



Town of Woodbury  
Historic District Commission

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

MINUTES – February 5, 2024

REGULAR MEETING

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Maureen Donnarumma, Chair  
Lois Y. Fiftal  
Judith Kelz  
William Hickey

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

George Messier

**ALTERNATES PRESENT**

Marc Kroll (on the phone)

**ALTERNATES ABSENT**

**NOTED OTHERS PRESENT**

Lyman Gilbert, Lisa Amatruda, Tom Amatruda, Ariana Beers, Chantel Croteau, John Lamb, Sal Cappuzzo, Julio Dukes, Patrick Roy, Raymond Manzi, Aiden Usher

**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 Chair Donnarumma, Vice Chair Fiftal, Members Kelz and Hickey
- **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**

- **MOTION:** To nominate and elect William Hickey as Secretary  
Made by **DONNARUMMA**, Seconded by **KELZ**  
Vote: 4-0-0 **Approved** – Motion **Passed**  
Aye           Donnarumma, Fiftal, Kelz, Hickey  
Nay           None  
Abstain      None

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

- **23-HD-0033 – 4 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 44 / MSD District & HD#1**

Thomas and Lisa Amatruda (applicant/owner)

**Section 8: Windows** – Replace 16 upper floor “wood” windows (6x6 true divided light single pane glass) with 16 new “aluminum clad” wood windows (6x6 simulated divided light double pane insulated glass); and Replace 2 front upper floor “wood” windows (15x15 true divided light single pane glass with 2 new “aluminum clad” wood windows (double hung 15x15 simulated divided light double pane insulated glass).

The Clerk read the legal notice published in Voices January 31, 2024.

Thomas and Lisa Amatruda came forward. Lisa Amatruda stated that there are no changes to the application that were accepted last month. She said they want to add that the building is a wood building with aluminum clad throughout and has been that way for decades. Putting the windows with aluminum clad will fit the building. The building also has aluminum siding.

Chair Donnarumma questioned if the existing windows are wood windows with aluminum storms? Lisa Amatruda answered yes but also stated that the windows are rotted and broken in several places. Thomas Amatruda stated that the frames are severely rotted and that there really isn't anything there.

Member Hickey commented/questioned that the windows are not functional, are they fixed in place, so they don't go up or down. Thomas Amatruda stated that this portion of the building has been vacant for decades, which is why it hasn't been maintained. The whole place was not maintained and was completely gutted.

Lisa Amatruda referenced the work session meeting from last month that she attended where the representative talked about a pulley system that is used to construct the wooden windows. The windows in their space does not have that pulley system and the windows have had no care.

Chair Donnarumma questioned if any of the windows were original. They seem to think that the front windows are original, but they are also in rough shape according to the applicant.

Chair Donnarumma asked would they consider wood windows if they do in fact need to be replaced and not restored. Lisa Amatruda said that she wouldn't consider them because they did get a quote which was \$10,000 more. The wood they use now is much less inferior than the older wood windows and would have a much shorter life span. She said that it just doesn't make sense to spend 35% more on a window that they will have to replace sooner rather than later. The windows that are made of pine do not last.

Thomas Amatruda stated that the nature of the building is already aluminum. It is all around the building. This was a working building and has not been used for residential use for quite some time. He went on to say that in his opinion the building doesn't have that many historical features aside from the front columns and they are working on preserving those.

Lisa Amatruda gave a brief description of the commercial places that were run out of bottom space. Thomas Amatruda also stated that because this was a working building many architectural features were changed to fit the need of the commercial space that was in there at that time. For example, stairs have been removed, chimneys have been removed and the whole front was altered. The downstairs existing front windows are there for commercial retail but in the older pictures those windows were not there. The case is that the building has been severely altered from the original historic look.

Member Kelz asked if they have an example of the proposed window. Lisa Amatruda responded no that they didn't have an example. They are like all the other windows that have been brought in. Member Kelz then asked for clarification on the light dividers. Lisa Amatruda said that the front will be 15/15 and all the windows will be 6/6 to make the whole building consistent instead of a hodge podge of different size windows.

Raymond Manzi, Ariana Beer (Bright Planet Solar) spoke in favor of this application.

**MOTION:** To close the public hearing for 23-HD-0033 – 4 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 44 / MSD District & HD#1.

