CITY OF BRIDGEPORT HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING OCTOBER 5, 2021

ATTENDANCE: Guy Horvath, Chair; Kristen Alvanson, Tim O'Connor, Rachel Rockwell,

Susan Tabachnick, Stuart Sachs (6:32 p.m.)

OTHERS: Paul Boucher, Asst. Zoning Administrator; Atty. John Bolton, Gloria

Penaranda, Steve Farrell, Judith Miller Shanner, Katherine Lantiqua,

Robert Kootu, Rocco DeBrezio

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Horvath called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. He called the roll and noted that that there was a quorum present.

Mr. Horvath then reviewed the rules of the meeting. He noted that there had been a request to review the minutes of September 7th and added that he had not been present at the meeting. Ms. Tabachnick was the Acting Chair at that meeting.

Mr. Sachs joined the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

<u>SEPTEMBER 7, 2021</u> (Tabachnick, Sachs, O'Connor, Alvanson, Rockwell)

Ms. Tabachnick stated that the first sentence of the first paragraph, she believed that they were speaking about affordability rather than accessibility.

Ms. Tabachnick said that in the second sentence of the second paragraph mentions "sighting" but it should be the "siding".

Ms. Tabachnick said that the third paragraph begins with the statement that "an application for more money for the restoration has been filed". She stated that she did not know what that meant. She said that it appeared to mean that the cost of the restoration was greater than the original estimates in the file.

On page 3, under Application 2021-20, Ms. Tabachnick stated that the applicant was the wife of the late Charles Shanner and Miller was Ms. Shanner's maiden name.

Regarding Application 2021-17, Ms. Tabachnick said the last line on the page noted that they table the application and have a re-submitted application. It needs to be clarified that the application that was being addressed was with John Bolton.

Ms. Rockwell said that under the conditions for approval for application 2021-18, the mullions must be placed on the outside of the glass and not between the two panes. It should be clarified that this should be on the exterior of the house.

On page 5, under 2021-20, Ms. Rockwell said that she had voted in favor of the item and did not abstain.

Mr. O'Connor noted that his last name was mis-spelled. (The spelling is consistent with the Historic Commission listing on the City website.)

- ** MR. O'CONNOR MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 7, 2021 WITH THE CHANGES NOTED.
- ** THERE WAS A SECOND.
- ** THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 7, 2021 WITH THE CHANGES NOTED PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

CONTINUED BUSINESS

There was no continued business at this time.

DEFERRED BUSINESS

There was no deferred business at this time.

TABLED BUSINESS

APPLICATION #2021-17 -- of Gloria Penaranda/Timoteo Zabala for restoration repairs to restore the appearance of the house located at the address of 194 Arctic Street.

Mr. Horvath said that he had not been at the meeting when the original application was presented.

Ms. Tabachnick said the changes were made in response to the initial meeting they had with the applicant. The revised application includes the Commission's requested changes. Atty. Bolton, who was representing. She asked whoever was presenting the application to come forward, state their name and present the application.

Atty. Bolton came forward, greeted the Commissioners and stated that he was representing Ms. Penaranda. He said that the summary of the last meeting was correct and noted that his interpretation was not incorrect but a misunderstanding as to what was being represented on the application and what he had presented to the Commission.

Atty. Bolton said it should have been straightened out and he had spent some time at the Zoning Office reviewing the documents. He said that the Secretary of Interior's standards for restoring historic properties and believed that substitute materials might be appropriate. However, they will follow the Commission's interpretation of the September 7th application. There was no objection to the installation of aluminum gutters and leaders because they did not discuss it at the previous meeting.

Atty. Bolton said that the issue appeared to be the encapsulation of what might appear to be an EPA concern. He checked with the EPA and they do not have any major concerns with his client. Atty. Bolton said that he was previously unaware of the District, P.T. Barnum and the variety of structures that were built there. He said that everything that the Commission expects his client to do will be undertaken. The only caveat is that there will be an eye towards sustainability and resiliency with some type of natural hazard.

