Paul Courchaine

Members absent:

John Toomey
Eric Hart

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 April 2, 2004.

APPLICATION NO. 3176-04. Lawrence & Sara Gluckman seeking to construct a two-story addition in the rear at 62 Center Street.

Sara and Lawrence Gluckman of 62 Center Street appeared before the Commission requesting approval to build a 2 story addition off of the rear of their home.

Mr. Cook noted that they had done an incredible job restoring the front windows and thought that if the quality of this project was any indication of the caliber of their work, then this project would be well done too.

The Gluckmans submitted photographs of the home as it exists and then described the approximately 500 sq. ft. addition. They said that the roofline would stay the same but would be inset from 6-8' on either side, and they would be losing one of the arched windows on the sunporch. There is currently no opening on the side of the house which makes them have to cross their lawn to enter the house. There would be French doors on the patio side.

Commissioner Miglus pointed out that the entire addition would be visible from the public gardens, and he asked them to describe the deck. Ms. Gluckman said that if possible they hoped the low deck to be flat without railings, but she knew that this would depend on the height from ground level. They would enclose the bottom with lattice.

Commissioner Miglus suggested that if the deck were low enough to the ground they could skip the lattice if they wanted to. He then pointed out that the plans said they would match all the roof trim and gutters and wondered if that included the siding. Ms. Gluckman said that the dormer has wide clapboard and the rest is shingled and they intended to match that pattern.

Ms. Gluckman explained the windows they proposed for the addition were Weathershield aluminum clad on the outside and wood on the inside.

Commissioner Logan pointed out that the information they had submitted was for Vetter windows.

Mr. Gluckman said that ultimately they would like to have the same or similar windows on the whole house and thought it would be silly to try to match 80 year old windows with modern ones. They would file another application for the rest of the windows once they got to that point. He explained that they had gotten prices for replacing the single pane glass with double low-e glass, as they had done on the front windows, for the rest of the windows and it was significantly more expensive than the replacement windows they were now discussing.

Commissioner Ovian said that option was only one of the possible solutions, but wondered if they had considered sash replacement kits which would replicate the existing look as well as be substantially cheaper than the restoration work they had previously done. They could get more information from Mr. Cook if this was something they were interested in.

Ms. Gluckman told the Commission that they had replaced 27 windows on their home in Vermont with the Weathershield windows and thought they were wonderful.

Commissioner Miglus asked for more information on that window in the form of a cut sheet. They handed him a booklet which he examined and clarified that what he was looking at was not a wood window with aluminum cladding but was actually 2 different materials joined together; a wooden part on the inside joined to an extruded aluminum part on the outside.

Commissioner Ovian asked what the division of the new windows would be. He was told that the double hung windows would be 6/1 untinted simulated divided light windows with muntins applied on the interior and exterior, there would also be several casement windows.

Clerk Wolf read a petition signed by several neighbors supporting 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. 3182-04. CT River Master Carpentry LLC seeking to construct an addition and deck in the rear at 19 Harmund Place.

Bonnie and Luke Smith, 19 Harmund Place, appeared before the Commission. Their contractor Jack Smith explained that although the Smiths intended to do extensive restoration and renovation work to the 1840's home, they had modified their original plans to accommodate Ms. Smith going back to school full time and would now be stretching out the project into several phases. They submitted several photographs of the home which showed the areas they intended to focus the first phase of their work on. Ultimately they hoped to build a 4' extension onto the rear of the home, which would be inset from the sidelines by 18", there would be a mud room, an extended porch with covered entry and a deck. However they have extensive work to do on the inside and choose to concentrate there first. So for the time being they propose to remove the existing side rear entry, which they referred to as their "outhouse" and move the rear entry to the center; replace it with a French door, build a temporary covered entry with a pillar on either side, and stairs off of that.