Made by **HICKEY**, Seconded by **KELZ**

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

Aye	Donnarumma, Fiftal, Kelz, Hickey
Nay	None
Abstain	None

- **23-HD-0037 – 118 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 123 / MSD District and HD#1**

Lissa Lovetere and Michael A. Gugliotti, Jr. Trustees (applicant/owner)

**Section 10: Roof** – Frame new “asphalt shingled pitched roof” over existing “rubber flat roof.”

The Clerk read the legal notice published in Voices January 31, 2024.

Lyman Gilbert from LG Building & Remodeling (1356 Southford Road, Southbury) came forward. Mr. Gilbert submitted a new drawing to help clarify the changes being proposed. The existing flat roof has been leaking so pitching the roof would help with the run-off of water. They are sloping the roof frame and keeping it as low as possible so that it would not be above the pitch that faces Main Street.

Chair Donnarumma questioned what the material of the flat roof is and what materials will be used on the proposed pitched roof? Mr. Gilbert stated that the flat roof is a rubber like roof and those materials will be removed. The new roof will be asphalt shingles which will match the rest of the building.

Member Kelz questioned the age of this section of the building because it is not original. Mr. Gilbert estimated it was constructed about 50 to 70 years ago. He also stated that flat roofs are prone to leaks and flat roofs aren't true to the times.

Raymond Manzi and Lisa Amatruda spoke in favor of this application.

**MOTION:** To close the public hearing for 23-HD-0037 – 118 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 123 / MSD District and HD#1.

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

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

Aye	Donnarumma, Fiftal, Kelz, Hickey
Nay	None
Abstain	None

- **23-HD-0038 – 8 Spring Street / Map 105, Lot 123 / MSD District and HD#1**

Peter Frederic Kelemencky (applicant/owner), Bright Planet Solar (agent)

**Section 12: Other** – Roof mounted solar array of 35 panels covering every pitched roof surface of existing house and accessory detached garage, including utility line trench from garage to main panel in house. Cluster added utility wall mounted connections on left front side of house.

The Clerk read the legal notice published in Voices January 31, 2024.

Ariana Beers, Bright Planet Solar Rep and Chantel Croteau Bright Planet Solar Rep came forward.

Chair Donnarumma did a drive by and stated that you can see the roof lines from the streets. She questioned the southern sun exposure, which is where the panels would receive the best exposure and why there are panels being proposed for the roof that is exposed to Spring Street and the roof exposed to Main Street which are northern and western roofs? How important is it that those two sections have the panels?

Ms. Beers stated that is the homeowner's preference, but it is based on the customers electrical usage. When the systems are designed, they try to get as close as they can to the customers usage consumption. If those panels were taken away, they wouldn't be able to offset the electrical usage as much. The percentage would drop. She went on to say that sometimes if customers will not receive 100% offset it can deter them from solar.

Member Kelz questioned, why does the whole house and outbuilding need the panels? Ms. Beers stated that it must be that they use that much electricity. Ms. Croteau stated that although it is the whole roof and outbuilding it is 35 panels system and that is a standard amount array. It is the way the house is configured.

Chair Donnarumma questioned that if the Main Street and Spring Street panels were taken off how would that impact the system? Ms. Beers answered that they will only be getting  $\frac{2}{3}$ 's of the wattage. They can reconfigure and recalculate to get the most for the customer. Chair Donnarumma stated other than those two planes the rest of the planes are not visible from the road, so they are less obtrusive.

Member Kelz questioned, where is the panel on the house? Ms. Beers stated that the cluster is placed next to the electrical meter which is on the side of the residence.

**MOTION:** To close the public hearing for 23-HD-0038 – 8 Spring Street South / Map 105, Lot 109/ MSD District and HD#1.

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

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

Aye           Donnarumma, Fiftal, Kelz, Hickey

Nay           None

Abstain      None

- **24-HD-0001 – 346 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 2A-2 / MSD District and HD#1**

The Birches on Main, LLC (applicant/owner), John Lamb (sole member)

**Section 5: Fences** – Post and picket fencing.

The Clerk read the legal notice published in Voices January 31, 2024.

John Lamb (74 Strathmore Road, Middlebury) came forward.

Mr. Lamb clarified the plan stating that part of the fence that is near Main Street will be behind the plantings.

**MOTION:** To close the public hearing for 24-HD-0001 – 346 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 2A-2 / MSD District and HD#1.