One of the applicant's concern was the cost of the restoration. The Commissioners to make sure that Atty. Bolton and the applicant were familiar with historic tax credits. Atty. Bolton said that he had informed his client of this. Discussion followed.

Atty. Bolton said that he was a Westport Zoning Commissioner and had a great deal of respect for the Historic Commissioners.

The discussion moved to the aluminum gutters and leaders in terms of profile or color.

Mr. Horvath thanked Ms. Penaranda and Atty. Bolton.

Atty. Bolton asked the Commission if these were preference were requests or mandates. Ms. Tabachnick explained that this portion of the meeting focuses on the application and then the recommendations are made later.

Mr. Horvath asked if there was anyone who was in favor of the application. No one signaled that they were in favor. Mr. Horvath then asked if there was anyone who was opposed to the application. No one signaled that they wished to address the Commission.

Mr. Horvath announced that the next item would be Application 2021-21.

Application #2021-21 – of Yves Fequierre/Bright Planet Solar for rooftop solar panel installation on the house located at the address of 164 Elmwood Place.

3

City of Bridgeport Historic District Commission Regular Meeting October 5, 2021 It was noted that the applicant did not appear to be present on the call. Mr. Horvath stated that they would come back to the application if the applicant joined the call.

Application # 2021-22 of Steve Farrell for new shingle replacement, copper flashing, and half-round gutters and leaders on the house located at 68 Brooklawn Place.

Mr. Steve Farrell said that he was attending the meeting via a phone call. He explained that his roof had suffered wind damage and needed immediate repairs. The shingles and half round gutters were replaced, as indicated on the application.

Ms. Tabachnick said that copper flashing had also been on the house. Mr. Farrell said that the photos of the work were attached to the application. Ms. Tabachnick asked if the photos were of the damage prior to the repair or of the work. Mr. Farrell said that the photos show the repairs with the correct gutters and flashing.

Mr. Farrell was asked if he had sought any help from the Commission prior to making the emergency repairs or if he had the work done without approval. Mr. Farrell said that he had been advised that he needed the Commission's approval, but time was of the essence. A discussion followed that included the warranty for the work and the type of gutters used on the building.

There was a brief discussion regarding the warranty on the materials used.

Mr. Horvath asked if there was anyone who was in favor of the application to raise their hand. There was no response. He then asked if there was anyone who was opposed to the application to raise their hand. There was no response.

Mr. Horvath said that this section of the application was closed and that the Commission would discuss it during their decision session.

Application# 2021-23 of Judith Miller Shanner for replacement fence in the rear of the property located at 60 Brooklawn Avenue.

Ms. Judith Miller Shanner greeted the Commissioners. She said that in 2018, a neighbor's tree fell on her fence surrounding her courtyard and on her sunporch. The insurance company gave her a budget to meet and this was problematic. She explained that she wanted the same height for the wooden fence but there was nothing available. Her contractor found a fence supplier that had a style of fencing that works much better with the house since it is a real Colonial picket style as opposed to the Victorian Gothic style. It will be easier to maintain because there was no way to paint the previous fencing because it was unwieldy. She said that she felt it looked much better and fit with the style of the house which is Colonial Revival.

Ms. Shanner was asked why she did not respond to the initial letter regarding the work that had been done without approval. Ms. Shanner replied that she was a busy person and it slipped her mind.

It was noted that on the second page of the application, there was no listing of the current fencing's material. Ms. Shanner said that the current fence was vinyl.

Ms. Shanner was asked how tall the new fence was. The old fencing was about five feet. Ms. Shanner replied that the new one was four feet.

Mr. Horvath asked if there was anyone who was in favor of the application to raise their hand. No one did. He then asked if there was anyone who was opposed to the application to raise their hand. No one did.

Mr. Horvath said that this section of the application was closed and that the Commission would discuss it during their decision session.

