MAYOR
DAVID MARTIN

DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS
ERNIE ORGERA

LAND USE BUREAU CHIEF
NORMAN F. COLE, A.I.C.P
Tel: (203) 977-4714

CITY OF STAMFORD
HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY COMMISSION

888 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD
P.O. Box 10152
STAMFORD, CT 06904 -2152

FINAL Minutes of the Historic Preservation Advisory Commission (HPAC)

Date:	Regular Meeting held: August 4, 2015
Location:	Stamford City Hall, 888 Washington Blvd. Stamford CT 06901 6th fl., Safety Training Room
Present:	Attending: Lynn Drobbin, Anne Goslin, Jill Smyth, David Woods, Barry Hersh, Alternates: Lynn Villency Cohen. Absent: Rebecca Shannonhouse, Elena Kalman

REGULAR MEETING
I. Call to order (Meeting called to order 7:09 pm)

II. Approval of July 7th meeting minutes
The Commission voted to approve the minutes of the July 7 meeting. No changes were noted.
(Moved by J. Smyth. and seconded by A. Goslin, and carried unanimously)

III. New Business

A. KT Murphy Elementary School Repairs
1. Jeff Pardo, of the engineering bureau, presented proposed changes to the school. It was built in 1922. The Building has been ignored for many years. Wood is rotted. The plan is to replace the dome on the cupola. They will be duplicating the metal with aluminum and will be painted to match the existing in white. The trims will be replaced with wood trims of same shape and size.

2. They are not changing the architecture. The asphalt shingles will be repaired and they will be replacing the windows above the roof line.

3. HPAC was asked to provide a letter of support for the work presented.

(A motion was made to approve the repairs presented and provide a letter of support, by J. Smyth and seconded by A. Goslin, and carried unanimously)

B. Sachs Farm, Proposed addition to cottage at 393 Webbs Hill

1. Kimberly Marteli presented this cottage on a 100 acre property on Webbs Hill Road. The cottage dates to about 1920. They intend to maintain the existing conditions of the property. There are no modifications to the front, facing Webs Hill. The addition is at the back of the building and not visible from Webbs Hill Road. The existing siding will remain and be matched at the addition. The addition is intended to be the same traditional colonial style. About 1,200 SF is in the original cottage and the addition is about 963. SF.

2. D. Woods commented that the roof at the new addition looks like a low pitch and does not look like the other roofs of the cottage. They could have used the same pitch to match the look of the cottage. The upper roof line at the ridge also does not look correct where it shifts along the north elevation. The roof ridge and eve should line up.

3. K. Martell noted that the roof shifts because the floor changes in height. The low pitch was used so there will be head room at the outside wall as they do not want to raise the peak of the roof beyond the original. She further said that they will take another look at the roof conditions.

(A motion was made to approve the changes that were presented to the commission and provide a letter to the ZBA in support of the project, by B. Hersh and seconded by J. Smyth and carried unanimously.)

IV. Old Business

A. Sacred Heart School, update

1. Tina Greco of Perkins Eastman made a presentation of the progress with the Sacred Heart school site. The project has progressed into phase 2 at this time . The phases of work are:

1st phase is hazardous abatement
2nd phase is light renovations, get gym and classroom “lightly” altered for K through 2 occupancy in September of 2016.
3rd phase is addition on South side. Work is to start after phase 2 occupancy.
4th phase is a full renovation of the main building after the new building is built; windows will be replaced, etc.

2. There are two cottages available for reuse or sale. The barn is also on the site and a preliminary evaluation is in progress.

3. T. Greco presented the barn progress to date. The barn will remain where it is. The team is pursuing “moth-balling” to follow standards. The conservation plan has to go to CT state office of school facilities with the rest of the school project. No programmatic decisions have been made.

4. Richard Wies noted the research that has been done already. They do not want to have any “demolition by neglect” -–They have begun to evaluate what is needed to stabilize the building.

5. R Weis talked about “moth-balling”. There is advanced decay. The first concern is to make temporary repairs to roof. The second issue is the “porous” wrapper. The third is to keep the structure ventilated, to stave off mold growth. The fourth is utility shut off. The fifth is new power and data lines to the building for security and emergency lights. Lastly, there will be periodic inspections of the building.

6. The project work for Phase two “light construction” will be out to bid in October. The moth-balling work on the barn must stay with the over all construction phase because of state funding applications. Work on the barn cannot take place in advance of phase two school house work.

7. L. Drobbin asked if it is possible that other interior stabilization will occur at the same time. She asked if the cupola has been evaluated for stability and structural integrity. The answer was that a camera has been used inside for evaluation as it is unsafe to walk around at this time. Mr. Wies noted it looks stable from this observation.

8. L. Drobbin asked if the roof and rafters look fairly stable from the inside. R Wies had a similar answer that their observations are that it is fairly stable. Lynn has a concern that there might be a storm that can bring down parts of the structure. The group generally agrees that stabilization should occur as soon as possible as this is a valuable historical structure to the city.

9. L. Drobbin also noted HNP’s concern with the hazardous material abatement plus seismic enhancements that may be required, could lead to some demolition. HNP further requested that this work be moved to first phase so that demolition will not be needed. R. Wies noted that the group has never considered demolition and that stabilization does not require interior structural work in the second phase of construction. The grant application for funding requests money to restore the building for the children’s use.

10. L. Drobbin likes that main building is focal point in the site circulation and questioned If the “new” south side building is going to be similar or compatible with the original main building. L. Greco stated that the design has not been done yet and it is just a massing model that was used at the interview presentation. The existing classroom building is about 30,000 SF and the new addition in phase 3 is around 70,000 SF., but it could be as little as 50,000. The program for that building has not been done.