The pillars would be round columns with double square pediments. They also proposed to repair the 2 car garage which had somewhat sunken with time by raising and restoring it. Since the new entry would no longer be on the side it would not be visible from Harmund Place but could be visible from the side or the rear train tracks.

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. 3183-04. Catherine A. Lyons seeking to replace the garage door and install central air conditioning at 52 Garden Street.

Ms. Catherine A. Lyons 52 Garden Street appeared before the Commission and requested permission to install a central air conditioning system outside the side of her home. She submitted a photograph showing approximately where the unit would be located because it could not be seen from Main or Garden Streets since it would be behind a

bush shown in the photograph but behind other shrubs which were behind that bush shown in the photograph. She said that it could possibly be viewed from the Green but it would still be hidden by shrubs.

Ms. Lyons then submitted a brochure which showed the type of wooden carriage-type garage door with antique hardware and 6 lights she hoped to replace her current garage doors with. She explained that currently the garage had double doors separated by an 18" divider. This 1940's - 1950's arrangement was not practical in the year 2004 since it did not allow enough width for 2 modern cars to park or be able to allow the occupants to exit or enter the vehicles. By replacing the 2 doors with a single door the center divider could be removed and the 18" difference would allow access. Her contractor assured her that this single door could replace both doors. She added that her current doors are getting increasingly difficult to open and close. The proposed doors would swing out.

The Commissioners pointed out that the door shown in the brochure would be too high for her garage. The applicant and Commissioners discussed the difference between the brochure and her garage, and it was noted that the brochure door would be proportionately different than the one in the picture.

Commissioner Miglus said that he would like the opportunity to fake a photograph and see exactly what the door would look like on her garage. He could do it but could not do that right 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. 3184-04. Brian Webster & Tom Francis seeking to install a new front screen door at 15 Middletown Avenue.

Mr. Cook said that he was not sure if the Commissioner covered screen doors under their purview.

Commissioner Miglus said that if they were plain and unadorned they did not need to come before them. But he told the applicant that if he had a perfectly lovely front door and wondered why he would want to hide it half way with that style of door.

Mr. Brian Webster 15 Middletown Avenue appeared before the Commission and explained that the old screen door had blown off during a storm and so he needed to replace it. Since he was replacing the screen he thought it would be a good opportunity to replace the front door since it was drafty with single pane glass.

The Commissioners suggested that he replace the actual front door first and work from the inside out so that the storm door would match. When he returned with his selection it could be handled as an amendment to this application so he needn't pay another fee.

Commissioner Logan explained that they tend to go along with like for like replacements and so when he returned to make sure he had pictures of both doors for comparison.

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. 3185-04. Stephen J. Kelly seeking to cover trim and overhangs with aluminum at 191-193 Garden Street.

Mr. Stephen Kelly 191-199 Garden Street appeared before the Commission and said that his house was built in the 1930's and had been aluminum sided but that the trim had not been done at that time. He said that it was starting to peel and he felt that the trim was too far up to be able to and paint. He proposed to wrap the trim in aluminum.

Commissioner Miglus asked how he intended to do it. Mr. Kelly said that it would look the same as it does now.

Commissioner Miglus didn't think that the curves could be reproduced in aluminum. Mr. Kelly hadn't realized there were any curves in the trim work but thought it would look better even badly wrapped than peeling paint.

Commissioner Miglus asked if the applicant had considered replacing it with a material that would not need to be painted, like Fipon. Mr. Kelly said that he had not and did not want to.

Mr. Kelly said that if the Commission insisted on it his contractor could try to replicate the crown molding and trim details.

Commissioner Logan asked if he would come back and tell them if the contractor wasn't able to match the details.

Mr. Kelly asked if she meant when it was all done, Commissioner Logan said that she meant before it was done.

Mr. Kelly explained that he was just trying to preserve the house. Commissioner Miglus answered that the Commission was also trying to preserve the house.

Commissioner Logan asked if they would be covering the soffits also, and would they be using the small panels. Mr. Kelly answered yes.