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

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

Aye           Donnarumma, Fiftal, Kelz, Hickey

Nay           None

Abstain      None

- **24-HD-0003 – 230 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 18 / MSD District and HD#1**

Splitrail, LLC (applicant/owner) - After the fact application:

**Section 5: Windows** – Replace 14 upper story “aluminum clad exterior” windows with new “aluminum clad” windows, wood grills and wood interior.

**Section 12: Other** – Remove attic vent on front of building; and remove old unused kitchen vent stack on south façade.

The Clerk read the legal notice published in Voices January 31, 2024.

Sal Cappuzzo, Julio Dukes (230 Main Street South) came forward. It was noted that this was an after the fact permit application.

Member Kelz spoke to Mr. Cappuzzo and Mr. Dukes saying that the Commission is here for a reason and the onus is on the property owner to know the rules and regulations of the Historic District Commission. They are there to approve the work to be done and that approval is for that work and that work only.

Mr. Dukes stated that when they were doing the bottom portion of the building, they didn't know the shape of the rest of the building until they started pulling off the siding. Mr. Cappuzzo

stated that the original application was submitted properly for the lower portion and they didn't think they would need to do anything to the top portion.

Member Kelz suggested that in the future if they are working on another building, that they stated was neglected, they should ask for more and then they will have the approval already.

Lisa Amatruda spoke in favor of the application.

**MOTION:** To close the public hearing for 24-HD-0003 – 230 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 18 / MSD District and HD#1.

Made by **HICKEY**, Seconded by **FIFTAL**

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

Aye           Donnarumma, Fiftal, Kelz, Hickey

Nay           None

Abstain      None

## **NEW APPLICATIONS**

- **23-HD-0036 – 215 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 73A / MSD District & HD#1**

215 Mainwood, LLC (applicant/owner), Ray Manzi (principal)

**Section 9: Doors** – Cut south façade wall in two places to add two separate new “metal and glass” doors to provide additional internal access, both doors with 5-inch wood trim to match existing trim.

**Section 12: Other** – Install new ADA ramp on south side of building over the area of the existing walk, reusing the existing walkway stones supported by concrete walls faced in natural stone and walkway rails to match existing porch rails; Also enlarge existing side door porch to extend for access of one of the new doors.

Raymond Manzi (25 Hard Hill Road) was present to speak on behalf of this application.

The front door is original that faces Main Street. The metal doors being proposed are replacing the two side doors.

They went over the location of the doors and the ramp being proposed so they can make it ADA compliant. When coming from the parking lot there is a bluestone walkway, they will be removing the two steps. They will build up the bluestone walkway so you can go straight onto the ramp.

Mr. Manzi stated that because the building is in the MSD District the apartment needs a second means of egress. He is proposing extending the rear porch and installing a door which will allow a straight shot in and out of the apartment.

The Commission agreed to do a site walk at their own leisure before the public hearing to get a better idea of the site.

Member Kelz questioned the handrails. The handrails on the ramp will be normal handrails to code and he will be adding a secondary railing for ADA compliance.

**MOTION:** To accept receipt of application 23-HD-0036 – 215 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 73-A / MSD District and HD#1 and schedule for public hearing on March 4, 2024.

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

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

Aye	Donnarumma, Fital, Kelz, Hickey
Nay	None
Abstain	None

- **24-HD-0007 – 813 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 50 / MSD District & HD#2**  
Southbury Property, LLC (owner), Tracy Usher (applicant)  
**Section 1: Signage** -- Placement of 3.5 x 5' "Soulbury" business sign on side of building.

Aiden Usher (144 Washington Road) came forward to speak on behalf of this application. This is an after the fact application for the sign placement.

The sign is wood with steel screws. The sign placement is on the right side of the building.

**MOTION:** To accept receipt of application 24-HD-0007 – 813 Main Street South / Map 102, Lot 50 / MSD District & HD#2 and schedule for public hearing on March 4, 2024.

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

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

Aye	Donnarumma, Fital, Kelz, Hickey
Nay	None
Abstain	None

## **DELIBERATIONS**

- **23-HD-0033 – 4 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 44 / MSD District & HD#1**  
Thomas and Lisa Amatruda (applicant/owner)  
**Section 8: Windows** – Replace 16 upper floor "wood" windows (6x6 true divided light single pane glass) with 16 new "aluminum clad" wood windows (6x6 simulated divided light double pane insulated glass); and Replace 2 front upper floor "wood" windows (15x15 true divided light single pane glass with 2 new "aluminum clad" wood windows (double hung 15x15 simulated divided light double pane insulated glass).

