



**Town of Woodbury
Historic District Commission**

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

MINUTES – June 5, 2023

REGULAR MEETING

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

MEMBERS ABSENT

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Judith Kelz
William Hickey

ALTERNATES ABSENT

Marc Kroll

NOTED OTHERS PRESENT

Aimee Natal, Michael Natal, Tuesday Rupp, Adam Maynard, Sean Llewellyn, Mary Tyrrell, Lydia Straus, Dolores Holmes, Thomas Arras, Marianne Daly, Priscilla Price, Jeff Leavenworth

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 Cheatham, Members Messier, Kolesnik and Alt. Member Hickey. Fiftal arrived late but was seated in place of Hickey before the first Public Hearing.
- **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.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- **23-HD-0012 – 10 Main Street North / Map 105, Lot 81 / MSD & HD#1**

Aimee Natal (applicant), Locomotion, LLC (owner)

Section 12: Other – Install gutters along both sides of existing building draining at rear into 50-gallon rain barrels with flat backs flush to building.

The Commission noted the agenda referenced 10 Main Street South where it should have referenced 10 Main Street North. The legal notice was correct in referencing 10 Main Street North.

Aimee Natal (10 Main Street North, Woodbury and 17 Pell Mell Drive, Bethel) and Michael Natal came forward to speak on behalf of the application. Their contractor suggested placing rain barrels with the gutters placed into the barrels to help with the drainage and rot that occurs around the foundation. They will also place a hose on the barrel in case there is overflow in which the water can then be directed to the back of the building to a rock garden that is in the courtyard between 10 and 12 Main Street North, both properties which they own. Michael went on to say that everything is out of site from the street except for the gutters. They are looking to make this improvement because the building had no gutters, and the water would splash down causing rot to the wood located near the foundation.

Mary Tyrrell (2 Main Street North) spoke in opposition to this change for the drainage problem it can cause, not the actual gutters. Her property has been in her family since the 1950's and there has never been a problem with water at this property, especially with it flowing into her septic system. She does understand that they need to protect the building from the splash back which she does agree that gutters are necessary, but she is concerned about the flow to the brook which is less than 10 feet from the building. This application never went to the inland/wetland agency for approval because the land use office felt it didn't need to, but what's going to happen with the top of the rain barrels if they are done with open mesh and if they get full and overflow. It's going to be the same situation they have without gutters causing splashing onto the building and the water will go into the watercourse without any treatment.

She went on to say that years ago the river went right through her property and followed the path of Main Street. It was changed by putting in piping at a 90-degree angle, so the drainage did not go onto Main Street. This change still needs to be protected. Ms. Tyrrell doesn't think a rain barrel will solve the problem and is also concerned for the property owners because the brook in back does overflow at times causing her property to have water in the basement. She is concerned that if the brook overflows and the overflow that goes into the rock garden gets to be too much the owners will also have a problem with water in the basement. She thinks that a better engineered plan would help solve the water impact needs.

Mr. Natal questioned what the commission is regulating. Are they regulating the water aspects or the historical aspects. Chair Donnarumma responded with the Commission looks at the physical parts. The leaders, the gutters and whatever goes onto the building.

Chair Donnarumma question the purpose of the rain barrel. Are the rain barrels designed to slow the drainage down? Mr. Natal said that all they want to do is get the water away from the building. He understands that there are other options other than the rain barrels and they do not want to affect any properties around them with making this improvement.

Ms. Tyrrell stated that since the building (10 Main Street North) was built the water has gone exactly where it needs to go without the gutters. It comes off one side and goes into the courtyard. It comes off the other side and goes near her property where it has time to seep into the ground and her parking lot is all gravel that is why the drainage is so good. She's concerned with concentrating the water which happens when you have leaders and gutters together. She doesn't know how the overflow from the barrels will affect the area but she's asking the Commission to take into consideration that if they are looking to preserve a building, they need to look at what will help preserve and not make it worse.

Kolesnik questioned the overflow system for clarification after hearing Ms. Tyrrell's concerns. He states that the water will now be concentrated, where in the past it just dripped of the roof line and then the overflow is reconcentrated to where it deposits. The Commission does not regulate where water flows, but Ms. Tyrrell's points are taken because they do regulate the preservation of the building. It is possible to ensure that the overflow hose, if it ever does overflow, can drain in a way that would not cause a problem.

