



**Town of Woodbury
Historic District Commission**

281 Main Street South
Woodbury, CT 06798
203.263.3467 - www.woodburyct.org

MINUTES – January 9, 2023

REGULAR MEETING

7:30 PM –Shove Building, 281 Main Street South, Woodbury, CT 06798

MEMBERS PRESENT

Maureen Donnarumma, Chair
Susan Cheatham, Vice Chairman
Lois Y. Fiftal, Secretary
Robert S. Kolesnik, Jr.

MEMBERS ABSENT

George Messier

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Marc Kroll
Judith Kelz
William Hickey

ALTERNATES ABSENT

NOTED OTHERS PRESENT

Roger Coutu, Zachary Mayo, Patrick Roy, Jock Lawrason, Lee Lawrason, Thomas Olejniczak, Jill Olejniczak, Thomas Arras

OPENING OF MEETING

- **Call to Order**
Chair Donnarumma convened the regular meeting at 7:30 pm.
- **Seating of Members / Alternates**
Seated for the meeting were Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal, Kolesnik and Alternate Kelz.
- **Conflict of Interest Reminder (CGS §8-11 & Woodbury Town Charter Section 901)**
Chair Donnarumma reminded the Commission of Conflict of Interest; No member expressed a conflict with any matter on the agenda.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

- Election of Officers

Motion: To nominate and elect Sue Cheatham as Vice-chairman

Made by **DONNARUMMA**, Seconded by **KELZ**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion **Passed**

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal, Kolesnik, Kelz

Nay None

Abstain None

Motion: To nominate and elect Maureen Donnarumma as Chairman

Made by **CHEATHAM**, Seconded by **FIFTAL**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion **Passed**

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal, Kolesnik, Kelz

Nay None

Abstain None

Motion: To nominate and elect Lois Fiftal as Clerk (Secretary)

Made by **DONNARUMMA**, Seconded by **KELZ**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion **Passed**

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal, Kolesnik, Kelz

Nay None

Abstain None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 22-HD-2237 – 487 Main Street South / Map 103, Lot 42 / MSD & HD#1

Kevin Honeycutt (applicant/owner)

Section 8: Windows – Replace 7 existing wood windows with new wood/Fibrex exterior.

Section 9: Doors – Replace 3 existing steel doors/wood trim with new steel/brickmold trim.

Chair Donnarumma read the application.

Roger Coutu, representative of Renewal by Anderson came forward to speak on behalf of the applicant Kevin Honeycutt. Mr. Coutu explained the specs of the replacement windows and doors. On the second floor the five windows on the front of the house will be replaced and one on each side of the house. Chair Donnarumma explained that a site walk was completed, and they looked at the conditions of the windows and doors. The existing doors seem to be all wood. The new ones will be steel. Application was stated wrong, so Chair Donnarumma asked to amend the application to say that the existing doors are wood, not steel. Mr. Coutu explained that what is there now is wood and they would like the steel doors to make it more energy efficient. Mr. Coutu brought a sample of the window and Member Kolesnik questioned if this was the exact same of what was going to be installed because the outside is aluminum. A sample was brought in showing the Fibrex (a composite with 40% wood) material with Fibrex cladding on the outside of the window. Existing windows are single pane, old but not original to when the house was originally built

Kolesnik questioned the size of the panes if they would be the size that is existing. Sizing will be the same. They will be using the same framing just replacing the sashes and windows. The working part of the window (sash) will be the composite material. Also asked if the other windows of the house are proposed to be replaced at this time; only the seven in the application are proposed at this time.

Kolesnik questioned the steel front door, the number of panels on the door and the material used for the side windows. Chair Donnarumma asked to amend the application under Section 9 under doors to include the sidelight windows. The application was amended to clarify the proposal was to replace the existing front wood door with sidelight windows with a new steel door and the new sidelight windows will have the same grill pattern that is existing. The frame of the door and sidelights will be wood, and the door slab will be steel. The two doors in the back cannot easily be seen from the street, particularly during the summer.

Public Comments

- *Thomas Olejniczak, 95 Judson Ave – Indicated in favor of the proposed application.*
- *Zachary Mayo, 42 Main Street South – Indicated in favor of the proposed application.*

Motion: To close the public hearing (22-HD-2237 – 487 Main Street South / Map 103, Lot 42 / MSD & HD#1).