Chair Donnarumma discussed that the wood windows are not operable however, they are wood, but they don't know if they are the original windows or not. If they were replaced, they were replaced with like kind with the storms to protect. Property owners know that they have to be painted and maintained in order to hold up.

Member Hickey questioned what the intent of the second floor is since he was not present at last month's meeting when the application was presented. He did say that when he was last up there many of the windows were not functional. He feels like if they aren't the original windows then they were salvaged from other buildings to replace them because they are different types of windows and windows from different ages of construction. In his opinion it would be difficult to get the existing windows up and functioning and it might be better to replace them in this case. Since he has not seen the windows they are proposing, this is another issue he has.

Chair Donnarumma questioned how many of the windows are original windows. Member Hickey responded with that since there were many commercial uses, we just don't know what the use of the upstairs was.

Member Kelz commented that although it's been a while since she was up there, she does remember that the upstairs windows do seem to be retro fitted for that space. It is so hard to tell because the space was gutted, and we don't know the configuration of the floor plan and how many windows are original and how many were added. She stated that in this case because the building has been changed so much and because the exterior has been changed with material and the front façade has been altered since original construction and always has been a commercial use, she tends to lean towards accepting this application.

Chair Donnarumma commented to Member Kelz asking if she felt this way because there have been so many changes over time? Member Kelz agreed that is what she feels, and the proposal would make it more consistent. Chair Donnarumma feels that since it is such a simple building with probably clapboard underneath and fewer windows, she doesn't agree on compromising the integrity of the building and the historic value, she doesn't buy the thinking that just because it was a little messed up it can't be brought back.

Member Kelz went onto say that is why she feels conflicted. She struggles with this keeping with the historic feel for the building is much more important for her way of thinking on the front façade and they are looking to maintain the look of the upper windows on the front.

Member Hickey stated one side of the building you can't even see from the street, while the other side of building is plain but is viewable from the street. He feels like if they were talking about the windows in the front bottom that he would feel much stricter about replacing those because they give the building some character. He feels that it would be an improvement if they put the aluminum clad windows on the side facing Route 47 because they wouldn't need the aluminum storms.

Chair Donnarumma filled in Member Hickey in regard to the workshop meeting held last month. She explained that there are other options other than new pine windows. There is Spanish cedar which is as durable as the old pine. She explained that if a window needed to be replaced with Spanish cedar it would exceed the cost of a replacement of aluminum clad or comparable material. If the windows are repaired, they can be done comparably to a replacement window.

Vice Chair Fiftal agrees that they need to keep the integrity of the windows that were there.

Member Hickey was concerned that he is not sure if the windows are fixable. He would have to visit again and look because he remembers them being different types and different ages just cobbled together. Chair Donnarumma suggested some might be salvable and might be older wood. Some might need to be replaced.



**MOTION:** To approve (23-HD-0033 – 4 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 44 / MSD District & HD#1) a Certificate of Appropriateness as proposed.

Made by **HICKEY**, Seconded by **KELZ**

Vote: 2-2-0 – **Not Approved** – Motion Failed

Aye	Hickey, Kelz
Nay	Donnarumma, Fital
Abstain	None

The motion failed.

Chair Donnarumma understands that it would look good to not have the storms but that this building is kind of like the “hub” of Woodbury. It would look great rehabilitated back to the original state which would be simple clapboard with windows and they could even eliminate some windows.

**MOTION:** To deny (23-HD-0033 – 4 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 44 / MSD District & HD#1) a Certificate of Appropriateness pursuant to §8.1.2 – Deteriorated architectural features should be repaired rather than replaced. If replacement is necessary, the new material should be compatible with the replaced material in composition, design, color, texture, and other aesthetic and architectural qualities. Repair or replacement of architectural features should be based on the original features of the building rather than based on designs taken from other historic buildings. Alterations that create an appearance inconsistent with the character of the building are discouraged. Low maintenance siding, such-as aluminum, or vinyl clapboards, which are products of the mid-20th century, are by nature, inappropriate on historic buildings.