Mr. Kelly replied that if they had wrapped the trim in the 1930's they wouldn't see the moldings today. Commissioner Miglus answered that the applicant was right; Commissioner Ovia commented that they were lucky.

Mr. Kelly said that he took care of all of his other properties and they looked historic, but this taller property was a hassle.

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. 3186-04. Stanislaw Dziejzik seeking to construct a roof overhang over the front steps at 365 Middletown Avenue.

Mr. Stanislaw Dziejzik, 365 Middletown Avenue, appeared before the Commission requesting permission to change the flat roofed overhang which covered the 2 front doors on his duplex and create a gabled overhang which would replicate the look of the one on the home across the street.

Mr. Cook said that the applicant had been new to the community and had started the work on the overhang but once he was made aware of the process and the need for approval he had been very agreeable and had extended a great deal of cooperation. Mr. Cook was in favor of the project.

Commissioner Logan asked what materials would be used. Mr. Dziejzik answered that it would be made from wood and plywood and then sided with the same siding as the house, which was 8" aluminum and perhaps vinyl. The roof shingles would match those on the house.

Commissioner Ovia explained that the home across the street was built in one style and the type of front door overhang reflected that style. The applicant's house was built in the 1950's and the flat front overhang reflected that more modern era which was consistent with the roof pitch also. To put the overhang of one era onto the home of a different era was inconsistent. He wondered if there was anything wrong with the current overhang. He then asked if the pitch of the porch roof would match the pitch of the house roof.

Mr. Dziejzik showed that it would be steeper, and would be about 1' below the 2nd floor windows. There was nothing wrong with it; he just thought it would look more attractive to have the gabled overhang.

Commissioner Miglus noted that the house roof was a 5/12 pitch which was much more shallow than the proposed overhang, he then asked what sort of trim there would be. The applicant explained that it would be trimmed in metal flashing.

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. 3187-04. Debra & Joseph Hammer seeking to replace the existing slate roof with asphalt shingles at 65 Broad Street.

Commissioner Courchaine asked why they were hearing this application when they had previously denied it. Commissioner Miglus explained that the Chairman and Vice Chairman had been consulted but had not been available for reply. The situation had been presented to him and it was his decision to allow it since the previous application was for roof replacement and windows, but this was technically a new application.

Mr. Joseph Hammer 65 Broad Street replied that there was information they had strongly felt the Commission should hear that had not been presented at the previous hearing.

Ms. Debra Hammer read a letter in attempt to explain why they were requesting to replace the remaining slate with architectural asphalt shingles as had been done on the north side and the new addition roof. They also wanted it to be known that it was never their intention to perform any work on their home without the necessary Commission approval. But it had been their understanding that they did not require an application to the Commission. She said that this understanding was based upon her prior review of Preserving Our Heritage; A Property Owners Guide to the Wethersfield Historic District. The Guide lists examples of building modifications that do not require a certificate of appropriateness, including the following; Installation of wood shingles on homes built prior to 1840. Installation of wood, black or charcoal asphalt shingles on homes built after 1840. Given that her home was built after 1840 and they were using charcoal asphalt shingles, they had not felt that any Commission approval was necessary. In addition prior to starting the work their contractor had spoken to the Town Building Department to advise them of the change and request of a permit, and was told that they could proceed.

The Hammers asked the Commission to take into account their reliance on the Guide and also the fact that it was Ms. Hammer who had informed Mr. Cook that the roof work was preceding. She also wished to address a statement made during the Commission's recent deliberations that they had not complied with the Commissions stipulations of approval for the Certificate of appropriateness dated May 27, 2003. Regarding the roofing material on the addition that they are in the process of constructing, specifically stipulation #3; That the roofing shingles shall approximate the slate material in color. It does not provide that the shingles are to be slate-like in material. In terms of the change from slate to asphalt, she said that they felt the change was compatible to the property, the neighborhood and the District and given the particular characteristics of their roof they did not feel the change to be significant. She said that the slates on their roof are not unique in shape as on the Silas-Robbins House, nor of the multi-colored variety as on the Rossini House. Furthermore she added that they do not have a mansard roof so as to make the shingles an important architectural feature, rather their roof is quite high with a shallow pitch and is not prominent to passersby on Broad Street. In addition during 3 seasons of the year the roof is largely obscured by foliage from the 3 large mature trees on their property.