Made by **KOLESNIK**, Seconded by **KELZ**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fital, Kolesnik, Kelz

Nay None

Abstain None

NEW APPLICATIONS

- **22-HD-2246 – 125 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 114-1 / MSD District & HD#1**
Patrick J. Roy (applicant/owner)
Section 8: Windows – Replacement of 30 existing wood windows to be replaced with wood/Fibrex material.

Chair Donnarumma read the application.

Patrick Roy, 125 Main Street South came forward. Mr. Roy amended the application to read existing material is wood to be replaced with Fibrex (a composite with 40% wood). This is a new application, and he is proposing replacing the sashes and the windows. Exterior trim will stay the same. The grills will be 6 over 6 with simulated divided light with full screens. Application was amended to read simulated divided light.

Motion: To accept application (22-HD-2246 – 125 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 114-1 / MSD & HD#1) and schedule public hearing for February 6, 2023.

Made by **KELZ**, Seconded by **KOLESNIK**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed
Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal, Kolesnik, Kelz
Nay None
Abstain None

- **22-HD-2245 – 42 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 132 / MSD & HD#1**

Zachary Mayo & Jennifer D. Torres (applicant/owner)

Section 12: Other – Install 26 roof mounted solar panels on main dwelling and outbuilding.

EXEMPTION REQUESTED per §7.2.4 Minor Change

Mr. Zachary Mayo came forward, owner of 42 Main Street South. Mr. Mayo showed an overview of the array's location. Solar panels are roof mounted and almost not visible from the road. The existing roof shingles are black, and the panels will be black. Mr. Mayo showed a picture from the road of the house roof that will have a couple of arrays on it. Most of the arrays will be on the garage that is not visible from the road.

Chairman Donnarumma described the details of the proposed application as submitted.

Kolesnik stated that the visibility is slight. Kolesnik states the state statute § 7-147f Considerations in determining appropriateness. Solar energy systems. The statute says the no application for certification of appropriateness for exterior architectural feature such as a solar energy system shall be denied unless we find the feature cannot be installed without substantially impairing the historic character in appearance of the district. Kolesnik stated that they know they can't deny the application especially since the vast majority is outside the commission's jurisdiction. Seems like it's a minor change and it so strictly enforced by the Connecticut law it should fall under the 7.2 exemption. Vice chair Cheatham thinks that solar is a major change and the historic district needs a say so even if it is a minor change and that a public hearing should be scheduled since it is in the purview of the historic district. Kolesnik did agree but looking at the site map submitted the arrays are out of the historic district jurisdiction and what is in the jurisdiction is so minor for this application that a public hearing is not needed. He also stated that the applicant if not approved tonight he would lose his financing for this project and because of all these reasons an exemption can be granted in this case, not every case.

Motion: To approve exemption (22-HD-2245 – 42 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 132 / MSD & HD#1) per §7.2.4 (minor change) for installation of 26 roof mounted solar panels on the main dwelling and outbuilding.

Made by **KOLESNIK** Seconded by **FIFTAL**

Vote: 4-1-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed
Aye Donnarumma, Fiftal, Kolesnik, Kelz
Nay Cheatham
Abstain None

- **22-HD-2247 – 920 Main Street South / Map 34, Lot 1D-A / OS-60 District & HD#2**
 Jock Duncan Lawrason and Lee Fuller (applicant/owner)
Section 5: Fences – Replace existing damaged white wooden three rail fence with wooden single guardrail with 8” x 8” square posts 30” high.

Chair Donnarumma read the application.

Jock and Lee Lawrason, owners of 920 Main Street South came forward to present. Proposing to replace only the damaged portion of the existing fence (will replace the rest at later date). The replacement proposed is a wooden single rail guardrail on the north side of the driveway due to an accident that destroyed the existing fence. Mr. Lawrason talked to the Department of Transportation regarding the placement of a guardrail to ensure it being on his property. This replacement is necessary for safety because it protects the gas line, the generator, and the house. If someone hits that then there will be a major problem. Mr. Lawrason spoke to a structural person regarding the need for a metal guard and it was determined that the wood will be fine because cars shouldn't be coming straight at it, they will be coming at more of an angle. Mr. Lawrason has an estimate to replace all the way up to the corner of the property but is comfortable with it stopping at the tree which will then be less than 200 feet. It will run from the driveway to the tree. The tree is a natural break. Mr. Lawrason amending the application to state that the guardrail will be less than 200 feet not 350 feet, just to the tree. Mr. Lawrason also is looking to replace the lamp post that was destroyed in the accident.

