

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

----- x  
In Re Property at: :  
: :  
1 Old Kings Highway : May 5, 2021  
Norwalk, Connecticut :  
:  
-----x

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL MEETING - PART 2

(via Zoom Videoconference)

Held before Historic Preservation Council Members:

THOMAS J. ELMORE, Chair  
CHRISTINE NELSON, Vice Chair  
ELIZABETH W. ACLY  
ELIZABETH BURGESS  
MARGUERITE CARNELL  
DR. MARGARET M. FABER  
DR. LEAH GLASER  
KATHLEEN MAHER  
SARA O. NELSON  
DR. SARAH SPORTMAN  
ELLEN ZOPPO-SASSU

Transcription Services of  
FALZARANO COURT REPORTERS, LLC  
4 Somerset Lane  
Simsbury, CT 06070  
860.651.0258  
[www.falzaranocourtreporters.com](http://www.falzaranocourtreporters.com)

## A P P E A R A N C E S:

State Historic Preservation Office:

Todd Levine  
Elizabeth Shapiro  
Jonathan Kinney  
Deborah Gaston  
Mary Dunne  
Marena Wisniewski

Preservation Connecticut:

Brad Schide, Circuit Rider  
David Goslin, Crosskey Architects

Property Owner:

Andy Glazer

Members from the Public:

Tod Bryant, President, Norwalk Preservation Trust  
Lee Grant

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order for Part 2 of Meeting
  - II. Review of Public Comment Procedures
  - III. Code of Ethics/Conflict of Interest
  - IX. Threatened Properties
    - 1 Old Kings Highway, Norwalk
  - XVII. Adjournment of Part 2 of Meeting
- 

(Proceedings commenced at 11:03 a.m.)

CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Good morning, everybody. I'm Tom Elmore, Chair of the Connecticut Historic Preservation Council, and I'm calling Part 2 of the May 5th, 2021 Historic Preservation Council Meeting to order for the purposes of considering 1 Old Kings Highway, Norwalk, Connecticut.

Part 2 of the meeting will run from 11:00 a.m. to 12:30, but I'd like to just touch base with council members to see if people can stay possibly to quarter to 1:00, 1:00 o'clock. I guess let me know if you cannot stay until that, that would be easier for me.

1                   LEAH GLASER: This is Leah. I do have  
2 another meeting at 12:15 that -- Department  
3 meeting, we're going to go over some kind of  
4 important things. I can probably be a little  
5 late, 12:30, but quarter of 1:00 is pushing it  
6 for me.

7                   CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Will you just jump  
8 in and remind me --

9                   LEAH GLASER: Okay.

10                  CHAIR TOM ELMORE: -- when you leave  
11 please?

12                  LEAH GLASER: Okay.

13                  CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Anyone else?

14                  KATHLEEN MAHER: It's Kathy, Tom.  
15 Yeah, 1:00 o'clock is going to be pushing it for  
16 me.

17                  CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Okay. Well,  
18 hopefully we won't need to go that far. But if  
19 you do need to jump off please just let us know.  
20 Thank you.

21                   I've been told that we have two people  
22 from the public that are registered to speak on  
23 the agenda today.

24                   Seated with me this morning are fellow  
25 council members Christine Nelson, Vice Chair,

1 Beth Acly, Beth Burgess, Marguerite Carnell,  
2 Margaret Faber, Leah Glaser, Kathy Maher, Sara  
3 Nelson, Sarah Sportman and Ellen Zoppo. We have  
4 a quorum so we'll get started.

5 Preservation Connecticut is a statutory  
6 partner and an interested party to these  
7 proceedings and will be given the same amount of  
8 time to speak as the property owner. As is  
9 Council's policy and to ensure sufficient time  
10 for all parties the agenda item is organized as  
11 follows:

12 Introduction of the matter by Todd  
13 Levine, Staff Liaison for Endangered Properties.

14 Presentation by Preservation  
15 Connecticut, presentation up to and not more than  
16 20 minutes in length followed by Council  
17 questions of 20 minutes.

18 The presentation by the owner for up to  
19 but not more than 20 minutes, followed by Council  
20 questions for 20 minutes, and then the members of  
21 the public will be invited to speak. And since  
22 we only have two people that are signed up as far  
23 as I know they will be allocated up to 5 minutes  
24 each to speak.

25 If you haven't already done so letters

1 and statements can be submitted into the record  
2 via email by directing them to Marena Wisniewski  
3 and that is spelled m-a-r-e-n-a dot  
4 w-i-s-n-i-e-w-s-k-i@ct.gov. Marena will be  
5 tracking all the letters and statements and  
6 making them available into the record.