Application# 2021-24 of Katherine Lantiqua/Guilin Construction to remove one window and install sliding door on the side of house, install four casement window in the basement on the house located at 408 Barnum Avenue.

Ms. Lantiqua said that she was a first time home owner and was not aware of the difference between a regular home and owning a Victorian. She was also not aware of the District or anything else. She hired a contractor. There have been three break ins so far and has the police reports about them. The door and windows were switched because it was safer for her family. This was also why the vinyl fencing was installed because they keep breaking her windows. She had not actually moved into the house because she is afraid and that is why she made the changes. She was not aware of needing permission. Her contractor told her he had permission.

Ms. Tabachnick said that she had seen the house and Ms. Lantiqua happened to be there. Ms. Tabachnick said that Ms. Lantiqua gave her a tour of the house and it is fully intact and amazing.

A discussion followed regarding the back door.

Ms. Tabachnick said that she had spoken to Ms. Lantiqua about the window mullions between the glass.

Ms. Lantiqua said that the rails had been put in place due to safety reasons. She said that the window was made smaller. Alarms, lights and motion sensors have been installed all around the house to keep her family safe.

Ms. Lantiqua was asked about the French double door and the basement windows that were added. Ms. Lantiqua was informed that she should submit an application for permission. Ms. Lantiqua said they had contacted her contractor.

Ms. Lantiqua was asked if the contractor had started working on the application after her contractor had told her about it. The work on the house should have stopped rather than having more items added to it, including changing the back window and installing a fence.

Ms. Lantiqua was asked why she was continuing to work on the house when she knew she needed to apply for permission. Ms. Lantiqua repeated that she was not aware that she needed permission or how the District worked. She said her contractor had permission to build some stairs on the back of the building in order to rent part of the house. She was not aware they needed permission for the windows.

Discussion followed about when the vinyl door was installed and whether the new windows would increase the security of the house.

Ms. Tabachnick suggested that rather than working on the windows, Ms. Lantiqua should focus on the fencing that the Commission approved. The discussion moved to the existing chain link fence and the fact that the intruders were jumping over it.

The discussion moved to the fact that the basement windows were made by Anderson and noted that the house was zoned as a two family residence along with the other work the house needs such as painting the windows, having the roof done and installing a staircase for the upstairs apartment.

It was suggested that the Commission could recommend an architect that Ms. Lantiqua could contact for the work. Ms. Lantiqua was also unaware of the tax credits potentially available.

Mr. Horvath said that the tax credits were based on the fact that it would be an owner occupied residence. Ms. Lantiqua said that she had not moved her family there yet because of the security issues. Ms. Lantiqua was also told she would need to get permission for the work before she applies for the tax credits because she will be asked about having a certificate of appropriateness.

Mr. Horvath asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak in favor of the application. He said that there did not appear to be anyone present to speak in favor. He then asked if there was anyone present who wished to oppose the application. He said that there did not appear to be anyone present to speak in opposition.

APPLICATION# 2021-25 of Dwayne Hanson and Lakeya Davis/Renewal By Anderson to replace 4 dbl hung windows, 6 over 1, on the second floor in the first phase and 4 dbl hung

6

windows, 6 over 1, on the first floor in the second phase on the front of the house located at 69 Blackman Place.

Mr. Robert Kootu, the Anderson project manager, came forward. He said that they had started Phase 1 involving changing the windows out. The Commission wanted that to be six over one. Phase 2 involves changing the windows across the front of the building. Those will also be six over one. Mr. Kootu then continued to review the details of the proposed details with the Commission.

Discussion followed about the various windows replacements and the timeline involved.

Mr. Horvath asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak in favor of the application. He said that there did not appear to be anyone present to speak in favor. He then asked if there was anyone present who wished to oppose the application. He said that there did not appear to be anyone present to speak in opposition.

Application# 2021-26 of Shayna Jones/Scott Doughman to replace 4 dbl hung windows on 3rd floor of gable ends of the house located at 121 Elmwood Place.