Made by **DONNARUMMA**, Seconded by **FITAL**

Vote: 2-2-0 – **Not Approved** – Motion Failed

Aye	Donnarumma, Fital
Nay	Hickey, Kelz
Abstain	None

The motion failed.

Member Kelz stated that the workshop they had was very informative, but she does feel that in some circumstances that preserving does not apply. She thinks this is one of those circumstances. She questioned what are we trying to preserve except a look?

Chair Donnarumma answered that they are trying to preserve the old stick building. Member Kelz stated that it is not there anymore, but Chair Donnarumma said it is still there, it is just under all the aluminum. Member Kelz remembers Member Messier would say that according to Historic Preservation like for like does not mean materials, it means kind of look alike. Chair Donnarumma stated the idea is to preserve what’s there with like “kind.”

Member Hickey deliberated that this statement is not based on hard facts but based on what he saw when he passed through. He thinks that this is a building that the windows can’t be refurbished and reinstalled in the frames they are in. Everything has been gutted which means the casements and everything are all gone. Everything that would have been present to help the windows get refurbished is gone. We don’t have a clear picture of what was there because everything is in the dumpster. He would rather have them put the windows in and down the line the owners could do something about the aluminum siding.

He feels that redoing the windows and spending thousands of dollars on building out the window frames would be prohibitively expensive. He doesn't think that in this case with the aluminum siding they would see a huge difference. Member Kelz followed with we need to figure out if we want the window to be the material that is existing right now or will we accept aluminum clad. It is not the quality. If we decide that a wood window needs to be put in, it is not the Commission's decision to determine the quality of it. Chair Donnarumma stated that the regulations state like for like.

**MOTION:** To deny (23-HD-0033 – 4 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 44 / MSD District & HD#1) a Certificate of Appropriateness based on §8.1.2 – Deteriorated architectural features should be repaired rather than replaced. If replacement is necessary, the new material should be compatible with the replaced material in composition, design, color, texture, and other aesthetic and architectural qualities. Repair or replacement of architectural features should be based on the original features of the building rather than based on designs taken from other historic buildings. Alterations that create an appearance inconsistent with the character of the building are discouraged. Low maintenance siding, such-as aluminum, or vinyl clapboards, which are products of the mid-20th century, are by nature, inappropriate on historic buildings. Made by **DONNARUMMA**, Seconded by **FIFTAL**

Vote: 3-1-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed

Aye	Donnarumma, Fital, Kelz
Nay	Hickey
Abstain	None

- **23-HD-0037 – 118 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 123 / MSD District and HD#1**

Lissa Lovetere and Michael A. Gugliotti, Jr. Trustees (applicant/owner)

**Section 10: Roof** – Frame new “asphalt shingled pitched roof” over existing “rubber flat roof.”

**MOTION:** To approve (23-HD-0037 – 118 Main Street South / Map 105, Lot 123 / MSD District and HD#1) a Certificate of Appropriateness as proposed to permit a new framed pitched roof with asphalt shingles over existing rubber flat roof.

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

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

Aye	Donnarumma, Fital, Kelz, Hickey
Nay	None
Abstain	None

- **23-HD-0038 – 8 Spring Street / Map 105, Lot 123 / MSD District and HD#1**

Peter Frederic Kelemencky (applicant/owner), Bright Planet Solar (agent)

**Section 12: Other** – Roof mounted solar array of 35 panels covering every pitched roof surface of existing house and accessory detached garage, including utility line trench from garage to main panel in house. Cluster added utility wall mounted connections on left front side of house.

Chair Donnarumma stated that it would look good if they eliminated the panels that face Spring Street and Main Street and would still be effective. There are 9 planes being proposed for the panels and this would bring it down to 7 planes. Others agreed.

**MOTION:** To approve (23-HD-0038 – 8 Spring Street / Map 105, Lot 109 / MSD District and HD#1) a Certificate of Appropriateness in part to permit some of the proposed solar panels on the roof of the house and garage except not approving any of the house roof solar panels facing Main Street (Roof B) and Spring Street (Roof F).

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

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

Aye	Donnarumma, Fiftal, Kelz, Hickey
Nay	None
Abstain	None

- **24-HD-0001 – 346 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 2A-2 / MSD District and HD#1**

The Birches on Main, LLC (applicant/owner), John Lamb (sole member)

**Section 5: Fences** – Post and picket fencing.

**MOTION:** To approve (24-HD-0001 – 346 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 2A-2 / MSD District and HD#1) a Certificate of Appropriateness as proposed to permit a post and picket fence.