7 If there are members of the public who  
8 have not submitted their information and who are  
9 late coming to the process you will be given a  
10 chance to speak after we have heard from all the  
11 other members whose name we have in advance. We  
12 will ask for a show of hands via Zoom and we will  
13 call on members of the public in order in which  
14 we see them.

15 At approximately 12:15 we will close  
16 the public testimony to allow Council 20 minutes  
17 to consider the motion. May I ask council  
18 members for a show of hands who have read the  
19 entirety of the agenda packet which is 175 pages  
20 in length which includes the table of contents?  
21 Very good. Thank you, everybody.

22 We therefore have extensive knowledge  
23 of the material in our agenda packet. The  
24 Council is looking for succinct information  
25 directly related to the forwarded questions.

1                   To maintain our schedule for the  
2 benefit of all Marena of SHPO will be assisting  
3 the Council and will be our timekeeper. Parties  
4 with 20-minute presentations will be give 5-  
5 minute and 1-minute warnings as they approach the  
6 end of their time. Their presentations will be  
7 cut off at 20 minutes. Parties with 5-minute  
8 presentations will be given a one-minute warning.

9                   Council is interested in new  
10 information with each presentation. In the  
11 interest of time and out of the fairness for all,  
12 if you are in agreement with points previously  
13 made please signal your agreement with the points  
14 made. We ask that all parties identify  
15 themselves by name and affiliation before  
16 speaking, including council members to aid our  
17 transcriptionist in recording the meeting.

18                   For those of you who are visitors today  
19 I want to draw your attention to the Department  
20 of Economic Community Development and SHPO public  
21 comment procedures. Given our online format I  
22 want to review the procedures.

23                   Order of presentation, I will read the  
24 motion and ask the motion to be moved and  
25 seconded. Presentations will be made to the

1 Council. Council members will have an  
2 opportunity to ask questions. If called upon by  
3 staff a representative of the organization may  
4 offer statements or address Council questions.

5 For members of the public who wish to  
6 speak to the agenda item we ask that you identify  
7 yourself and your affiliation. The Historic  
8 Preservation Council takes statements from  
9 members of the public but does not respond to  
10 questions.

11 After all the questions have been  
12 addressed and statements made a rollcall vote  
13 will be taken.

14 The following is the Historic  
15 Preservation Council policy regarding conflict of  
16 interest. The Historic Preservation Council  
17 votes on matters which provide leadership,  
18 service and economic benefits to property owners  
19 and consultants, to government, to local  
20 governments and nonprofit organizations. Given  
21 this responsibility and to maintain the highest  
22 professional standards in the discharge of our  
23 duties it is important to maintain a strong code  
24 of ethics for all council members and Department  
25 employees. In order to avoid possible violations



1 to the Department of Economic and Community  
2 Development ethics statement it is necessary for  
3 the Council to be aware of any statements in  
4 which there is real potential or apparent  
5 conflict of interest involving anyone here.

6 A conflict of interest may occur when  
7 the public official's participation in agency  
8 matters results in personal financial gain.

9 You have been provided with the  
10 Department of Economic Community Development  
11 ethics statement governing state statutes.  
12 Having reviewed them in today's agenda members of  
13 the Council and staff are now asked to disclose  
14 any affiliation with entities or projects that  
15 may cause a conflict of interest as defined by  
16 the agency policy and pursuant to Connecticut  
17 General Statute 1-79 through 1-89 entitled Code  
18 of Ethics of Public Officials. Once disclosed,  
19 the member or staff may recuse themselves from  
20 that particular agenda item.

21 Having read this statement are there  
22 any council members or staff who wish to disclose  
23 a conflict of interest with this agenda item?

24 LEAH GLASER: Tom, so just for the  
25 public record and just because there was

1 misspellings in some of the paperwork, I just  
2 wanted to clarify that that I am not related to  
3 Mr. Glazer with a Z, and that I think he spells  
4 with a Z and I spell with an S and we're not  
5 affiliated.

6 And then the other thing I just want to  
7 point out and I don't think this is an issue but  
8 I wrote the nomination for the Perry Bridge many  
9 years ago and I also bid on the National Register  
10 District for Silvermine. I did not get it many  
11 years ago. So --

12 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: I don't suspect  
13 that's any conflict so I think you're fine.

