**WASHINGTON HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

**Bryan Hall Memorial Plaza**

**Washington Connecticut 06793**

**Minutes – October 16, 2017**

7:00 PM Main Level Conference Room

Members Present: Susan Averill, Jane Boyer, Tom Hollinger, Sally Woodroofe, Phyllis Mills

Members Absent: None

Alternates Present: Bill Fairbairn, Dimitri Rimsky, Louise Van Tartwijk

Alternates Absent: None

Others: Craig Ciarlone, CSC Construction

Peter Becker, Head of School, The Gunnery

William Zekas, Chief Financial Officer and Business Manager Andrew Richards, Visual Arts Department Chair

Richard Connell, AIA, Principal, The S/L/A/M Collaborative

Geoffrey Gaunt, AIA, Senior Associate, The S/L/A/M Collaborative

Mr. Hollinger called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM and seated Mr. Fairbairn for Ms. Mills

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness by Melissa and Russell Triedman,119 Calhoun Street, Washington CT for a proposed extension of an existing stone wall along Calhoun Street and replacement of iron railing system with a cedar railing system, west side of house.

Mr. Craig Ciarlone of CSC Construction represented the owners, Melissa and Russell Triedman. The clerk distributed Plot Plan Elevations A-100.00, A-101.00, A-102.00 and A-103.00 to the commissioners.

Ms. Mills arrives at 7:12 and is seated. Mr. Fairbairn returns to Alternate status.

Stone Wall - Questions Asked and Answered:

Q. What material will be used for the extension of the stone wall?

A. The extension of the stone wall will be the same material as the existing wall, matching height and width.

Q. How high will the stone wall be?

A. 34” to 36”

Q. Commissioners asked what the top of the stone wall will look like. Prefer not to have a flat top.

A. The stone wall will not be flat on top.

Railing - Questions Asked and Answered:

Mr. Ciarlone explained that the iron system is rotted, unsafe and non-code compliant. It will be replaced with a cedar rail system on the west side of the house. The new rail system will be cedar newels and balusters painted white. The newels will be secured into masonry via metal posts into the bottom of the newel.

Mr. Hollinger asked if there were any more questions and comments and there were none.

MOTION: To close the public hearing on the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness by Melissa and Russell Triedman, 119 Calhoun Street, Washington CT to extend the existing stone wall along Calhoun Street and to replace the existing iron railing system with a cedar railing system. By Ms. Boyer, seconded by Ms. Woodroofe, passed 5 to 0.

This public hearing was recorded. Audio is available in the Land Use Office, Washington Town

Hall

1. Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness by The Gunnery Incorporated, 99 Green Hill Road, Washington CT for a proposed 32,000 square foot Arts and Community Center

Mr. Hollinger provided a Summary of the October 16, 2017 public hearing for The Gunnery’s

proposed Arts and Community Center as follows:

The application is for a new Arts and Community Center to be located on the campus.

Peter Becker, Head of School, gave opening remarks on why the school feels the need for the new building and why the choice of location. He stated that currently, Gunnery students and faculty must cross Rte. 47 three times a week for school meetings stopping traffic on the hill. This means roughly 300 or more people moving across Rte. 47. In addition, students going to all music, theater and art classes must cross Rte. 47 which happens at many times in the day and into the evening. The school feels that this is not particularly safe. In addition, the existing theater and arts facilities are inadequate for a high quality program. The current theater seats only 240 people which is below the current enrollment which makes it difficult to stage plays and concerts. The visual arts portion of the building would also allow for improved studios. Mr. Becker then introduced the architects from SLAM who presented the overall plan. They provided booklets to all Commissioners with photos and plans of the new structure and proposed parking lot.

