



**Town of Woodbury
Historic District Commission**

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

MINUTES – May 6, 2024

REGULAR MEETING

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Maureen Donnarumma, Chair
Lois Y. Fiftal – Vice Chair
George Messier
Judith Kelz
William Hickey – Secretary

MEMBERS ABSENT

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Edward Winters
David Newell

ALTERNATES ABSENT

Marc Kroll

NOTED OTHERS PRESENT

Ken Deschino, Ray Manzi, Brendan Reig, Gary Nurnberger, Diane Printz, Patrick Corrigan,
Thomas Schwenke

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 Messier, Kelz, and Hickey
- **Historic District Regulations**
Chair Donnarumma read from the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 1995 *Section 6* - Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
- **Conflict of Interest Reminder (CGS §8-11 & Woodbury Town Charter Section 901)**
Chair Donnarumma reminded the Commission of Conflict of Interest; Chair Donnarumma expressed she has a conflict with matter 24-HD-0011 and recused herself from that agenda item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- **24-HD-0011 – 215 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 73A / MSD District & HD#1**
215 Mainwood, LLC (applicant/owner), Ray Manzi (principal)
Section 12: Other – Black metal railing for ADA Ramp.

Chair Donnarumma recused herself seating Alt. Member Winters.

Ray Manzi came forward to speak on behalf of this application. Mr. Manzi clarified that this application is just for the railings on the ramp since the ramp has already been approved.

MOTION: To close the public hearing for 24-HD-0011 – 215 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 73A / MSD District & HD#1.

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

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

Ayes Fital, Messier, Kelz, Hickey, Winters

Nays None

Abstain None

Chair Donnarumma was reseated, unseating Alt. Member Winters.

- **24-HD-0013 – 305 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 85-4 / MSD District & HD#1**
Patrick Corrigan (applicant/owner)
Section 5: Fences- Install two (2) sections of wooden split rail fencing and one (1) section of wooden 6-foot-high stockade fencing.

Patrick Corrigan came forward to speak on behalf of the application. He stated that since the last meeting, at the commission's, request he researched the history of stockade fencing and looked at other properties around town.

Mr. Corrigan stated that a stockade fence is a historic style fence in the north and the south. The earliest type of fence was a paling fence made of vertically placed branches and saplings with sharpened ends. Over time they evolved to lumber planks with the tips cut at 45-degree angle. Then in 1909 stockade fences became more like we know it today.

His request for a stockade fence is because it goes along with the continuity of his neighbor's fence. Looking at other fences in town already, he thinks that asking for a stockade fence is a reasonable request, especially after learning the history behind them. Mr. Corrigan also provided a map to the commission that shows all the that are in the district.

He has investigated tongue and groove fencing but that is not as historical as a paling fence, and he feels like the stockade-style fence goes along better with the time frame of his house.

Chair Donnarumma questioned the cost difference between a dog ear fence and a stockade fence. Mr. Corrigan said that is about a \$700 difference and the difference between a tongue and groove and stockade is about a \$1000 difference.

Public Comment

- *Ray Manzi (25 Hard Hill Road, Woodbury) spoke in favor of the proposed fence saying that Mr. Corrigan did his homework to find the history behind the stockade fence.*
- *Ken Deschino (311 Main Street South) spoke in favor of the fence. He is a neighbor of this property, and he got approval for his fence in 1997 for a stockade fence and split rail.*

MOTION: To close the public hearing for 24-HD-0013 – 305 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 85-4 / MSD District & HD#1.

Made by **FIFTAL**, Seconded by **MESSIER**

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

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

NEW APPLICATIONS

- **24-HD-0014 – 50 Main Street North / Map 105, Lot 77 / MSD District & HD#1**

Thomas G. Schwenke (applicant/owner)

Section 12: Other – Install 24K generator and 100-gallon propane tank on north side of house, screen with fence and landscaping.

No one present to speak on behalf of the application.

