

Wethersfield Historic District Commission
Public Hearing
September 23, 2003

The Wethersfield Historic District Commission held a public meeting on September 23, 2003 at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Conference Room of the Town Hall, 505 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

Members present:

Douglas Ovian, Vice Chairperson
Vacek Miglus
Billye Logan
John Toomey
Eric Hart
Robert A. Garrey

Members absent:

Clare W. Meade, Chairperson
Jennifer Wolf, Clerk

Also Present:

Robert Cook, Wethersfield Historic District Coordinator

Vice Chairperson Ovian called the hearing to order at 7:30 p.m. and Clerk Pro Tem Logan read the Legal Notice as it appeared in the Hartford Courant on September 12, 2003.

APPLICATION NO. 3143- 03. Fred & Julie Paiva seeking to install window grilles at 8 River Road.

Fred and Julie Paiva appeared before the Commission in order to receive approval to install wooden window grilles on the vinyl replacement windows they had installed before being aware that they needed approval from the Commission. The grilles would have 30 degree angles like the sample that he had previously shown to Commissioner Miglus. Mr. Paiva explained that the grilles would be configured 6/1 like the original windows and would be covered by a full wooden framed black screen.

Commissioner Ovian commented that some Commissioners preferred the darker screens, but some preferred the lighter silver screens with lighter trim colors, as he did. He explained that there was a predicate for darker screens because all screens darken with age regardless of the original color.

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

Commissioner Garrey arrived at this time.

APPLICATION NO. 3144-03. Eric Hart seeking to install a fence at 9 Fernwood Street.

Mr. Eric Hart 9 Fernwood Street appeared before the Commission requesting approval to erect a classic scalloped open-picket fence on his property. He submitted a sheet showing different fence styles and indicated which was his preference, but explained that his selection would have the rounded over pickets and not the gothic style. The posts would be square and carved out as shown in the rendering.

Commissioner Miglus asked about the height of the fence. Mr. Hart explained that as shown on his plot plan, the 4' fence would begin from the back of the enclosed porch on the left hand side, continue at this height across the front yard, turn and continue for 24' down the side yard, before transitioning to 6' for an additional 48', with the good side facing outward.

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

APPLICATION NO. 3145-03. Larry Gluckman seeking to repair chimney without stucco covering and with addition of blue stone cap at 62 Center Street.

Mr. Larry Gluckman homeowner of 62 Center Street as of Friday appeared before the Commission and explained that when the home had been inspected before their purchase, the chimney tile had been found to have major cracks, and the seller had intended to give them a discount to the selling price. However the bank would not finance the sale without a working chimney and so a contractor had been hired by the seller and the mason started the process. They had a permit Pending, because they needed to have a functioning chimney to close on the house. The chimney had been covered by stucco but they believed now that it had been done because some time back the owners had recognized that the chimney was falling apart and had put on stucco in order to hold it together. When the mason had removed part of the old chimney it was discovered that the tile was less than 3/8" thick, which required them additionally to add a liner. Mr. Gluckman thought after reading the Commission guidelines that the chimney should be returned to red brick. He took pictures of 10 other houses in the neighborhood that were also red brick, none of them were stucco. They were requesting to not return it to the stucco.

Commissioner Oviaan asked if the applicant had seen a neighboring house which did have a stucco covered chimney. Mr. Gluckman said he had, but it was tan colored and not white like his. Commissioner Logan added that that particular house was also stucco covered.

A model of the blue stone cap and photographs of the old and new chimney were submitted as comparison.

Commissioner Oviaan wanted to point out that while the Commission might rule in favor of their request the argument might also be made that since there are so few stucco covered chimneys like this one, theirs might be considered an artifact and therefore worthy of preservation.

Mr. Gluckman asked if it could also be a split rule, such as; yes, we can have the blue stone, and no they don't have to stucco. Commissioner Oviaan answered that it certainly could and was preferable for the Commission to know the homeowners preference.