Mr. DeBrezio from Home Depot came forward to address the Commissioners. The windows are in the attic on the right and left side of the door. They are currently two double-hung windows and they want to replace them with white vinyl windows.

It was noted that the windows had already been changed and noted that the mullions on the windows were flat. Discussion followed about the window details.

Mr. DeBrezio was asked if the home owner had considered using a replacement sash system that would have allowed the proper sash sizes as well as additional details. The home owner was not present on the call.

Mr. DeBrezio said they had not considered it and it was something that Home Depot offers. It's either a full replacement or an insert-style window which they are proposing.

Mr. Horvath asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak in favor of the application. He said that there did not appear to be anyone present to speak in favor. He then asked if there was anyone present who wished to oppose the application. He said that there did not appear to be anyone present to speak in opposition.

Application #2021-21 of Yves Fequierre/Bright Planet Solar for rooftop solar panel installation on the house located at the address of 164 Elmwood Place.

Mr. Horvath called to ask if anyone was present to represent this item. There was no one present to discuss this item.

DECISION SESSION

Application #2021-17 of Gloria Penaranda/Timoteo Zabala for restoration repairs to restore the appearance of the house located at the address of 194 Arctic Street.

Mr. Horvath recused himself. Ms. Tabachnick assumed the Chair for this item.

Mr. O'Connor said that there may be areas in which to repair and restore to the ultimate quality they will need to buy new materials. A big section might have to match the existing material with an alternate material. By doing so they could address concerns about cost and durability.

Discussion followed about informing the Commission what kind of material that would be used along with the fact that there were windows that were sealed. The Commission should give some direction on how those are resolved or handled.

An area where was no window there previously was also discussed as was the upper gable work and the windows that were unacceptable. Fiberglass and vinyl are unacceptable in terms of UV light.

Ms. Tabachnick then gave a brief summary of the work that the application listed, which included repairing the clapboard, shingles, repairing the fence and the window trim. The owners proposed to scrape, prep and paint the house, the wood siding, and trim to restore the exterior appearance of the house, install gutters and leaders and all repair and fix match original material. The exterior doors will remain on the back of the house. Some of the windows have already been replaced and will likely be remaining. It is a complicated restoration.

It was asked if the basement windows could be less of a visual contrast to the existing foundation and if they could ask for it to match the existing condition. A condition that the windows and door frame be made to match the existent siding was suggested.

The discussion moved to the windows that had plywood over them. The applicants should come back with a proposal with the type of windows they wish to use.

Ms. Tabachnick asked if the Commission was satisfied with the items that were listed on the application such as using half round gutters for the house. Discussion followed about what type of gutters were on the house.

It was noted that the application did not say that they were planning to replace the boarded-up windows with proper windows. Discussion followed regarding the replacement of the windows.

8

City of Bridgeport Historic District Commission Regular Meeting October 5, 2021

- ** MR. SACHS MOVED TO APPROVE APPLICATION 2021-17 OF GLORIA PENARANDA/TIMOTEO ZABALA FOR RESTORATION REPAIRS TO RESTORE THE APPEARANCE OF THE HOUSE LOCATED AT THE ADDRESS OF 194 ARCTIC STREET WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:
 - THE REPLACEMENT GUTTERS SHALL BE THE HALF ROUND STYLE.
 - THE NON-FUNCTIONAL WINDOW OPENINGS THAT ARE CURRENTLY BOARDED-UP REQUIRE AN AESTHETIC SOLUTION TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE WINDOW LOCATION. RESUBMIT TO THE COMMISSION WHERE THE OPTION(S) FOR THE SOLUTION CAN BE CONSIDERED AND APPROVED.
 - YOU ARE ENCOURAGED TO PERFORM THE RESTORATION WORK THAT IS WRITTEN IN YOUR APPLICATION "DETAIL DATA", ITEMS NUMBERED 1-9. HOWEVER, IF YOUR WORK EXCEEDS THE LISTED SCOPE OF WORK YOU SHALL BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT A NEW APPLICATION OUTLINING THE NEW SCOPE OF WORK FOR APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSION.
- ** MS. ROCKWELL SECONDED.
- ** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Horvath rejoined the meeting.