Ms. Hammer said that most visitors to their home are unaware that the shingles are slate unless intentionally brought to their attention including real estate appraisers, and also including the Town's own consultant during the recent tax assessment. Retention of the slate roof would present unusual practical difficulty; she noted that it has not been possible given the rooflines to transition smoothly from the approved asphalt roofing on the addition to the slate on the main body of the house.

Dennis Estanislaw the highly qualified slate roof specialist who has performed the maintenance on their slate roof since they purchased the house has said that the roof has suffered from years of little or no proper maintenance. She explained that the roof leaks and shingles fall off of the roof because of the complete deterioration of the fabric membrane that underlies the shingles as well as the deterioration of the copper flashing and the ridge caps. The only way to remedy this situation while maintaining a slate roof would be to essentially replace the entire slate roof, at a cost of \$65-75,000. Alternatively Mr. Estanislaw estimates that the removal of the asphalt on just the north side of the roof and replacement of new slate to be \$20,000. Not including over \$3,000 of work already performed on the north side. But even if that were done, the Hammers would still be left with a failing slate roof on the 3 remaining sides of the house.

Ms. Hammer explained that they had already devoted substantial resources to the restoration and enhancement of their

property with careful attention to architectural detail such as having a master carpenter replicate column moldings and original trim on the addition. They also hope to undertake badly needed repairs that are necessary to the structural integrity of their 150+ year old barn. The cost of replacing the slate roof would far exceed their resources for completing the ongoing renovation and restoration work. They asked that the Commission consider all of the above circumstances when making their decision and respectfully requested that the Commission approve their application as submitted.

Commissioner Logan said that while the applicant has said that they were following the Guide, but yet on the original application Ms. Hammer had told Commissioner Oviaan that if they couldn't find anything to matching the existing roof that they would come back to the Commission to request a different option.

Ms. Hammer said that they felt that what they selected was a good color match, but there was more that went into their decision to change the material than the color.

Commissioner Logan said that she had been on the Commission in 1999 when they had come in for the addition and they had required that the addition be slate.

The Hammers pointed out that the previous owner had come before them in 1999. Commissioner Logan agreed and said that because she remembered the 2 hearings she wasn't sure which one she had been thinking of so she went back and listened to the tape of the Hammer's previous hearing to be clear about what had been said for this present addition.

Commissioner Miglus said that the Commission is dealing with something after the fact, so what they must decided upon is whether or not architectural shingles are appropriate for this building.

Commissioner Wolf commented that the Hammers had looked into the cost of replacing the slate with slate, and then asked if they had looked into any of the slate-like materials available. Mr. Hammer answered that they had looked at the artificial slate and felt that it did not look as good as the architectural shingles and in fact looked more artificial. In terms of the cost it would be more than an asphalt shingle. Their contractor had told them that he had even seen shingles that had been installed some time ago actually curling up at the edges as they aged.

Commissioner Miglus said that he had been told that the artificial slate-look shingles installed, cost between 3-4 X the cost of architectural shingles.

Commissioner Wolf stated that the Commissioners can not let that enter into their deliberations and must stick to what was before them now.

Commissioner Oviaan agreed and said that they must base their decision on the aesthetic only.

Commissioner Miglus said that in the funny history of roofs, architectural shingles are trying to imitate wooden shingles, 3- tab shingles are trying to imitate slate. He wondered if the Hammers had considered 3-tab shingles. He pointed out that the house was built with slate, but could have been built with wood as well. He also noted that one of the things that identifies the roof as slate is the snow guards.