Commissioner Miglus asked the reason for the cap. Mr. Gluckman said that in Vermont where they come from all the chimneys running a wood stove or furnace have some sort of an aluminum cap but he didn't see many aluminum caps in this area. They had seen some chase-the squirrel- type caps and had thought that some sort of blue stone as they had seen in the house across their street seemed more appropriate for a home of the period of their home. If the Commission decided that the aluminum was better then they would do it. The mason believed that part of the reason that the tile was in such bad shape was that the rain was combining with the by products of combustion and dissolving the chimney. But if Mr. Gluckman had his druthers he would not spend the money for the blue stone, however he did feel it more in keeping with the architecture of the home than the aluminum.

Commissioner Miglus pointed out that any contractor will try to upgrade the project; however aluminum was not a good choice for the same reason of rain mixing with the combustion and forming acid that would eat away the aluminum. Stainless steel was the usual choice around this area and generally installed for animal protection.

Mr. Gluckman admitted that the caps he was familiar with were probably stainless steel too.

Commissioner Oviaan asked how far down the chimney had been torn down. Mr. Gluckman answered that it had been removed down to the sun porch roof and so they had installed a new liner rather new flue tiles.

Commissioner Miglus asked if there was a fireplace in the house, and was it a 2 flue chimney. He was told that there was, and it was.

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

APPLICATION No. 3126-03. Marilyn M. Binns seeking to construct an addition and covered deck at 45 Woodland Street.

Mr. Cook explained that he had been informed that the applicant had intended to withdraw and asked if there was a withdrawal attached to the application.

It was noted that no notice had been received or otherwise attached to the application, and there was no one present to represent the application.

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

APPLICATION No. 3131-03. William Stec seeking to install vinyl siding and a patio in back at 159 Church Street.

Mr. Cook mentioned that Mr. Stec also intended to withdraw this application and that the notice had yet to be received.

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

APPLICATION NO. 3135-03. Brigid Kennedy seeking to extend the front steps and portico over the front door and add a pergola to the deck in the back at 285 Garden Street.

Mr. Steven Haines husband of the applicant appeared before the Commission and submitted a footprint of the planned constructions as well as hand drawn renderings, which he pointed out were not drawn to scale. He explained that the portico was going to extend out to 5 1/2' from the facade of the house and added that depending on the condition of the columns they might replace them with fiberglass for the durability, but otherwise intended to reuse the old ones.

Commissioner Ovian mentioned that in a picture that had been submitted for comparison sake, the columns shown were a little wider and he suggested that the more substantial column might be a better match for the larger portico.

Mr. Cook asked if there were any considerations for the center railing area of the portico. Mr. Haines said that they had considered a bench of some sort.

Mr. Haines said that they had initially wanted to build some sort of a deck in the rear of the house, but after research into homes built of the same period as theirs, had found that pergolas were not uncommon. After considering the pergola idea they realized that it would be built on an unraised patio and now were proposing this brick patio idea on which to build a pergola and enhance the character of their home.

Commissioner Miglus asked if they were proposing the same type of framing and structure as the example submitted in the photograph and was told yes. It would be roughly the width parallel the shape of the sunporch and the house, keeping it simple to make it as subtle as possible. In time he could envision some sort of arbor or perhaps wisteria.

Commissioner Miglus asked if the 9' height on the plans referred to the roof height or the pergola height. Mr. Haines answered that because of the roof height and the second floor windows it would have to be contained within a narrow envelope.

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

APPLICATION NO. 3139- 03. Paula & Klaus Larsen seeking to construct an addition at 271 Main Street.

Mr. Cook explained that Mr. Larson had been given a list of information last week that he needed to supply to the Commission for consideration of this application and had not heard from him since then.

Commissioner Ovian noted that the applicant was not present this evening and they would not vote without any further information but invited public comment from the public assembled.

Ms. Kathleen Ahern 15 Hartford Avenue stepped forward and mentioned that she had been present at the last meeting in order to get more information on what was being proposed for this application and she came tonight for the same reason but the applicant was not. She wondered how many of these meetings she would need to attend in order to find out what was going on.