11. J. Smyth asked if the team it taking the whole site into consideration and have they reviewed the trees and landscape options. She also asked if existing trees will be saved? Tina noted that there will not be much site work in phase two as it is limited renovation work. The site is intended to be the same until the design for the phase 3 new building is considered. The Tree warden has been to the site a couple of times. They want to conserve the important trees. The drive off of Strawberry Hill Ave. remains as is.

12. L Drobbin also asked if they are taking into account some of the older architectural features of the original school building. Tina noted that safety needs will be addressed first including the hardware on doors and security systems. Phase two light renovations will be according to “IBC, Chapter 34” standards. The first floor will be accessible. An elevator will be in the later phase 4. The entrance to the first floor will be made accessible by a new door at south entrance. They will redo the toilets and have some new flooring where asbestos tiles are removed as a part of the abatement. The ceiling plaster work looks like it is clear from hazardous materials. Tina also stated that they will need to remove and save fire egress doors, as the fire stair needs to be enclosed with 2 hr walls.

13. T. Greco stated that the team will continue to meet. The next step is to complete the DD WHAT IS DD documentation and provide that to CT office for school facilities, for review. The DD set will be sent over to HAPC at that time.

14. L. Drobbin added that HNP has an update on the listing for the sale of the cottages. The listing has been accepted by the CT trust. It missed a publication deadline, and will be in the next issue. Lynn will check with Wes on progress.

(Three were no requests of HPAC at this time and the item was tabled without further decision. Review of status will be on going)

B. Hoyt Barnum House Relocation, update

1. Jeff Pardo of the engineering bureau provided an update of the progress. Last Friday the city received 3 proposals for the architectural consultant and will interview all three August 17 th.. HNP has asked that M. Diamond represent HNP in the interviews and selection of the architect.

2. L. Drobbin noted that demolition and relocation was approved by board of reps, Land use committee at last night's meeting. She also noted that C. Reeder resigned in protest.

3. J. Pardo stated that the schedule is to have a contract with the architect consultant by Sept 7th The Historic Structures Report is to be finalized in the fall of 2015. The report and recommendations for the move will be provided to SHPO in November. There is also a February 15 submission for the state's March meeting. SHPO approvals are anticipated in May of 2016. The city will issue the request for bids in the summer of 2016, and anticipate the move in October of 2016.

4. An archaeologist will be able to do evaluations in just a few days and will work with SHS. The schedule will be determined by the city.

(The item was tabled without further decision. Review of status will be on going)

C. Findings of HPAC jurisdiction

1. L. Drobbin noted there was a meeting with the city's corporate council, Kathryn Emmett on July 23rd. There were two issues reviewed with the group.

a. . There is no procedure or time frame for referrals and responses to HPAC resolutions, and no procedure or process of the next steps. K. Emmett will be working on a time frame and standards for city responses.

b HPAC is the only commission in the city that does not have a staff liaison. K. Emmett will be looking into the role of staff liaison.

2. K. Emmett will be looking into theses two issues and will report back.

(The item was tabled without further decision. Review of status will be ongoing)

D. Coastal Survey, status
1. R. Shannonhouse met with SHPO and W. Haynes and reported that the state is open to the consideration of the Cove/ E. Main neighborhood to be part of a historic resources inventory in the Coastal Survey study.

2. HNP will be speaking to Cove neighborhood association on August 17th.

(A motion was made by L. Drobbin to make a resolution to support the HRI in their Sandy recovery project, in the Cove and the E. Main Neighborhoods. The motion was seconded by B. Hersh and passed unanimously)

E. Atlantic Street PO, update
1. W. Haynes reported by email that the developer wants to begin preparing the building for potential tenants and to support public access to the building.

2. They want to have a walk through for observation and identification of historic fabric with SHPO on August 11, at 11:00 AM. D. Woods agreed to represent HPAC and to attend the walk through.

(The item was tabled without further decision. Review of status will be ongoing)

F. Programming Updates
1. W. Haynes reported by e-mail that HNP is considering refocusing the organization on education.. J. Norinsky also stated that there is an idea to establish partnerships with the public school system for educating younger persons.

2. B. Hersh noted that the HPAC programming subcommittee has discussed having a preservation architect speak about successful projects. There may be options to partner with DSSD.

3. The HPAC subcommittee will continue to explore ideas. J. Norinsky would like to be a part of that discussion.

(The item was tabled without further decision. Review of status will be ongoing)

G. Status of Pending Demolitions
1. 9 Hobbie St.: There will be a meeting with the owner to review options with HNP.

2. Planet pizza site on Summer St.: The owners have not pursued discussion with HNP. All believe their intention is to wait out the demolition delay and tear the building down. It looks like there is very little the group can do as any new construction will be “as of right”.

3. J. Smyth reported there are 4 demolitions requests in July. She reviewed the 4 and determined that they should not file a delay request. All agreed that HPAC will not pursue delay for these.

4. W. Haynes also stated that HNP may step back from demolition reviews, and allow HPAC to take the lead.

(The item was tabled without further decision. Review of status will be on going)

H. Grants update
1. A. Goslin noted that the RFP has not been issued for Glenbrook Historic Survey. It will be soon.

(The item was tabled without further decision. Review of status will be on going)

V. Adjournment

L. Drobbin adjourned the meeting at 9:28 PM. (There was no further discussion.)

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Woods AIA Secretary
Historic Preservation Advisory Commission