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

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

Aye	Donnarumma, Fiftal, Kelz, Hickey
Nay	None
Abstain	None

- **24-HD-0003 – 230 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 18 / MSD District and HD#1**

Splitrail, LLC (applicant/owner) - After the fact application:

**Section 5: Windows** – Replace 14 upper story “aluminum clad exterior” windows with new “aluminum clad” windows, wood grills and wood interior.

**Section 12: Other** – Remove attic vent on front of building; and remove old unused kitchen vent stack on south façade.

Chair Donnarumma thanked Member Kelz for speaking up regarding doing work without approval from the Historic District. The regulations under §5.1 - No building or structure or property fixture shall be erected or altered within the historic district until after an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as it relates to exterior architectural features, has been submitted to the Commission and approved by said Commission, are pretty clear on what they need to do.

**MOTION:** To approve after the fact (24-HD-0003 – 230 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 18 / MSD District and HD#1) a Certificate of Appropriateness as proposed for the replacement of 14 upper story “aluminum clad exterior” windows with new “aluminum clad” windows, wood grills and wood interior; and removal of attic vent on front of building and old unused kitchen vent stack on south façade.

Made by **HICKEY**, Seconded by **FIFTAL**

Vote: 3-1-0 – **Approved** – Motion Passed

Aye	Donnarumma, Fiftal, Hickey
Nay	Kelz
Abstain	None

Member Kelz reason for opposing is because she thinks it should have been denied and something put on their file for doing the work without approval.

- **Regular Meeting Minutes** – January 8, 2024

**MOTION:** To accept the regular meeting minutes of January 8, 2024, as presented.

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

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

Ayes           Donnarumma, Fiftal, Kelz, Hickey

Nays           None

Abstain       None

- **Special Meeting Minutes**

Page 2 – 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph – Number 1 - changed to should say *or*.

Page 3 – 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph – Change *where* to *were*.

**MOTION:** To accept the special meeting minutes of January 8, 2024, as amended.

Made by **KELZ**, Seconded by **HICKEY**

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

Ayes           Donnarumma, Fiftal, Kelz, Hickey

Nays           None

Abstain       None

### **ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

- A complaint came through for 487 Main Street South for replacing the front door. Zoning Enforcement Officer followed up with the contractor and they are preserving the door not replacing it.

### **COMMISSION HOUSEKEEPING**

- Chair Donnarumma spoke to the Commission about how important it is to get all the information when making decisions. We really need to make decisions and not abstain so getting all the information is key. That could also include doing site walks on our own.
- Member Kelz informed the Commission that the Route 6 Corridor Study is underway. They are moving ahead with a plan by the end of the year. She explained that every board has a representative and that they are looking for input from each board. She asked the Commission for some suggestions to go back with to keep the pretty town look.
- A site visit to Woodbury Supply showroom in Oxford will be scheduled to discuss different types of windows, on February 19, 2024, at 10:30 am.

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

- None

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

- Patrick Roy – 3 Church Street Roxbury

Mr. Roy asked for clarification on the ruling for 230 Main Street South, if it was approved because he could not hear the motion. He questioned the application versus what is there. The application states aluminum clad and what is there is vinyl. Mr. Cappuzzo confirmed that the windows are aluminum clad.

Mr. Roy questioned why aluminum clad is good for 230 Main Street South and not 4 Main Street South? Chair Donnarumma answered because they were replacing the upstairs windows with like for like. The upstairs windows were aluminum clad already.

- Lisa Amatruda – 19 Orchard Ave

Lisa Amatruda is requesting a clarification on the Robert Rules that were followed when three votes were made regarding 4 Main Street South. Her understanding of Robert Rules is that the chair abstains from the vote. She also felt like Chair Donnarumma gave the appearance of brow beating Member Kelz to change her vote.

- Ariana Beers questioned what her next step for 8 Spring Street will be. Chair Donnarumma stated that she needs to submit a revised plan for the solar with the Land Use office.

**ADJOURNMENT**

- Hearing no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 9:32 pm

RECEIVED & FILED  
IN WOODBURY, CT  
This 12<sup>th</sup> day of Feb 2024  
at 3:27 o'clock PM  
Maura M. Mancini  
Town Clerk