At the public hearing they will need clarification of the fencing that will be added, and the application will need to be amended.

MOTION: To accept receipt of application 24-HD-0014 – 50 Main Street North / Map 105, Lot 77 / MSD District & HD#1 and schedule for public hearing on June 3, 2024.

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

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

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

- **24-HD-0015 – 63 Main Street North / Map 105, Lot 70 / MSD District & HD#1**

Kevin Michael Printz (applicant/owner)

Section 5: Fences –

- Remove wooden solid screen fence and replace with new PVC solid screen fence.
- Remove wooden picket fence and replace with new PVC picket fence.

Owner Diane Printz was present to speak on behalf of the application. She explained that they are proposing white PVC but has been told that white might be too modern. They are looking to

do the backyard in PVC since it won't be visible from the street. If they get approval the color will be the same as what is there now, and the front will be wood.

There was discussion about whether the backyard fence is in the historic district purview. The commission members agreed to do a site visit on Thursday, May 9, 2024, at 12pm to get a better understanding of the distances and visibility of the proposed fence.

MOTION: To accept receipt of application 24-HD-0015 – 63 Main Street North / Map 105, Lot 70 / MSD District & HD#1 and schedule for public hearing on June 3, 2024.

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

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

Aye Donnarumma, Fiftal, Messier, Kelz, Hickey

Nay None

Abstain None

• **24-HD-0016 – 57 Main Street North / Map 105, Lot 069 / MSD District & HD#1**

Robert & Adele McCarthy(applicant/owner) – Gary Nurnberger, Architect (agent)

Section 2: Light Fixtures – Install two (2) post mounted and one (1) building mounted lanterns.

Section 4: Stone Walls – Install stonewall and steps reusing existing stones, add bluestone patio.

Section 6: Demolition – Demolition of rear 1-story building appendage (replace with addition).

Section 7: Remodeling –

- Remove existing aluminum siding and existing cedar clapboard siding underneath and replace with new painted cedar clapboard siding.
- Repair window trim as needed.
- Remove above-ground propane storage tank.
- Install buried natural gas service line from street.
- Revise and add windows on south face of 1-story extension with new arrangement; add three (3) windows and replace three (3) windows (double hung, 12 over 12).
- Install new gable weather protection overhang supported by painted cedar brackets over front door.
- Install rectangular cedar drip edge weather protection at head of windows.

Section 8: Windows – Replace seventeen (17) existing wooden windows with seventeen (17) new wooden windows.

Section 9: Doors – Replace rear door wooden door with new slightly wider wooden door.

Section 10: Roof – Replace existing asphalt shingled roof with new cedar shingle roof.

Section 11: New Construction – Install 2-story addition (18 feet x 26 feet) to rear with new concrete foundation, granite steps to door, cedar clapboard siding and trim to match rest of replaced existing siding.

Architect Gary Nurnberger was present to speak on behalf of the application.

Chair Donnerumma questioned the door replacement. She asked if just the rear door was being replaced. Mr. Nurnberger clarified that it is just the rear door that will be replaced. A weather-protected gable over the front door, supported by brackets not columns, is being proposed.

Gary Nurnberger stated that the new addition in the back will be two stories and will be wider than what is there now but won't come out to the corners of the existing house. Looking from the street you won't be able to see the new addition and the rear door replacement.

Chair Donnarumma questioned the window replacement. Mr. Nurnberger stated that there are 17 existing windows on the house and there will be 17 new windows on the addition. The proposed plan is to replace the existing windows with replacement wood windows. Chair Donnarumma asked what the condition of the windows are now, and Mr. Nurnberger stated that they seem to be the original single-glazed windows. Chair Donnarumma expressed that the commission likes to see the windows repaired or restored.

The commission decided to do a site walk on Thursday May 9, 2024, at 12:30pm to get a feel of the proposed work's layout and the windows' condition.