Ms. Tyrrell stated that if a plan for construction was submitted to the town they would need to know where the gutters are discharging to. The amount of water is calculated and planned for accordingly.

Alt. Member Hickey stated that Main Street sits on bank run gravel, so the drainage is good. If they were to run a French drain would that solve the problem with the splash back onto the building, instead of the rain barrel? Maybe running it to a shallow dry well along the side of the building in a perforated pipe. It would be the same volume of water as they would have without gutters. Ms. Tyrrell's concerns with that solution is depending on the depth of the drain and the location in proximity to her septic system.

MOTION: To close the public hearing (23-HD-0012 – 10 Main Street North, Map 105, Lot 81 / MSD & HD#1)

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

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

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Messier, Fital, Kolesnik

Nay None

Abstain None

• **23-HD-0013 – 294 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 5 / MSD District & HD#1**

Tuesday Rupp (applicant), St. Paul's Episcopal Parish (owner)

Section 12: Other – Installation (retroactive approval sought) of a 60" x 36" x 12" free-standing food pantry cabinet in the front garden courtyard.

Tuesday Rupp (317 Main Street South) came forward to talk on behalf of the application. She stated that this is an unusual item that does not fall under any of the town ordinances. It's not a sign and not a structure. She presented pictures for the members to review the size and location.

Lydia Straus (331 Main Street South) stated that this seems to be a piece of furniture, kind of like patio furniture, park benches, it is not a structure.

Dolores Holmes (150 Middle Road Tpke) spoke, and she seems that this is an issue of form and function. Form because the item was modeled after the free food party like the one in South Britain which is also at a historic site. Function because it is to provide free food for people who really need it when the food bank is not open. What a better way for the congregation to be part of the community to give to the community in a meaningful way. It is situated in a way that is visible and doesn't take away from the church.

Thomas Arras (76 Main Street South) questioned if the Commission has a say on what the use is for. What is the Commission's responsibility for this structure?

Chair Donnarumma stated that they have no control on the use. They just look at the structure.

Vice Chair Cheatham asked if they discussed turning it. Ms. Rupp stated they did discuss it, but they thought that making it visible to the street makes it appealing and safer. If it was turned people could put in or take out anything that is not appropriate for the pantry. The high visibility is important for the purpose and safety.

Marianne Daly (351 Washington Road) spoke on behalf of the pantry. She volunteers at the Woodbury Food Bank and feels that this is a nice compliment to the food bank especially for the hours that the food bank is not open. She has seen people stopping a taking things out, but she has also witnessed people donating to it. It's a nice addition to our community.

Ms. Rupp went on to say that she has had a conversation with the resident state trooper, so they know when they are making their rounds to keep notice.

Priscilla Price (105 Hoop Pole Hill Road) wanted to address the Commission because it seems as though they are concerned with the visual aspect of the pantry if it fits into the historic district. She does feel that it just blends in with the church.

Jeff Leavenworth (7 Stone Pit Road) hasn't lived full time in Woodbury for many years but every time he comes back into town, he always looks to see what has changed in town. This year he was noticing the changes to the church with the copper roof and the steeple renovation. He thought to himself, what have they done with my church! This sounds like he isn't speaking in favor of the pantry, but he is. The pantry structure might not be pretty, but hunger isn't pretty either.

Lydia Straus (331 Main Street South) wanted to add that she is very much in favor of this because it enhances the character of the town. It shows that we support each other.

MOTION: To close the public hearing (23-HD-0013 – 294 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 5 / MSD District & HD#1)

Made by **MESSIER**, Seconded by **KOLESNIK**

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

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Messier, Fiftal, Kolesnik

Nay None

Abstain None

NEW APPLICATIONS

- **23-HD-0014 – 8 School Street / Map 105, Lot 121 / MSD & HD#1**
Applecourt, LLC (owner/applicant), Adam Maynard (contractor agent)
Section 10: Roof – Replace sections of existing asphalt roof shingles with new asphalt shingles; and replace 800 sf section of black tin roof with new asphalt shingles.

Adam Maynard (contractor agent) came forward. He stated that half of the building has old shingles, half of the building has newer asphalt shingles and about 800 square feet is a tin roof. The owner is looking to have the roof all the same material to be more uniform. The tin roof part of the roof faces School Street and the other side faces the neighbor's property.