14 Anyone else? Very good. Thank you.

15 Before I read the motion I would like  
16 to just give a brief background. A letter of  
17 invitation was extended to the property owner  
18 with an appended list of questions, materials  
19 helpful in documenting a lack of prudent and  
20 feasible alternatives to demolition. The  
21 material that was forwarded to SHPO was place in  
22 Drop Box and made available to all interested  
23 parties, and so any information provided by the  
24 owner and by Preservation Connecticut was made  
25 available to all parties.

1                   Lastly, I want to remind everybody that  
2                   the discussion and review is not a discussion  
3                   about the historic merit of this structure. This  
4                   building is a contributing resource to the  
5                   Silvermine Center historic district which was  
6                   listed on the National Register of Historic  
7                   Places on June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009.

8                   The motion that we have before us is  
9                   the Connecticut Historic Preservation Council  
10                  votes to request the assistance of the Officer of  
11                  the Attorney General to prevent the unreasonable  
12                  destruction of the historic property at 1 Old  
13                  Kings Highway, Norwalk, Connecticut pursuant to  
14                  the provisions of Section 22a to 19a of the  
15                  Connecticut General Statutes.

16                  May I have a motion?

17                  SARA NELSON: This is Sara Nelson. So  
18                  moved.

19                  CHAIR TOM ELMORE: And a second?

20                  KATHLEEN MAHER: Kathy, second.

21                  CHAIR TOM ELMORE: And presentation by  
22                  staff. Todd?

23                  TODD LEVINE: Good morning, everyone.  
24                  For the record my name is Todd Levine. I am  
25                  Staff Liaison with the Attorney General's Office

1 for the State Historic Preservation Office for  
2 matters of potential SEPA cases. The subject  
3 property is 1 Old Kings Highway in Norwalk,  
4 Connecticut and it is located within the  
5 Silvermine National Register of Historic Places  
6 District listed under NR June 23, 2009.

7 The threat to the structure first came  
8 to the attention of our office in February 3<sup>rd</sup>,  
9 2021 when Mr. Andrew Glazer reached out to our  
10 office about this property that he was  
11 purchasing. And on February 9<sup>th</sup> when the local  
12 preservation organization in Norwalk, Norwalk  
13 Preservation Trust, contacted us with their  
14 concerns with the future of the building. Also  
15 on the 9<sup>th</sup> SHPO contacted our preservation  
16 partners, Preservation Connecticut, about the  
17 threat.

18 On January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2021 Mr. Glazer applied  
19 for a demolition application which triggered the  
20 120-day demolition delay, and then on February  
21 19<sup>th</sup> Mr. Glazer closed on the property and became  
22 the owner.

23 On March 8<sup>th</sup> Mr. Glazer met with SHPO  
24 and Preservation Connecticut staff on site to  
25 examine the structure. It's important to note

1 that throughout the process Mr. Glazer has been  
2 cooperative and responded promptly to questions  
3 and provided access to the property for SHPO  
4 staff, Preservation Connecticut staff and our  
5 consultants on several occasions.

6 On March 23<sup>rd</sup> Norwalk Preservation Trust  
7 with assistance from Preservation Connecticut  
8 started an online petition. As of April 21<sup>st</sup>  
9 there were 524 total signatures with a 155 from  
10 Norwalk.

11 On March 26<sup>th</sup> the Historic Preservation  
12 Office Review Board, our State Historic  
13 Preservation Review Board rather, affirmed that  
14 the subject property continues to contribute to  
15 the Silvermine historic district. The property  
16 exhibits character defining features from two  
17 main periods of significance, circa 1812, which  
18 is the date of construction of the earliest part  
19 of the house, and circa 1955 when extensive  
20 alterations were made during Silvermine's  
21 development as an artist colony.

22 On March 29<sup>th</sup> Mr. Glazer and I discussed  
23 a potential agreement to not demolish the  
24 structure until at least May 21<sup>st</sup>. He entertained  
25 the idea but ultimately declined.

1                   On April 6<sup>th</sup> SHPO sent a letter of  
2                   invitation to Mr. Glazer for this meeting. On  
3                   April 14<sup>th</sup> historic architect Dave Goslin and  
4                   structural engineers James Grant met with Mr.  
5                   Glazer on site to conduct a building assessment.  
6                   The ensuing report documented that much of the  
7                   historic fabric from the first period of  
8                   significance which is 1812, had been lost with  
9                   the exception of the foundation, floor boards and  
10                  fireplace and that the historic materials from  
11                  the second period of significance, circa 1925,  
12                  with the exception of exterior finishes had been  
13                  replaced with more modern material, including  
14                  those from the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century and most recently  
15                  dating from the 1980s when the existing garage  
16                  and breezeway were constructed.