Mr. Hammer said that they had not considered 3-tabs, but they already have architectural shingles on the addition.

Commissioner Miglus said that 2 things would be lost if they went with any kind of asphalt with its granular surface, the snow guards, and the visual sheen of slate.

Mr. Hammer mentioned that they plan to paint the whole house a shade of gray with white trim and white storm windows when everything is done; they think that the asphalt architectural shingles would be very complimentary.

Clerk Wolf read a letter dated March 28, 2004 which supported the application from neighbors, Alice and Gary Gold 73 Broad Street, and Lorraine and Douglas MacDonald 57 Broad Street.

Another letter was read dated April 9, 2004 from the owner of Stanislaw Construction whose business was the repair, maintenance and installation of slate roofs for over 25 years. He said he had worked on hundreds of slate roofs, and that he had worked on the roof at 65 Broad Street several times over the past 4 years and was very familiar with the condition of their roof. It was his opinion that prior to the Hammer's ownership the roof had not been properly maintained which had resulted in deterioration of the protective membrane and the copper flashing. In addition, previous attempts at repair included pouring tar over loose shingles in an attempt to stop leakage which is an improper method of maintaining slate. Numerous areas of leakage and resulting water and plaster damage have occurred at several areas in the house.

In addition, shingles fall from the house during heavy rains or high winds. The only way to repair would be the removal of each slate and replacement of the protective membrane, copper flashing and ridge caps at an estimated cost of \$65-75,000. If this is not done the deterioration and shingle loss will continue.

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. 3172-04. Fran Dupuis seeking to amend the approved Certificate of Appropriateness to install a shed at 21-23 Hartford Avenue.

Mr. Fran Dupuis 23 Hartford Avenue appeared before the Commission to request a different shed than the one he had received approval for since he had found out the cost of the other shed was on a closeout and no longer available. He presented a brochure which showed the new pine sided shed which would be special ordered to have the same type of siding as his home, a double door side entrance and a single window and flower box. He would paint it grey to match his house, and have gray roof shingles.

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

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

**WETHERSFIELD HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
APRIL 13, 2004**

APPLICATION NO. 3176-04. Lawrence & Sara Gluckman seeking to construct a two-story addition in the rear at 62 Center Street.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

The Commissioners discussed the confusion over what brand of windows were being asked for on the application and what had been requested verbally by the applicant and also what had been talked about informally by the applicant. In addition, they were not sure if the applicant intended to use the same windows on the addition as they would use at a later date on the whole house. They also talked about wood clad windows but the windows they presented were not clad windows. They agreed that it would solve a lot of confusion if they could see the exact window that the applicant intended to use.

Upon motion by Commissioner Garrey, seconded by Commissioner Ovian and a poll of the Commission it was voted to TABLE the subject application to allow the applicant the opportunity to bring in a sample of the window.

Aye: Miglus, Wolf, Ovian, Garrey, Logan Abst: Courchaine

APPLICATION NO. 3182-04. CT River Master Carpentry LLC seeking to construct an addition and deck in the rear at 19 Harmund Place.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

Commissioner Ovian was not really clear as to what was being voted upon right now since the applicant had made major changes to the renderings they had submitted. He felt that he needed more information in order to make a decision.

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

Aye: Ovian, Wolf, Logan, Miglus, Courchaine Abst: Garrey

APPLICATION NO. 3183-04. Catherine A. Lyons seeking to replace the garage door and install central air conditioning at 52 Garden Street.

Upon motion by Commissioner Miglus, seconded by Commissioner Garrey and a poll of the Commission it was voted to TABLE the subject application to allow for a mock up of the garage door to be produced.

Aye: Miglus, Wolf, Garrey. Ovian. Logan

APPLICATION NO. 3184-04. Brian Webster & Tom Francis seeking to install a new front screen door at 15 Middletown Avenue.