Messier questioned which property this is. Mr. Maynard answered that this is the Tri Star office building. Kolesnik asked if any of the roof was visible from School Street because the Commission has jurisdiction from what is visible from the street and 200 feet in. Mr. Maynard confirmed that it is visible if you are in front of the Mitchell School.

MOTION: To accept the application (23-HD-0014 – 8 School Street / Map 105, Lot 121 / MSD & HD#1) and schedule a public hearing for July 3, 2023.

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

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

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Messier, Fital, Kolesnik

Nay None

Abstain None

- **23-HD-0015 – 7 Washington Road / Map 105, Lot 45A / MSD & HD#1**
Sean Llewellyn (applicant/owner)
Section 8: Windows – Remove one (1) existing wood window and replace with new wood window following wall repair.
Section 12: Other – Remove exterior wall shingles, restabilize (strengthen) and repair wall framing, replace exterior shingles in kind.
EXEMPTIONS REQUESTED per §7.2.1 (window and wall repair) Maintenance/Repair

Sean Llewellyn (7 Washington Road Apt #1) came forward. He is doing some structural repairs on the wall facing the Town of Washington and needs to repair a wall with a window, involving removal of the shingle siding, removal of a single existing wood window and replace with a new one wood window and then reapply the shingle siding for which an exemption is requested as repair.

MOTION: To approve exemption (23-HD-0015 – 7 Washington Road / Map 105, Lot 45A / MSD & HD#1) per §7.2.1 (ordinary maintenance or repair of any exterior architectural feature in the districts which does not involve a change in the appearance or design thereof) and issue an "Exemption" Certificate of Appropriateness

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

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

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Messier, Fital, Kolesnik

Nay None

Abstain None

DELIBERATIONS

- **23-HD-0012 – 10 Main Street North / Map 105, Lot 81 / MSD & HD#1**

Aimee Natal (applicant), Locomotion, LLC (owner)

Section 12: Other – Install gutters along both sides of existing building draining at rear into 50-gallon rain barrels with flat backs flush to building.

Messier would like a clarification on the barrel size. The application states the barrel will be 50 gallons but what was submitted is a ½ barrel. He believes a full barrel is 55 gallons so a ½ barrel will be 25 gallons. Seems to be decorative ½ barrel.

Kolesnik would like clarification but doesn't seem to be an impact on what they are approving. It just needs to be cleared up with what they will be using.

Chair Donnarumma stated that what is in front of them are the gutter and the rain barrels which are visible as well from the road. Concerns about the overflow and the damage it can cause to the structure itself and the basements involved in another matter.

Members talked about if they are approving the rain barrels, and no one seemed to have an issue with them so long as the motion was stated in a way that the runoff wouldn't affect the surrounding properties.

MOTION: To approve application (23-HD-0012 – 10 Main Street North / Map 105, Lot 81 / MSD & HD#1) and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with the provision that any overflow from the rain barrels be directed such that it replicates or improves upon existing run-off that occurs without gutters.

Made by **KOLESNIK**, Seconded by **MESSIER**

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

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Messier, Fiftal, Kolesnik

Nay None

Abstain None

- **23-HD-0013 – 294 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 5 / MSD District & HD#1**

Tuesday Rupp (applicant), St. Paul's Episcopal Parish (owner)

Section 12: Other – Installation (retroactive approval sought) of a 60" x 36" x 12" free-standing food pantry cabinet in the front garden courtyard.

Chair Donnarumma thinks that the pantry structure is obtrusive to the front of the church. You really want to see the church door and steps and just turning it will change the visibility. It might not be as visible when traveling north on Main Street.

Vice Chair Cheatham agrees that the pantry structure should be turned or moved to another location. She understands that people want it right up front but the obligation to the structure of the buildings must be considered.

Fiftal loves the idea and wants to support it, but the location needs to be separated from the church.

Kolesnik stated this is not part of the building. The function of a church is to be part of the community and changes to these buildings must occur as evolution occurs. This is not a change to the building in any way shape or form. It is a separate structure, piece of furniture whatever you want to call it. It enhances the streetscape. This presents a change but it's not visually offensive. It does not impair the historic value of the church.

MOTION: To approve application (23-HD-0013 – 294 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 5 / MSD District & HD#1) and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness as is without modification.