The Commissioners first asked questions regarding the new proposed parking lot that would be located in an area directly behind the stone wall near the upper entrance. Commissioners expressed some concern about visibility of the lot from Kirby Road. The architects provided pictures of what might be visible and the pictures showed only the tops of a few cars. The most visible part of the lot will be a new pavilion at the corner of the lot to provide shelter for students waiting for pick-up. A design for the pavilion was presented to the Commission. The architects explained that the new parking lot would replace the existing one in front of Solley/Brown. This area will become grass. The number of spaces in the new lot will be only slightly more than in the existing lot. Efforts will be made to protect the interesting topographical features of the area, i.e. rock outcroppings, etc.

The deliberations then moved on to focus on the proposed new building. The Commission asked questions regarding scale in relation to existing buildings such as Solley/Brown, Emerson Dorm and Teddy House Dormitory. The proposed building will be 32,000 sq. feet. That is 25% larger than Solley/Brown; the new building will face Solley Brown. The architects explained that the design attempted (through the use of the gradient) to have the building fit more into the hill so that on the upper side facing Solley /Brown the building would appear to be one story tall while the back would be two stories. Commissioners asked about the glass wall which faces in toward the campus and about the pitch of the roof line as well as the height of the chimney. The Commission expressed some concern about the height of the chimney and the frame peak in the design. The architects presented the actual elevations which then cleared up the questions. The architects stated that all zoning regulations regarding height would be observed.

Commissioners asked about the materials to be used in the building. The overall design is a modern adaptation of a Tudor design meant to echo the existing buildings on that portion of campus. Pictures were provided to show other Tudor style buildings nearby. In terms of material, the Commission was pleased that local stone from Waterbury would be used in the building and the new terrace walls. Although landscaping does not fall within the purview of the Commission, the members were pleased to see that an effort will be made to use native trees and plants.

The Commission asked about the window frame materials and about the extent of light which might come through. The architects explained that there is a system of blinds designed to mitigate light into the night sky.

The use of “Hardie Board” will be used for the Tudor trim and the walls. The architects received some input from neighbors about both windows and stucco which was taken into consideration when finalizing the design. The stucco will not be a bright white but more muted and less blinding.

The Commission expressed concern about the overall mass of the building but basically agreed that there weren’t many options for the school given the confines in the District. The Commissioners were pleased how the mass of the building was broken up by different wings, especially the wing that will house the visual arts. The elements that reflected the surrounding Tudor buildings were noted and commended. The architects did offer that at some point Emerson Dormitory which was built in the 1960’s as a temporary building would at some point be removed and the site would become lawn sweeping over toward Graham House and restoring open space. This will act to mitigate the sense of size.

The Commission asked about proposed lighting. The architects said that the lighting would be in the actual railings at the building and other lighting would be in the walls. The material sheets provided had examples. There will not be lights in tress or on lamp posts. There was some discussion about the need for a lighting plan and whether it should be required. The issue was taken up at the regular meeting session on the application.

Overall, the commission commended the school for coming up with a design that tipped its hat to the old campus style while creating a new and modern building.

MOTION: To close the public hearing on the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness by The Gunnery Incorporated, 99 Green Hill Road, Washington CT for a proposed 32,000 sq. ft. Arts and Community Center. By Ms. Mills, seconded by

Ms. Woodroofe, passed 5 to 0.

I. Regular Business

A. Call to order

B. Seating of members and alternates

II. Pending Business

1. Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness by Melissa and Russell Triedman,119 Calhoun Street, Washington CT for a proposed extension of an existing stone wall along Calhoun Street and replacement of an iron railing system with a cedar railing system, west side of house.

Mr. Hollinger asked if there were any further questions or comments. There were none.

MOTION: To approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness submitted by

Melissa and Russell Triedman, 119 Calhoun Street, Washington CT to extend the existing stone wall along Calhoun Street and to replace the existing iron railing system with a cedar railing system. By Mr. Hollinger, seconded by Ms. Mills, passed 5 to 0.

1. Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness by The Gunnery Incorporated, 99 Green Hill

Road, Washington CT for a proposed 32,000 square foot Arts and Community Center

Mr. Hollinger seats Mr. Fairbairn and Ms. Boyer is unseated for the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Hollinger asked if there were any further questions or comments. Ms. Woodroofe stated

that lighting plans should be reviewed by the HDC in order to provide input. Comments from

Commissioners included:

* the A frame front of the building did not appear as stark as first thought
* one member stated that she was pleasantly surprised and the architects did a great job
* a commissioner stated that she likes all aspects and that the Center is a necessary building for The Gunnery
* a member commented that the new building is a critical addition for The Gunnery and likes the entire plan; good for the Town of Washington
* a center for visual and performing arts should have a pleasing aesthetic feeling with an edgy slant toward the Tudor architecture of the surrounding buildings

In summary, it was the consensus by the majority of the members that this building will be an enhancement to the Town of Washington.

MOTION: To approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness submitted by

The Gunnery, Incorporated, 99 Green Hill Road, Washington CT for the construction of a 32,000 square foot Arts and Community Center in accordance with the plans and presentation materials prepared by the S/L/A/M Collaborative for the October 16, 2017 HDC Public Hearing as stated in this motion**:**

* 24 Page Project Presentation Booklet dated September 25, 2017
* 37 page Set of drawings and site plans S/L/A/M Collaborative Project #1624800
* computerized renderings – street views, exterior building angles, landscaping and more
* color pamphlets:
  + curtain wall systems
  + architectural systems for commercial light
  + roofing - asphalt shingles, grey
  + exterior walls – stucco, off white
  + trim - fiber cement trim, grey
  + windows - aluminum, grey
  + stone – natural granite, grey, light grey, brown blend exterior which will be locally quarried in Waterbury CT
  + LED illuminated railing system
  + step lighting

By Mr. Fairbairn, seconded by Mr. Hollinger and passed 4 to 1.

Vote Count:

Susan Averill – Yes William Fairbairn – Yes Sally Woodroofe - No

Thomas Hollinger - Yes Phyllis Mills – Yes

Ms. Woodroofe stated that the lighting is important. The HDC should have input into what is planned for lighting.

III. Consideration of the Minutes – August 21, 2017 (no September 18 meeting). The members reviewed the August 21, 2017 meeting minutes and there were no corrections.

MOTION: To approve the August 21, 2017 minutes as written. By Ms. Averill, seconded by Ms. Boyer, passed 5 to 0.

IV. Motion to Include Subsequent Business Not on the Agenda

MOTION: To include subsequent business not on the agenda: 1) Discuss the Connecticut Delay of Demolition Ordinance. By Ms. Woodroofe, seconded by Mr. Hollinger, passed 5 to 0.

Ms. Woodroofe made reference to *The Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation* section on Demolition Delay Ordinance dated February 2017. There is a model ordinance stated in The Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation Website entitled *Model Demolition Delay Ordinance – February 2017.*The model states that there is *a two-stage review process, first to determine whether a particular building or structure is architecturally or historically significant, and then to determine whether the demolition delay should be imposed*. *Properties that are listed on the State or National Register of Historic Places may also be subject to limitations against “unreasonable destruction” under the Connecticut Environmental Protection Act (C.G.S. 22a-14 through 22a-20).*

*BUILDINGS - DELAY OF DEMOLITION Sec. [n] – 1. TITLE AND PURPOSE*

*This chapter of the municipal code shall be known as An Ordinance to Encourage the Preservation of Architecturally and Historically Significant Buildings by Delay of Demolition.*

Note – Verbiage in italics is from the Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation website

Ms. Woodroofe suggested forming a subcommittee to look into this and several members offered

to help. They thought it was a great idea.

Below is the link for information on The Town of Washington.

<https://cttrust.org/demo-delay/ordinances>

MOTION: To adjourn. By Mr. Hollinger, seconded by Ms. Averill, passed 5 to 0.

Submitted subject to approval,

Janice Roberti, Historic District Commission Clerk October 27, 2017