MOTION: To accept application (22-HD-2247 – 920 Main Street South / Map 34, Lot 1D-A / OS-60 & HD#1) and schedule public hearing for February 6, 2023.

Made by **KOLESNIK**, Seconded by **KELZ**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal, Kolesnik, Kelz

Nay None

Abstain None

- **22-HD-2249 – 95 Judson Avenue / Map 36, Lot 46 / R-40 District & HD#1**
 Thomas and Jill Olejniczak (applicant/owner)
Section 2: Light Fixtures – Installation of lantern fixtures next to front doorway.
Section 7: Remodeling – Relocation of masonry steps to the location of the new front door along with new wood railing. (All work has already been completed)

Chair Donnarumma read the application.

Thomas and Jill Olejniczak came forward, owners of 95 Judson Avenue to present. Work has already been completed before the Olejniczak purchased the property. Donnarumma questioned the light fixtures and by looking at old pictures there were no existing exterior light fixtures. The masonry steps were completed because the front door was relocated, and the railing installed is made of wood. Mr. Olejniczak added that regarding the light fixtures they seem like others in the neighborhood, black fixture with loop towards the top.

Motion: To accept application (22-HD-2249 – 95 Judson Avenue / Map 36, Lot 46 / R-40 & HD#1) and schedule public hearing for February 6, 2023.

Moved by **FIFTAL** Seconded by **KELZ**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal, Kolesnik, Kelz

Nay None

Abstain None

Chairman Donnarumma asked to adjust the agenda to move item 22-HD-2248 before the other listed items under Acknowledgement of Exemptions Approved by the Land Use Office.

MOTION: To adjust the agenda to move item 22-HD-2248 before the other listed items under Acknowledgement of Exemptions Approved by the Land Use Office.

Made by **DONNARUMMA**, Seconded by **KOLESNIK**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal, Kolesnik, Kelz

Nay None

Abstain None

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF EXEMPTIONS APPROVED BY LAND USE OFFICE

- **22-HD-2248 – 95 Judson Avenue / Map 036, Lot 046 / R40 & Historic District #1**

Jill Olejniczak (owner/applicant)

Section 10: Roof - In-kind replacement of existing roof asphalt shingles with asphalt shingles.

Section 12: Other – In-kind replacement of existing (patch less than 10% of overall building) siding and trim (see previous approval 22-HD-2128 for replacement windows)

Chair Donnarumma summarized the matter. There was a previous application for replacement windows but never went any further with that application. The roof and siding were not applied for at that time but since this is like for like they are seeking exemption.

MOTION: To approve exemption (22-HD-2248 – 95 Judson Avenue / Map 36, Lot 46 / R-40 & HD#1) per §7.2.4 (minor change) for replacements in kind of asphalt roof shingles and patching of siding and trim.

Made by **KOLESNIK**, Seconded by **CHEATHAM**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal, Kolesnik, Kelz

Nay None

Abstain None

- **22-HD-2243 – Woodbury Place Units 1,2,3 / Map 32, Lot 6A / GA & Historic District #2**
Michael Henry (applicant), Woodbury Place Commons (owner)
Section 10: Roof – In-kind replacement of existing roof asphalt shingles with asphalt shingles.

Roof replacement is like for like.

MOTION: To approve exemption (22-HD-2243 – Woodbury Place Units 1, 2 and 3 / Map 32, Lot 6A / GA & HD#2) per §7.2.4 (minor change) for replacement in kind of asphalt roof shingles.

Made by **FIFTAL**, Seconded by **KOLESNIK**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed

Aye	Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fital, Kolesnik, Kelz
Nay	None
Abstain	None

- **22-HD-2244 – 1023 Main Street South / Map 084, Lot 026 / OS60 & Historic District #2**
Wilson Forero (owner/applicant)
Section 10: Roof – In-kind replacement of existing roof asphalt shingles with asphalt shingles.

Roof replacement is like for like.

MOTION: To approve exemption (22-HD-2244 – 1023 Main Street South / Map 84, Lot 26 / OS-60 & HD#2) per §7.2.4 (minor change) for replacement in kind of asphalt roof shingles.