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

Aye: Miglus, Garrey, Ovian, Logan, Wolf

APPLICATION NO. 3185-04. Stephen J. Kelly seeking to cover trim and overhangs with aluminum at 191-193 Garden Street.

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

REASON FOR THE DENIAL

The applicant has not demonstrated that the application of aluminum wrap would sufficiently replicate the trim on the house.

Aye: Miglus, Garrey, Wolf, Ovian, Logan

APPLICATION NO. 3186-04. Stanislaw Dziejzik seeking to construct a roof overhang over the front steps at 365 Middletown Avenue.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

Commissioner Ovian thought that pitch of the overhang was too steep for the house and that the same siding should be used as was on the house. The simpler flat overhang was appropriate for a 1950's structure and was a characteristic feature that they were in charge of saving. He pointed out that the classic McMansion-style used multiple gables across the front and he felt that what was on this house was less imposing than the 1990's type portico proposed.

Commissioner Garrey admitted that the flat overhang was a 1950's style, but the gable overhang would not be inappropriate.

Mr. Cook said that the pitch of the proposed overhang was like a cathedral. Commissioner Garrey thought that he might have some concern about that too.

Commissioner Logan pointed out that there was a whole row of similar type duplexes along Middletown Avenue; however none of the other ones still had the flat overhang.

Commissioner Ovian felt that made this one worth saving.

Commissioner Garrey said that this house also didn't have any overhang from the roof.

Mr. Cook didn't think the applicant would be unwilling to change the pitch a little. He also pointed out that the drawing that had been submitted would not fly by the code and that the weight of the structure would not be supportable as drawn.

Commissioner Courchaine thought that if the pitch was modified then it would be acceptable to him.

Mr. Cook suggested that the application be tabled until more detailed drawings were submitted, because the Building Department would need them anyway before a permit could be issued.

Commissioner Miglus felt that they would be hard-pressed to get better drawings from the applicant.

Commissioner Miglus suggested that they could stipulate a 5/12 pitch for the roof.

Commissioner Ovian felt that once the overhang was allowed to change then the applicant would want the more modern vinyl siding, and he didn't see how they could deny it once the original features were gone. Personally he didn't want to see anything changed on the original overhang, but allowed that some of the other Commissioners might be agreeable to a less severe roof pitch for the gabled overhang proposed.

Upon motion by Commissioner Miglus, seconded by Commissioner Garrey and a poll of the Commission it was voted to APPROVE the subject application with the following stipulations:

1. The gable and eave overhangs shall match those at 362 Middletown Avenue.
2. All white trim shall be wrapped with aluminum coil stock.
3. The front gable end shall be sided with 8" aluminum to match.
4. The columns shall be 8" square posts with pediments on top and bottom.

Aye: Garrey, Miglus, Logan, Wolf Nay: Ovian

APPLICATION NO. 3187-04. Debra & Joseph Hammer seeking to replace the existing slate roof with asphalt shingles at 65 Broad Street.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

Commissioner Miglus pointed out that the house could have been built with wood, slate or even a metal roof at that time. He noted that the house next door had architectural shingles and it didn't look inappropriate.

Commissioner Wolf said that while she was sympathetic to their situation there was nothing new introduced to this application tonight. She said that her feeling was the same as last time, that this was a prominent house in a prominent area in the biggest Historic District in Connecticut. The street is a tourist destination to see homes in their original condition with slate roofs, which she felt was an important decorative feature of this home, an American four-square which they don't have many of and certainly not on the Green. A slate roof simply looks different than architectural sand textured for shingle. For this reason she would not be changing her vote from the last vote.

Commissioner Garrey also felt the same as he had last time, and thought that no passerby would look at it and note the loss of the slate roof on this property. This Commission approved a large addition with architectural shingles and thought that varying materials were always a problem and had to say that he thought that the asphalt looked good.

Commissioner Logan said that she had tried to stop the contractor from ripping off the slate when she got there, but naturally they paid no attention to her.