Member Kelz questioned the replacement of the siding. Mr. Nurnberger stated that it is aluminum siding now and they won't know the condition of the cedar until the aluminum siding is off.

There was some discussion about giving a "blanket" approval to remove the siding and replace it with new cedar siding before seeing the condition of the cedar underneath. Member Messier was concerned that if they gave this "blanket" approval they would never see the condition of the existing siding and new will be put on. Mr. Nurnberger was agreeable to amend the application to state that replacement will occur if they determine the condition of the cedar is not workable.

Member Hickey questioned if they were keeping the same size windows that already exist and the answer was yes, they are keeping the same size and the same layout.

MOTION: To accept receipt of application 24-HD-0016 – 57 Main Street North / Map 105, Lot 069 / MSD District & HD#1 and schedule for public hearing on June 3, 2024.

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

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

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

MOTION: To allow Tom Schwenke to speak on behalf of his application 24-HD-0014 – 50 Main Street North / Map 105, Lot 77 / MSD District & HD#1 as he was not present earlier in the meeting.

Made by **HICKEY**, Seconded by **MESSIER**

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

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

- **24-HD-0014 – 50 Main Street North / Map 105, Lot 77 / MSD District & HD#1**

Thomas G. Schwenke (applicant/owner)

Section 12: Other – Install 24K generator and 100-gallon propane tank on north side of house, screen with fence and landscaping.

Member Kelz question the location of the new fencing. Mr. Schwenke stated there will not be new fencing just relocated the corner piece, so the generator is completely concealed. He will add additional planting if needed. He will bring a better drawing for the public hearing.

DELIBERATIONS

- **24-HD-0011 – 215 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 73A / MSD District & HD#1**
215 Mainwood, LLC (applicant/owner), Ray Manzi (principal)
Section 12: Other – Black metal railing for ADA Ramp.

Chair Donnarumma recused herself seating Alt. Member Winters.

Member Hickey felt that Mr. Manzi proposed a good solution for the handrail on the ramp.

MOTION: To approve (24-HD-0011 – 215 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 73A / MSD District & HD#1) a Certificate of Appropriateness for a black metal railing for ADA Ramp.

Made by **KELZ**, Seconded by **MESSIER**

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

Aye Fital, Messier, Kelz, Hickey, Winters

Nay None

Abstain None

- **24-HD-0013 – 305 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 85-4 / MSD District & HD#1**
Patrick Corrigan (applicant/owner)
Section 5: Fences- Install two (2) sections of wooden split rail fencing and one (1) section of wooden 6-foot-high stockade fencing.

Chair Donnarumma was reseated, unseating Alt. Member Winters.

The commission felt that the research was very thorough, and they didn't see a problem with the proposed fencing.

MOTION: To approve (24-HD-0013 – 305 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 85-4 / MSD District & HD#1) a Certificate of Appropriateness as proposed for two (2) sections of wooden split rail fencing and one (1) section of wooden 6-foot-high stockade fencing.

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

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

Aye Donnarumma, Fital, Messier, Kelz, Hickey

Nay None

Abstain None

- **Meeting Minutes** – April 1, 2024
 - Page 2 – Under new applications, first paragraph, says ADA complaint. Should say ADA compliant.
 - Page 3 – 4th paragraph – says application seemed like it was guidelines. Should say application seemed like it was a guideline.
 - Page 3 – 4th paragraph – says application wasn't necessary guidelines with immediate approval. Should say application wasn't necessarily guidelines for immediate approval.

MOTION: To accept the regular meeting minutes of April 1, 2024, as amended.