Commissioner Ovian explained that once an application is filed they are notified of the last meeting date the Commission can act before the application is automatically approved. In this case some time between now and November 11, 2003 the Commission would need to vote, since it is rare that they would allow an application to lapse without a vote one way or the other.

Commissioner Miglus noted that it would certainly not happen with this application.

Commissioner Ovian continued that they would need more information in order to consider the application. They had not received any advance notice that the applicant would not be present this evening. But for the future he would recommend calling Mr. Cook to find out if the applicant is planning to show up.

Mr. Cook said that he had given the applicant quite a long list of requirements and they might not have had time to find answers for all the questions yet. In addition he wanted to add that he would need time to review those answers before the Commission's decision was made.

Ms. Ahern said that she had called Mr. Cook and knew about the list but had expected Mr. Larsen to show up tonight with answers to those questions. The Commissioners all agreed that they expected the same.

Mr. Cook said that on the application Mr. Larsen had requested space for business use but had told them at the meeting that it would not be for business use. However if it were a business use then the applicant would need to go before other departments for a change of use in addition to his appearance here.

Ms. Shirley Alderman 267 Main Street stepped forward to say that she had not attended the first meeting because she had no objection to what she had thought was being proposed, however she had since heard that a lot more was being proposed than she had thought. She asked if there was any way she could find out what was being requested. Commissioner Ovian said that the original application proposed the construction of an addition on the back of the house to be used as a business. But what they had been told at the last meeting was that the applicant also was requesting a 4 car garage and an 80' greenhouse. The specifics are available at the Town Planning office, but if Ms. Alderman wished to wait, there was some information here that they might be able to share during one of the breaks this evening. He added that in his opinion it seemed that the applicant had not finalized the plans in his own mind yet.

Ms. Alderman said that she had concerns already with the present situation and said that there are big trucks backing up to the garage to make deliveries for the ice cream shop and that she feared for the safety of the many children that are often present at the Legion Hall next door.

Commissioner Ovian explained that although traffic issues aren't too far afield from what the Historic District Commission dictates, they tend to regulate structures rather than uses. However, that didn't mean they wouldn't be willing to hear some of her concerns later when they had a final idea of what was being proposed for this application. The public hearing would be kept open and there would be opportunity to voice concerns either in person or in letter form.

Commissioner Logan said that until they hear from Mr. Larsen they were all surmising.

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

APPLICATION NO. 3140-03. John & Jennifer Shafer seeking to remove chimney on house addition, restore window

on 2nd floor and install a sunroof window at 211 Garden Street.

Mr. John Shafer 211 Garden Street appeared before the Commission with photographs showing the house with the chimney still in place and one with it removed.

Mr. Cook commented that this was the best application he had seen given that the chimney is still standing on the rooftop. Mr. Shafer replied that it was amazing what could be done in Photoshop.

Commissioner Ovian said that although these materials had been available at the last meeting, the applicant had not. He continued and said that addition was an old addition and that this was the chimney being referred to.

Mr. Shafer said the chimney currently runs up the middle of the second floor room and while it was probably once a kitchen chimney, it currently serves no venting function. He also told the Commission that the second part of the application which requested the restoring of a window currently covered by shutters was being withdrawn. There was also a request for a skylight but they were not sure at the time of the application whether they were going to pursue it or not, so had decided to add it in just in case. However they had no additional information to submit such as cut sheets or photographs indicating where it would be located.

Mr. Cook thought that it wouldn't be visible. Mr. Shafer mentioned that it would be located on the roof facing the rear of the property and could be seen slightly from the rear but only during the winter months since it was otherwise a very heavily treed area.