17                         So the nomination describes 1 Old Kings  
18                         Highway as vernacular circa 1812 with additions  
19                         and alterations from 1925 and 1980.

20                         Further, the nomination goes on to say  
21                         some of the period interpretative value of the  
22                         district had been lost to changes but most of  
23                         these changes are recognized as evolutionary and  
24                         therefore contributing. And I will conclude my  
25                         summary with that. Thank you.

1 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Thank you, Todd.

2 Presentation by Preservation

3 Connecticut. Brad? And I just want to note that  
4 again Preservation Connecticut is a statutory  
5 partner to SHPO and a party to this dispute.

6 BRAD SCHIDE: Thank you, Tom.

7 My name is Brad Schide for the record.

8 I'm Circuit Rider for Preservation Connecticut.

9 On behalf of my organization, Jane Montanaro as  
10 Executive Director, staff and all in attendance  
11 today we do thank the Council for the opportunity  
12 to provide our presentation concerning the  
13 demolition of 1 Old Kings Highway in Norwalk.

14 With me today following my brief  
15 comments is David Goslin, Crosskey Architects.  
16 As Todd Levine already said, Jim Grant was the  
17 other part of what we call the consultant team in  
18 SEPA actions such as this. Jim Grant cannot be  
19 here today but as Todd Levine stated and as in  
20 your -- he did do a report that's in your packet.  
21 He found everything structurally sound but I want  
22 to be totally clear too, Mr. Glazer is not taking  
23 the position that it is structurally unsound. So  
24 the work was pretty easy for Jim to do.

25 The consultant team made its site visit

1 on April 14<sup>th</sup>, concluding much of the interaction  
2 as Todd has stated with the State Historic  
3 Preservation Office. We're here today to discuss  
4 an alternative. I did hear at the onset of this  
5 meeting Mr. Glazer, the owner, has come up with  
6 an alternative proposal which Dave Goslin and  
7 myself have not seen so we're presenting as we  
8 know here and at least for the record here and I  
9 think Mr. Glazer plans to talk about that  
10 alternative in his 20 minutes.

11 So I'll start off -- Marena, you can go  
12 to the next slide -- I'll start off by just  
13 really summarizing some of the things Todd  
14 already said and I'll talk through some really  
15 photographic images. As it's already been said  
16 the history is not in doubt here. It is a  
17 contributing resource in the National Register  
18 district.

19 As Todd mentioned there seems to be  
20 three times of significance for the district, or  
21 two, I'm sorry, two times. 1922 by the way was  
22 around kind of an artist community that seemed to  
23 gather here at that period of time. The property  
24 itself abuts the Silvermine River and if you go  
25 to the house today and walk in the backyard there



1 is an extraordinary falls right there. Also the  
2 Silvermine Tavern of course people are aware of  
3 and Mr. Glazer has rehabbed that property and the  
4 adjoining buildings that you can see from the  
5 backyard of this building.

6 As Todd stated and as David will also  
7 state much of the structure has been altered and  
8 many of the historic features were very hard to  
9 find and some have been removed obviously over  
10 time. We will say however, and this is kind of  
11 what David will talk more in detail about, we did  
12 think that the current structure, probably  
13 greatly reduced from what it is today, was  
14 obviously in existence during the two times of  
15 significance.

16 We can go to the next slide. So I just  
17 -- this is a preface to when David is talking so  
18 we have a clearer understanding of what we're  
19 looking at here. We're looking at the original  
20 structure 1812 or thereabouts to be kind of like  
21 a cape-like structure. If you see the top roof  
22 line, the center chimney, and you can see -- we  
23 think that is probably the original portion of  
24 the house. The bump-out appears to be 1925 which  
25 is the next change in the property but it's a

1 little unclear. The picture on the right then  
2 kind of gives you more of a sense of the other  
3 time changes. The building that you're looking  
4 at and the side, the lower level building, lower  
5 roof line, that we believe is the 1925 addition.  
6 It's slab on grade, there is no basement in this  
7 structure.

8           Go to the next slide, Marena. And then  
9 just looking at other sides of the property it's  
10 unclear that that bump-out on the side is  
11 historic for the property but it's really a nice  
12 feature and it could be part of it. You can see  
13 the stone foundation which is original to the  
14 building.

15           What's unusual about this property too,  
16 it seems to cut off. If you look at the picture  
17 on the left there you got a roof peak there and  
18 it kind of cuts off and it's unclear whether that  
19 was demolished or -- I mean obviously an  
20 extension -- an addition was put on the back  
21 which we assume is 1925 or later. Whether the  
22 building got chopped off is totally unclear.