Made by **FITAL**, Seconded by **KELZ**

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

Aye Donnarumma, Fiftal, Messier, Kelz, Hickey

Nay None

Abstain None

ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

- A discussion was held regarding clarification for the below addresses.
 - Unicorn Holdings, LLC – 452 Main Street South
 - R.O.S.E.S. Holdings, LLC – 113 Main Street South
 - Rex K. Collum – 137 Main Street South
- A discussion about a blight ordinance follow-up from last month’s meeting. The Selectman’s office does not have a copy that was drafted in the past. Chair Donnerumma will try to get a copy.
- Member Hickey expressed that a blight ordinance comes with a lot of fear on the enforcement end because of the legal cost and that they can be used against people. It should be through the land use ordinances if it is well written.
- Alt. Member David Newell expressed his concern that new property owners need to know that they are in the Historic District and given the guidelines for the district. Something needs to be done to notify residents.
- Member Kelz agreed to form an Ad-HOC Committee on how to notify new property owners that they are in the Historic District.

COMMISSION HOUSEKEEPING

- Member Messier asked Chair Donnerumma to re-read the Historic Regulation that she read in the beginning of the meeting.

From the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation 1995 Section 6 - Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

He stated that materials were cited a little differently than design and color.

- Member Messier brings this up because there are things that come up in the Historic District. Things that can never be fixed again, for example, windows. He feels that they should be enforcing repair because once they are gone, they are gone forever. When we are talking about fences though. Fences are not a permanent part of the historic building, so when we say we don’t approve PVC fences, this is where we get into material and the standard says that material is not the thing it has to be. Its Design, color, and texture.

Chair Donnarumma read the town regulations:

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.

- *Discussion was had regarding doing site visits when they get siding and window applications, so they can see the state of the material.*

CORRESPONDENCE

- None

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

- Ray Manzi came forward. He stated that he is a lifelong resident of Woodbury. He expressed his concern about properties on Main Street that are in disrepair. He mentioned a couple of properties that have gone through some renovations over the past two years and that they look 100% better. They look better because the property owners have spent money to fix them up.

Manzi read *CHAPTER 97a HISTORIC DISTRICTS AND HISTORIC PROPERTIES, Sec. 7-147f. Considerations in determining the appropriateness* and expressed that nowhere in those regulations does it mandate that it must be the same materials. His understanding is that those regulations are more with keeping with the look, style, texture, and when possible certain materials. He knows that the town has its regulations, which state, that they can revise their regulations as necessary, but he feels that this gives the commission a little leeway to change parts of the regulations.

He questioned what the community wants. Do they want the town to look nice and charming or do they want to preserve properties using the same materials and have the properties run down? He encourages the commission to be open to changes and to encourage Main Street property owners to improve their property.

He is bringing this up because he received a letter regarding his existing railing on the front porch that is PVC material. The railings have been up since before he owned the property and now, he is being asked to replace them with cedar wood railings.

At what point does the commission vote on this because it doesn't seem like it was a consensus among commission members that they feel that the railing needs to be replaced, he questioned.

Chair Donnarumma responded that since there was a Certificate of Appropriateness issued for cedar rail replacement approved in 1996, then the railing needs to be of that material otherwise it's in violation of the Certificate of Appropriateness and becomes an enforcement issue.

After some discussion of who the enforcement comes from. Alt. Member Winters stated that there should be some statute of limitation as to a time frame that enforcement falls under. It should not extend to a new property owner when it wasn't properly enforced by the town.

Member Kelz stated that as a commission they have an obligation to notify the current property owner of a violation of the approved Certificate of Appropriateness. This violation is on the record that the railings on the property were not approved by the commission.

Chair Donnarumma expressed that their job as members of the Historic District Commission is to look at the property itself and preserve that property. It shouldn't matter if the property changed ownership the property needs to be preserved.

- Mr. Manzi also brought up some ideas to entice the cleanup. There has been a lot of talk about blight ordinances, but as discussed that is hard to enforce. Maybe starting a community chest where donations can be made for the property owners in the Historic District to use to paint their houses or do some landscaping and improve the part of the property that can be seen from the road.

ADJOURNMENT

- Hearing no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45pm

RECEIVED & FILED
IN WOODBURY, CT
This 20th day of May 2024
at 9:20 o'clock AM
Maria M Mancini
Town Clerk