Commissioner Miglus said that a roof window is very non traditional and that there were no Commissions in Town who would have the authority to stop anyone from taking a chainsaw to all the vegetation once a whole row of roof windows had been installed that were previously completely screened by trees. That said he asked where it would be located and what it would look like. Mr. Shafer said that while he did not have specifics he could say that the chimney is currently located between 2 rooms and the window would go in that general area on the backside of the roof facing west, a little farther down. He wasn't sure whether the Commission would allow a skylight and so that had not gotten any more information.

Vice Chairman Ovian asked if he would be comfortable enough coming back to them with the specifics, such as manufacturers cut sheet and a photograph showing the roof location. Mr. Shafer said that he had a photograph already and if he had realized that the Commission would consider it he would have brought it in tonight.

Commissioner Ovian said that he wasn't saying that they wouldn't discuss it tonight but it would have been helpful to have more information. He then asked when they intended to demolish the chimney. Mr. Shafer answered that if it were approved tonight that were hoping to do it as soon as possible, certainly before the winter.

Commissioner Miglus asked if they had any dimensions in mind for the window. Mr. Shafer answered that it couldn't be that big because of the roofing arrangement but rectangular, something like 3' X 4'.

Mr. Cook asked how far from the main house would it be located because he couldn't see where it would go when he looked. Commissioner Miglus answered that no one knew where it was going to be located or where it would go without a photograph.

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

APPLICATION NO. 3141-03. Joseph Morrissey seeking to replace windows and siding at 206 Middletown Avenue.

Mr. Joseph Morrissey 206 Middletown Avenue and his contractor Mr. Gene Parks appeared before the Commission.

Mr. Cook said that he had made a site visit with Fred Valente and had seen an area where some of the siding had been removed and that the wood was pretty well shot.

Mr. Parks passed out an informational sheet which gave price comparisons of the various window types that had been considered. Vice Chairman Ovian commented that the Commission is primarily concerned with appearances and not the cost.

Mr. Morrissey said that he had been asked to consider some other options as far as window replacements and the siding at the last meeting. They had done that and had brought in some samples to show tonight.

Commissioner Ovian asked if they were still asking the Commission to consider the aluminum clad window for which they had submitted the brochure which he held up.

Mr. Parks said that they had originally asked for the vinyl replacement window, their 2nd choice was for the other window.

Commissioner Ovian asked if their 1st choice window offered exterior grids. Mr. Parks answered that it was only available sandwiched between the glass with beveled grills and he showed a sample of the vinyl window to the Commission. No sample was available for the simulated divided light aluminum clad window which would come with muntins applied to the exterior of the glass. Both choices would be white.

Commissioner Ovian had felt some concern about what he felt to be excessive texture of the siding that had been submitted at that last meeting and was told that this brand of premium siding was not available with a smooth texture. Mr. Parks submitted samples showing some of the other vinyl siding choices that would be available with less of a textured finish. These brands were not available in the rich color choices nor did they come with the same warrantee and assurances of quality that were offered with the first choice.

Commissioner Ovian asked what color of coil stock would be used. He was told, white.

Commissioner Logan mentioned that at the previous meeting she had been told that the windows were available with a single center lock up to a certain width. She asked if a single lock would be sufficient for the small cape windows and was told that it would be and that they were available in several colors.

It was discussed that the picture window would be replaced with 2 double hung windows both of which were narrow enough to require only a single center lock.

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

A 5 minute recess was called for during which time the public were allowed opportunity to examine the information available on Application No. 3139-03.

**Wethersfield Historic District Commission
Public Meeting
September 23, 2003**

APPLICATION NO. 3143- 03. Fred & Julie Paiva seeking to install window grilles at 8 River Road.

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

1. Full height wood screens shall be used.
2. The grilles shall be wood 6/1 grilles applied to the previously installed vinyl windows.

Commissioner Miglus felt that although the Commission had been placed in a somewhat awkward position since the windows had been installed without an application, what had been proposed here tonight would replicate wood grilles and supply the shadow lines now lacking in the windows. The addition of the full wood screens would also help to

mitigate the harshness of the plastic exteriors without which he could not see approving because the color of the windows as they exist now are certainly incongruous to the rest of the home and the rest of the district.