Application # 2021-22 of Steve Farrell for new shingle replacement, copper flashing, and half-round gutters and leaders on the house located at 68 Brooklawn Place.

- ** MS. TABACHNICK MOVED TO APPROVE APPLICATION # 2021-22 OF STEVE FARRELL FOR NEW SHINGLE REPLACEMENT, COPPER FLASHING, AND HALF-ROUND GUTTERS AND LEADERS ON THE HOUSE LOCATED AT 68 BROOKLAWN PLACE.
- ** MS. ROCKWELL SECONDED.
- ** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Application# 2021-23 of Judith Miller Shanner for replacement fence in the rear of the property located at 60 Brooklawn Avenue.

** MS. TABABCHNICK MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION # 2021-23 OF JUDITH MILLER SHANNER FOR REPLACEMENT FENCE IN THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 60 BROOKLAWN AVENUE.

** MS. ROCKWELL SECONDED.

** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Application# 2021-24 of Katherine Lantiqua/Guilin Construction to remove one window and install sliding door on the side of house, install four casement window in the basement on the house located at 408 Barnum Avenue.

** MR. HORVATH MOVED TO APPROVE APPLICATION 2021-24.

Mr. Horvath explained that they needed to move the item for discussion.

** MS. TABACHNICK MOVED TO APPROVE APPLICATION 2021-24 WITH CONDITIONS.

A discussion followed about whether a second was needed in order to continue the conversation about the application.

** MR. SACHS SECONDED.

Ms. Tabachnick noted that there were photos of the property that were taken on September 28th and they did not show a back gate. However, on October 5th, a back gate had been installed. The contractor was contacted and told to stop working.

Ms. Tabachnick said that the home owner has not moved into the house and that it has been broken into three times. Because of this, they installed the fence to protect the property. However there are many sections that are open and because of this, they could not use that excuse. They expects that the entire property will be fenced in, but this has been delayed because of the rain.

A discussion followed about a window on the back of the house where a smaller one was place into a larger opening. The inside of the house has been altered to accommodate that window. It appears that there had been a window there and this was filled in somehow. All the windows are original and have been maintained.

The discussion moved back to the security issues. The owner mentioned installing video cameras. There were issues about the best way to secure them. Cameras are not included in the approved materials for a historic building.

A discussion followed about the recommendations on what kind of fence the Commission thinks would work in the neighborhood to help with the security of the of the house and also having one of the French doors which have been put in removed and reinstalling the original door.

Mr. Sachs said that they could not cover over existing windows that were presently covered with plywood. Mr. O'Connor said that the requirement for large section repairs referred to areas of siding that needed replacement. Mr. Sachs said that the applicant would not need to re-apply for permission as it would fall under maintenance purview. Ms. Tabachnick disagreed, saying that the material used for the repair may not be something approved by the Commission. Discussion followed.

The discussion also included the topic of indicating where a window opening was previously located if the window could not be restored. There was also an open porch that was on the second floor which will require a separate application once the home owner decides how they wish to address it.

The Commissioners agreed that all the window trim would have to match the original trim on the house. They also noted that there were doors on the residence that were not the original doors and the Commission would want to approve any proposed replacements.

Ms. Tabachnick said that the original request was to install a sliding door and the basement windows. She added there was a crossed-out staircase shown on the drawings.

Mr. Boucher said he had no drawing of the staircase and didn't know where it was going so he removed it from the application.