Made by **KELZ**, Seconded by **FIFTAL**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed

Aye	Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fital, Kolesnik, Kelz
Nay	None
Abstain	None

DELIBERATIONS

- **22-HD-2237 – 487 Main Street South / Map 103, Lot 42 / MSD & HD#1**
Kevin Honeycutt (applicant/owner)
Section 8: Windows – Replace 7 existing wood windows with new wood/Fibrex exterior.
Section 9: Doors – Replace 3 existing steel doors/wood trim with new steel/brickmold trim.

Kolesnik said the commission was very concerned about the possibility about misrepresentation and the inaccuracy of the application which appears to be filled out by the contractor. After listening to Mr. Coutu, he does not think the inaccuracy should be considered by the commission. Should be given the benefit of the doubt and were not trying to pull the wool over our eyes. No consideration of fraud here. Chair Donnarumma did say that the application was corrected so all their questions have been answered and the application stands corrected now.

Section 9: Doors – Replace 3 existing steel doors/wood trim with new steel/brickmold trim.

Kelz indicated the doors in the back are of little concern since they cannot really be seen from the street, but the front door is of concern. The Commission should not be concerned with what is energy efficient. To replace the original for solely that purpose isn't a historic issue. We did not hear that the existing wooden door was deteriorating and that is why they are replacing it. The focus was on the efficiency of the doors. Cheatham stated that preservation can be efficient with new materials that are coming up. Kolesnik stated that this is a major change to the front of the building. They are not proposing to alter the square feet, but the material is changing. It's a substantial change. Kelz added that not only is it in the historic district the proximity of the house to the road and sidewalks is one of the houses that is closest to the road and can be seen from a car not just walking by. Chairman Donnarumma said this is a gem of a historic house. The idea of changing from a wood door to steel would be very noticeable. Kolesnik added that he is the most liberal when it comes to this, and he thinks because of the proximity to the road and the condition of the existing door and sidelights would be a noticeable change. Energy efficiency can be addressed from the inside by installing a panel inside not visible from outside or other similar means.

Motion: To approve the replacement of the two rear doors as proposed as they are not old doors and were previously replaced and are barely visible from the street, and to deny the proposed replacement of the front door and sidelights as the exterior material proposed is inconsistent with the architectural features of the existing and inappropriate due to the proximity of the house to the street and originality of the current architectural features with the Historic District per Section 8.1.2.

Made by KOLESNIK

(Note: the conversation switched to the window aspect of the application without a second or a vote on the above motion).

Section 8: Windows – Replace 7 existing wood windows with new wood/Fibrex exterior.

Kelz noted the same concern for the windows as she had for the doors that they are only being replaced for energy efficiency. Kolesnik stated that they don't know that for sure because they didn't question Mr. Coutu on that during the hearing. Kolesnik said that the existing windows in this dwelling are not a functioning window because they just don't work. It's not just for energy efficiency, it's about preserving the house and ensuring that it is a livable functioning window in which you can open and close but for this time they are not a reasonable window. They are proposing changing the sashes and glass and the framing will be the same. If what was being proposed was wood the hair on our neck wouldn't be up. What they are proposing is better than wood. Kolesnik does believe that the windows being proposed are a reasonable window for this house at this time. If the commission is at the point that we are going to deny this application because the window is only 40% wood, then we are dancing on a head of a pin. The commission has a reason and time to regulate and a time not to. The purpose of the District Regulations is to guarantee an appropriate streetscape and to guarantee the preservation of historic architecture. Roofs change, windows change, siding changes and windows change more than anything else. The commission has never denied Fibrex windows up and down Main Street with the exception for his own property. He can't think of a rational basis to deny the windows when it is such an insignificant change to the house. Cheatham asked what the definition of Fibrex material vs wood. What is the material?

Kolesnik stated that Fibrex looks like wood, cuts like wood and doesn't know what the Commission is regulating, one rots, and one does not. Kelz is extremely frustrated regarding this regulation. She knows they look at each application for its own merit. She's concerned that at some point they will be forced to state what they will or will not accept. Products keep getting better every day. She has an open mind that products are just as good as wooden windows. Regulations need to be a little more specific as to what they will and will not approve. Donnarumma disagreed and said the regulations are very clear as to what they are to approve and not approve. She read Section 8.1.2 pointing out its clear instructions. Our Regulations are quite clear, not vague, as to what we are regulating ("replace with like material") and this house is a gem of a house. No reason for the window replacement was made and we don't know if they can be opened and closed or other issues. Kolesnik stated that due to appear to be original to the house if not awfully close. No evidence of dry rot or other issues visible during site visit. The regulations state like for like and Fibrex material is close to like as they can get without being wood and these regulations were completed before we had Fibrex. Kolesnik is concerned that we are forcing all to just stick with wood.