Aye: Miglus, Hart, Logan, Toomey

Abst: Ovian, Garrey

APPLICATION NO. 3144-03. Eric Hart seeking to install a fence at 9 Fernwood Street.

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 fence shall be a scalloped rounded picket fence with square posts
2. The fence shall be 4' in height across the front and 24' along the side yard, then a transition piece to 6' in height for 48'

Commissioner thought the fence was appropriate for the style of home with 4' being a natural height at the front locations, and that the 6' height will have little to no effect on the district.

Aye: Miglus, Garrey, Toomey, Logan

Abst: Ovian, Hart

APPLICATION NO. 3145-03. Larry Gluckman seeking to repair chimney without stucco covering and with addition of blue stone cap at 62 Center Street.

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

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

Commissioner Ovian thought that the location of this chimney raised the question of whether or not Hubbard had envisioned stucco as a part of the house however whether the stucco was original to the house or not it worked well with or without. But if he had to choose he would give the choice to the homeowner. He also thought that the quality of the chimney cap would leave him to believe it would be a successful completion to what they already have.

Commissioner Logan didn't think that the stucco was original and agreed that they had probably had problems and had seen stucco on another chimney in the neighborhood had thought that they could cover their problems with it. So in this case she had no problem going to brick.

Commissioner Garrey agreed that while Mr. Hubbard used a lot of stucco it didn't appear that he used it a lot on his chimneys, because he tended to focus on the masonry of the chimneys. He pointed out that there was no other stucco on the house and would expect that the chimney was probably originally brick

Commissioner Miglus thought that given that the Commission did not have more information as to how the house had looked when originally built, or when the Historic District was established the proposal was entirely appropriate. A professional job had been done and the corbelling worked well with the house. He thought that the proposed cap would work well with the proportions of the chimney and be an asset to the community.

The Commissioners all welcomed the Gluckmans to the District.

Aye: Miglus, Logan, Toomey, Garrey

Abst: Ovian, Hart

APPLICATION No. 3126-03. Marilyn M. Binns seeking to construct an addition and covered deck at 45 Woodland

Street.

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

REASON FOR DENIAL: No final presentation made before the Commission.

Aye: Logan, Garrey, Miglus, Toomey

Abst: Ovian, Hart

APPLICATION NO. 3135-03. Brigid Kennedy seeking to extend the front steps and portico over the front door and add a pergola to the deck in the back at 285 Center Street.

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 entire portico shall be replicated except its depth shall be extended to 5 1/2' total.
2. The pergola shall be 15' X 8' and built as submitted in photograph.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

The Commissioners discussed the possibility of adding an additional stipulation to allow the possibility of larger columns. In the end it was agreed that once full scale drawings were drawn up for the construction by the contractor then it would become clearer whether or not the present size for the columns would work or might require a larger column. In addition it might be discovered that the health of the present columns was in question and at that point they would need to return in order to request another material anyway.

Commissioner Logan said that the proposal was gorgeous and that it would be a definite asset to the District.

Aye: Miglus, Garrey, Toomey, Logan

Abst: Ovian, Hart

APPLICATION NO. 3140-03. John & Jennifer Shafer seeking to remove chimney on house addition, restore window on 2nd floor and install a sunroof window at 211 Garden Street.

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

1. The window replacement on the Church Street side shall not take effect.
2. The sunroof window shall be centered on the west side of the addition and shall not exceed 4' in height, and be bronze color.
3. The window shall not exceed 24" X 36".
4. Roofing repairs to match existing roof.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

The Commissioners had the opportunity to view a photograph of the roof area and were able to make their decision based upon its proposed location. It was also agreed that since there were multiple chimneys located on the house the loss of this one would have little impact.

Commissioner Miglus said that the roof window will be relatively unobtrusive and as it will only serve glancing public views the impact will be minimal.