- ** MS. TABACHNICK MOVED FOR A PARTIAL APPROVE of APPLICATION 2021-24 WITH THE ADDITION OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:
 - THAT PORTION OF THE APPLICATION TO LEGALIZE THE REMOVAL OF A WINDOW AND INSTALLATION OF SLIDING DOORS (OR FRENCH DOORS) IS DENIED
 - THE INSTALLATION OF BASEMENT WINDOWS IS APPROVED. THE WINDOWS MUST BE PAINTED A COLOR TO BLEND IN WITH THE HOUSE FOUNDATION OR TO COMPLEMENT THE EXISTING HOUSE COLOR.
- ** MR. SACHS SECONDED.
- ** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Boucher said that he would draft up a letter and send it to Mr. Horvath for approval.

Application# 2021-25 Of Dwayne Hanson and Lakeya Davis/Renewal By Anderson to replace 4 dbl hung windows, 6 over 1, on the second floor in the first phase and 4 dbl hung

windows, 6 over 1, on the first floor in the second phase on the front of the house located at 69 Blackman Place.

Ms. Tabachnick said that during a previous discussion the Commission had decided that the applicants need to do the entire front of the house all at one time. She said that the issue was that the front windows for the children's bedrooms do not open. The first round of windows are ready, but the second ones are going to be late.

** MS. TABACHNICK MOVED TO ACCEPT THE APPLICATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

• THE FRONT, SECOND-STORY, CASEMENT WINDOWS ABOVE THE FRONT PORCH GABLE ROOF SHALL BE PAINTED BLACK TO MATCH THE APPROVED REPLACEMENT WINDOWS.

Discussion followed regarding additional conditions to the motion.

- ** MS. ALVANSON SECONDED.
- ** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Application# 2021-26 of Shayna Jones/Scott Doughman to replace 4 dbl hung windows on 3rd floor of gable ends of the house located at 121 Elmwood Place.

Ms. Tabachnick noted that Home Depot would not be able to provide an ideal solution. She added that she had an issue with the vinyl windows and said it was the wrong material for the district.

** MS. ROCKWELL MOTIONED TO DENY THE APPLICATION FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

• VINYL IS NOT A HISTORICALLY APPROPRIATE MATERIAL FOR A HISTORIC HOUSE.

** MS. TABACHNICK SECONDED.

Ms. Rockwell suggested that they look at the Anderson renewal system and the Morven Replacement Sash System. Further discussion followed on potential business that could help with the renewal.

** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Tabachnick said that she had sent out a couple photographs earlier in the day. One of them was a fence/wall that is on Elmwood Place. The second one is a house at 176 Elmwood Avenue, where they've put in a new railing, which needs to be modified. She asked if they could send them a violation.

Mr. Boucher asked what the violation was. Ms. Tabachnick clarified that it was the porch railing which was inappropriate.

Discussion followed to clarify the situation and if they should send a notice of violation or not. Mr. Boucher can notify the owners they need to apply for a certificate of appropriateness. If there is no follow-up on their end, a notice of violation will be served.

Ms. Tabachnick said that she had seen a house on Clinton Avenue. People were redoing or refinishing or just repairing the little stone part of the front where they were putting back the stones or putting in the stones. It may not need to come to Commission. It was a huge project that had likely cost a large sum of money.

Ms. Tabachnick said that she had heard about the Lead Abatement program through the Bridgeport Health Department. After speaking with Yvonne Jackson at the Health Department, Ms. Tabachnick said that most of the time, the Commission wants the windows in the Historic District to be restored, not replaced. Ms. Jackson told Ms. Tabachnick that 99% of the time, that is the case.

Ms. Tabachnick said that she had shared that information with the Isaacs. She added that she had met the new home owners at 815 Pendergrast. Further discussion followed on the details of that house.

The discussion then moved to the upcoming Planning and Zoning meeting on the 13th when the new Zoning regulations would be on the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

- ** MR O'CONNOR MOTIONED TO ADJOURN.
- ** MS. ROCKWELL SECONED.
- ** THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

13

City of Bridgeport Historic District Commission Regular Meeting October 5, 2021 Telesco Secretarial Services