Made by **MESSIER**, Seconded by **KOLESNIK**

Vote: 2-3-0 **Not Approved** – Motion Failed

Aye Messier, Kolesnik

Nay Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fiftal

Abstain None

MOTION: To approve application (23-HD-0013 – 294 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 5 / MSD District & HD#1) and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to the turning of the orientation of the pantry structure 90-degrees so the front face of the structure faces North, and the side faces Main Street.

Made by **DONNARUMMA**, Seconded by **Failed to garner a second**.

Discussion ensued regarding the merits of turning the structure 90 degrees or in the alternative, setting it back further into the site, behind the front façade of the church building.

MOTION: To approve application (23-HD-0013 – 294 Main Street South / Map 104, Lot 5 / MSD District & HD#1) and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to moving the location of the pantry structure back into the site, so the front face of the pantry structure is offset and behind the front wall façade of the adjacent church building.

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

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

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Messier, Fiftal

Nay Kolesnik

Abstain None

Kolesnik stated for his opposition that he considers this a piece of furniture, and in the alternative, not a structure that impairs the streetscape.

Hickey was seated for Kolesnik

- **Meeting Minutes** – May 1, 2023

Corrections:

- Page 5, second to last paragraph should have said manufacturers *not* manufacture.
- Page 6, first sentence should have said manufacturers *not* manufacture.

MOTION: To accept meeting minutes of May 1, 2023, as amended.

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

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

Aye Donnarumma, Cheatham, Fital, Messier, Hickey

Nay None

Abstain None

OTHER BUSINESS

Chair Donnarumma asked the members if they had done any research on the towns they were assigned to for information on those historic districts:

- Vice Chair Cheatham was assigned Fairfield and found it fascinating because they have a philosophy on preservation. They gave their philosophy and recommendation in each of the three different districts. In each district they know about all the architectural features, what they are made of and how you should go about preserving them. Along with their three districts they separated it out by properties. She found that Fairfield was quite thorough.
- Cheatham suggests having separate meetings to go through each town and then creating a handbook for the people in the districts and that the Commission oversees it.
- Chair Donnarumma has Washington and most of the guidelines were written by commissioner George Krimsley who is a journalist. They are well written and well researched.
- Kolesnik stated that he has spent some time lately in Fairfield. He has read their regulations and looked at their applications. He took photos of some very historic homes where they have varied their regulations to allow the Fibrex windows to be installed where appropriate.
- Alt. Member Kelz stated that a separate meeting should occur, and they should make specific guidelines on what they will approve and what they won't. That's their obligation to let people know what will be appropriate. A definition of the Commission says that they will make suggestions and they don't do that. They really must be careful with what they are approving and does not agree with Kolesnik when he said that the pantry structure, stated in the public hearing, was a piece of furniture. They are setting a precedent for different situations without having hard guidelines.
- Kolesnik brought in a sample of the Fibrex windows from his house that were approved nine years ago and that are in 75% of his house so the Commission can see what they truly look like.

CORRESPONDENCE

- None

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

- Thomas Arras – 76 Main Street South – As stated last month he suggested approving the minutes after the public comment period because there are omissions in the minutes, and they are getting approved with these omissions.

He went on to state that the part he wanted on the record was the exchange between Messier and himself about the covenant agreement on Messier’s house, the Glebe house and he questioned if there were other buildings in town with such covenants. He felt that this was an important part of the exchange and to be omitted and approved makes the minutes not accurate.

Kolesnik responded to him that the minutes are just a summary and is not opposed to approving the minutes at the end of the meeting. So, if the public did see something the Commission missed, they could consider it.

A discussion was had about when the minutes should be approved, and that the approval is made by the Commission and not the public.

Another question he had was when did the Commission approve the Zoning Enforcement Officer? To which, Chair Donnarumma stated that they don’t have the authority to approve employees. They are not an elected Commission stated Cheatham they are appointed. There are things that can’t do that other Commissions can do legally.

Fiftal questioned next month’s meeting. Is there a meeting on July 3rd? The Commission determined that they should have enough people for a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 9:34 pm.

RECEIVED & FILED
IN WOODSBURY, CT
The 12th day of June 2023
at 3:52 o'clock P.M.
Manuela P. Mancini
Town Clerk