Aye: Miglus, Hart, Toomey, Logan, Garrey

Abst: Ovian

APPLICATION NO. 3141-03. Joseph Morrissey seeking to replace windows and siding at 206 Middletown Avenue.

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

1. All aluminum siding shall be removed
2. Corner boards, window & door trim shall be at least 3 1/2" and no more than 4" wide.
3. All J-channel shall be incorporated into the trim
4. Siding shall be double 4" dark grey graphite colored vinyl with white trim
5. Existing eave and gable trim overhangs shall be maintained
6. Windows shall be aluminum clad wood replacement windows and have 6/6 grillwork applied to the exterior, sashes shall have butt joints.
7. Picture window shall be replaced with 2 mulled double hung windows

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

Commissioner Miglus said that the State Statutes say that the Commission should not take costs into consideration, and wouldn't. But he thought that the list that had been submitted was the same as comparing Toyotas with Mercedes', in that there are different levels of quality in each of the categories but they were not being told which level they were being shown in order to make an informed decision. They had not been given any information on the Trimline window. They had no exterior view, no information on the corner joints or shown where the window stops would fall etc. Although he felt the reduction of window glass size was more an issue for the homeowner, he couldn't deny that if the trim was brought in to meet the frame edge, it would result in oversized trim with an undersized window. The frame would essentially dwarf the window. Here was also considerable discussion among the Commissioners with the philosophical question about allowing the house to be wrapped in plastic and allowed to continue rotting underneath. Mr. Cook couldn't see why they would require the repair of wood siding underneath if they were going to allow it to be covered with artificial siding.

Mr. Parks seemed to feel that the rot had occurred and as a result the former homeowners had covered it with aluminum siding. While Mr. Cook disagreed and felt that the rot had occurred as a result of being encapsulated in the artificial siding.

Commissioner Ovian asked if all the siding was being removed before installing the new siding. Mr. Parks said that it would be removed in the dormer area because they needed to replace the flashing in that area. He also explained that any structural issues would be addressed before the new siding was installed.

Commissioner Miglus said that it was important that the wood siding be kept underneath so that a later day historian would be able to remove the layer of siding on top and still be able to see what the original house was made of. He also felt that the newer siding products would probably seal better than the old ones and once the source of moisture had been stopped then the wood rot would not progress.

Aye: Miglus, Logan, Toomey, Garrey

Abst: Ovian, Hart

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF: September 9, 2003

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

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Cook told the Commissioners that he and Peter Gillespie the Town Planner, had a 2-hour meeting with Mr. Ford and that Mr. Ford had wished to appeal the decision reached by the Commission on his parking lot request. He had given Mr. Cook a long list of requests and comments to bring to the Commission. Mr. Cook told Mr. Ford that he and Mr. Willard should try to work out their differences before he championed his cause with the Commissioners. In the end Mr. Ford agreed to try to work out differences with Mr. Willard before continuing.

Mr. Cook told the Commission that he had given a notice to 19-20 Mill Street to immediately contact his office in regard to vinyl windows that had been installed without permit or approval.

Mr. Cook told the Commissioners about a home on Middletown Avenue he had seen which had tacked up a sort of dog house canopy over the front door. He and Fred Valente had visited the home and requested that they take it down immediately since it had certainly not been approved or a permit granted for it. The homeowner had requested that he be allowed to wait until the weekend because he had to work late all week. It was allowed but they insisted that the doorway not be used since the boards that held up the floating thing were not attached to anything but the face of the house.

There was another situation where Mr. Cook had driven by 375 Hartford Avenue where a new roof was being put up. He had stopped and asked the contractor if he had a permit, and was told yes. Upon checking at Town Hall it was found that no permit had been issued. Mr. Cook then insisted that the contractor come in to Town Hall and was told that he would be fined and it would be doubled for lying about the permit. The contractor complained that it was just a little lie, upon which Mr. Cook explained that it was just a little fine!

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

TOWN OF WETHERSFIELD
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

Billye Logan
Clerk Pro Tem