Mr. Cook said they had spoken in the morning and was told that the applicants were going to stop work. It was much later that Commissioner Logan showed up. He commented that if they had stopped work when they said they would then perhaps they wouldn't be here now.

Commissioner Logan said that this home was an American 4-square on Broad Street. She said that she had voted that the addition should have slate in 1999; her mistake was that she didn't vote to have slate on this addition. She admitted that the slate on this house was not the best looking slate, but it was still slate. While she admitted to being torn between her feelings and allowing something she disagreed with, in the end she felt that they needed to save the slate roof.

Commissioner Courchaine said that he agreed with Commissioner Wolf and he felt that it had to do with the appropriateness of the actions taken and the resulting loss to the house.

Commissioner Oviaan thought that what was happening at the Hammer house was a substantial amount of change, but felt that the asphalt of the addition would be more evident than what was going on above. Still he felt that the details above would tend to be less important, as long as the unifying features on grey body, white trim are successful and the changes consistent.

He pointed out that asphalt and slate are both rock materials and he felt less objection to that alteration than if it were a completely different material. He said that there had been arguments as to whether it's appropriate to require a landowner to replace a 100 year roof. But the argument can always be made that slate could always be put back on. But getting back to aesthetics he thought that not as many people would notice the loss of the slate on this house as would notice the addition at Larsen's.

Commissioner Garrey thought that the use of different materials would be far more noticeable than whether it was slate or even all asphalt.

Upon motion by Commissioner Oviaan, seconded by Commissioner Garrey it was motioned to Approve the subject application. The motion failed to carry.

Aye: Oviaan, Garry Nay: Logan, Miglus, Wolf

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

REASON FOR THE DENIAL

Asphalt architectural shingles do not adequately replicate the existing slate roof and are not appropriate for the house.

Aye: Wolf, Miglus, Logan Nay: Oviaan, Garrey

APPLICATION NO. 3172-04. Fran Dupuis seeking to amend the approved Certificate of Appropriateness to install a shed at 21-23 Hartford Avenue.

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

Aye: Miglus, Garrey, Logan, Wolf, Courchaine Abst: Oviaan

APPROVAL OF [MINUTES OF: March 23, 2004](#)

Upon Motion by Commissioner Wolf, seconded by Commissioner Garrey, and a poll of the Commission, it was voted that the above minutes BE APPROVED with the following change:

Commissioner John Toomey was erroneously listed as present.

Aye: Wolf, Garrey, Miglus, Wolf, Ovian Abst: Logan, Courchaine

OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Miglus, speaking for Anne Kuckro said that the Tourist Commission objects to the word survey in the web-site listing because it might make people think that they're going to be bothered by something. It will be changed to, Buildings. So the Town Web site will point you directly to the survey, now called, Buildings. There will be a paragraph of text explaining what the survey is and how it can be used. You'll be able to search a specific address, date range and style, another button to search any of the fields that are part of the survey, such as roof styles, clapboards etc. and then a list or thumbnail display to click for further details. There will also be an opt-out in case the present owner does not wish to be listed. Ultimately there will be a list for all decisions for a particular property which will come up with that address; the entire running history. The general look and feel and heading will be Historic Wethersfield.

The Commissioners discussed the revisions that Mr. Cook had been compiling for the Handbook. Commissioner Miglus thought that a running file should be kept on specific issues for several months before acting upon them. Commissioner Courchaine suggested quarterly updates.

Commissioner Wolf wanted to say that when Certificates of Appropriateness are mailed out, that she would like to sign her name to them instead of it being signed for her.

CORRESPONDENCE

A letter complaining of the demolition of several trees on the Stillman property had been addressed to the Historic District Commission. Commissioner Courchaine said that all trees are marked by the Tree Warden. It was his decision as to whether it was diseased or needed and be cut down. Commissioner Miglus agreed and said that the Commission regulated structures and not the demolition of trees.

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