Chairman Donnarumma asked if anyone wanted to make a motion regarding the proposed windows.

MOTION: To issue a certificate of appropriateness for the window replacement as proposed. (22-HD-2237 – 487 Main Street South / Map 103, Lot 42 / MSD & HD#1).
Made by **KOLESNIK**

Chairman Donnarumma again said to change things on this house would be disconcerting. Nobody seconded the above Motion. Chairman Donnarumma then called for anyone to make another motion.

MOTION: To deny the aspect of the application relating to proposed window replacement (22-HD-2237 – 487 Main Street South / Map 103, Lot 42 / MSD & HD#1) as not being consistent with §8.1.2.

Made by **KELZ**, Seconded by **CHEATHAM**

Vote: 4-1-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal, Kelz

Nay Kolesnik

Abstain None

- **Meeting Minutes**

MOTION: To add to the agenda consideration of special meeting minutes of December 8, 2022.

Made by **DONNARUMA**, Seconded by **KOLESNIK**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed

Ayes Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal, Kolesnik, Kelz

Nays None

Abstain None

The Chairman read outloud the minutes for the December 8, 2022, Special Meeting (Site Walk).

MOTION: To accept the special meeting minutes of December 8, 2022, as presented.

Made by **FIFTAL**, Seconded by **KELZ**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion **Passed**

Ayes Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fital, Kolesnik, Kelz

Nays None

Abstain None

MOTION: To accept the regular meeting minutes of December 5, 2022, as presented.

Made by **KOLESNIK**, Seconded by **FIFTAL**

Vote: 5-0-0 – **Approved** – Motion **Passed**

Ayes Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fital, Kolesnik, Kelz

Nays None

Abstain None

OTHER BUSINESS

- *Fital said that plaques are available for the house in the Historic District. She will find out the criteria for the houses. Kolesnik shared that he has a plaque on his house and had difficulties with his insurance company not wanting to insure his house because it being on the National Historic registry and the insurance company does not insure those houses. He said it took him considerable time to convince the insurance company that the designation had no impact on the insurability of the house. He advised that before giving out these plaques that people should be warned to check with their insurer. The Commission instead thought they should reach out to the SHPO on this.*

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

- *Tom Arras stressed his concern about the signs around town. He's spoke at a Board of Selectmen meeting regarding signs that are around town, and he feels discriminated against for what the Commission put him through and cost the taxpayer six figure range for the lawsuit they put him through. Why isn't the Commission doing anything about the signs on the North Green? The Town needs enforcement for all the signs that are around. Kolesnik responded by saying first they are not enforcement and second, they were not discriminating against him. He stated that this was brought up in their last meeting, so they are aware of the situation. He feels like people don't know the rules about the 60-day historic time period and need to be made aware of this. The 60-day period came into effect because of Arras's case and now they have a bright line rule that needs enforcement. The State has the right of way and if the Town calls the State, they will come do a sweep of all the signs, but the call must come from the Town. Cheatham added that this needs to get under control with the Land Use office and First Selectmen. The zoning regulations changes are being held up due to sign issues and have yet to be published for a public hearing. Arras commented that the sign placement is a life safety issue on some of the signs. Kolesnik volunteered to draft a letter to be sent to out as a reminder to businesses and residents of the Historic District.*

- *Arras also questioned what happened to the SDAT study? Cheatham answered that it was never acted on. The study addressed both speeding and parking issues in the Town and Arras doesn't know why nothing was done since money and time was spent. Kolesnik recalls that the study suggested that the white lines be moved in but there was an overwhelming response against that. Hickey asked if there would be representative from the Commission to go the NVCOG and Kelz will be the representative. His thought is that during this study they can mention the SDAT study and have the issues addressed through that.*

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 9:37 pm.

RECEIVED & FILED
IN WOODBURY, CT
This 13th day of Jan 2023
at 2:30 o'clock PM
Maria M Mancini
Town Clerk