23           The building on the right is just a  
24 backward look at the back part of the property,  
25 the jalousie windows, and the dormers we believe

1 were also part of the 1925. In that same photo  
2 you see to the left the start of the slab-on-  
3 grade 1925 addition.

4 Go ahead, next slide. Yeah, I just  
5 wanted to -- we've been talking about 1980, what  
6 does that mean. The 1980 is the breezeway and  
7 the garage. Again it's not under study. We  
8 didn't walk through that. That's not really a  
9 part of our research but you can see there are  
10 apartments above and a two-car garage that were  
11 added later.

12 Next slide. And then inside the  
13 building again very hard to find a lot of  
14 historic features left but certainly the  
15 foundational walls and structure in the basement  
16 of what we believe is the original house, the  
17 kind of cape structure, is in great shape. And I  
18 think we have Jim Grant's report. It looks like  
19 it's been well-tended, you know, well-repointed  
20 as well.

21 Fireplace, you saw the center chimney.  
22 This is one side of the fireplace. It might have  
23 been rebuilt but we believe the opening was  
24 probably the historic chimney.

25 Next slide. And these are just more

1 shots to give you a little idea. The jalousie  
2 window addition in the back I pointed out, this  
3 picture on the left footnotes that. The picture  
4 on the right, it's a nice door. I'm not sure  
5 it's 1925, but this is in the slab-on-grade  
6 addition.

7           Go ahead, next slide. And then you can  
8 see the stairway, on the picture on the right  
9 there's a stairway going upstairs. That picture  
10 on the left is the small rooms that are upstairs.  
11 This actually is facing the back, this is the  
12 back dormer and if you look back to the right  
13 picture there that door you're seeing there is  
14 maybe not the original door but it probably was  
15 the original opening to the historic house. And  
16 the stairway could have been. It's unclear.

17           Next slide. And just finalizing here,  
18 so this is the slab-on-grade portion of the house  
19 in 1925. This is what it looks like today. If  
20 you walk right to that door on the left you'll  
21 walk into this fireplace. This is the other side  
22 of the other fireplace, so this is the center  
23 chimney and the fireplaces on each side.

24           So in conclusion and I'll transition  
25 into David Goslin, the windows -- so this is a

1 very hard building to read. And certainly David  
2 -- or the windows are kind of a mix. There's  
3 some casement windows that could be 1925, we're  
4 not sure. Many of the other windows are double  
5 hung. It did not appear to be original to the  
6 building. A lot of dry wall --

7 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: You have 10  
8 minutes.

9 BRAD SCHIDE: -- very little plaster  
10 left that we could find except around the  
11 chimney.

12 So this will lead in to David and we'll  
13 put to David. Basically we're looking only at  
14 the original floor of the house, that cape kind  
15 of structure and then trying to build off of that  
16 with the 1925 addition which -- but the three  
17 pieces which Todd has already stated, certainly  
18 the foundation is original, certainly a lot of  
19 the floor structure, the floor has been changed,  
20 not the floor structure itself, and certainly the  
21 central fireplace. And from that David had to  
22 work his magic and try to figure out an  
23 alternative to the demolition.

24 David?

25 DAVID GOSLIN: Thank you, Brad.

1                   For the record my name is David Goslin,  
2                   principal with Crosskey Architects.

3                   Marena, I don't know if you can call up  
4                   the site plan and share the screen on that?

5                   MARENA WISNIEWSKI: Sure. I just made  
6                   you host but I can do that.

7                   DAVID GOSLIN: Okay.

8                   (Pause.)

9                   DAVID GOSLIN: Okay, I'll do it. Can  
10                  everybody see this?

11                  MARENA WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

12                  DAVID GOSLIN: Okay. What we're  
13                  looking at here, this is an overall site plan of  
14                  the property just to get yourself some bearing.  
15                  The Old Kings Highway road is along the top of  
16                  the page. The Silvermine River is along the  
17                  bottom of the page. There is a dam and a  
18                  waterfall that's here. There's some stone walls  
19                  that occur along the street here and as you look  
20                  at this colored rendering what I did is I added  
21                  colors to kind of give a better understanding of  
22                  how the house originated.

23                  If you look at the -- let me see if I  
24                  can enlarge this. This green rectangle in the  
25                  center here is what we think is the original

1 house circa 1812, and that was pretty evident  
2 when we went down into basement, the original  
3 stone foundations kind of follow that shape.

4 Along the front of the house this is  
5 what we think was a later addition in 1925. This  
6 was slap on grade. To the north end her this U-  
7 shaped addition we also think was added in 1925  
8 and the back addition was also. So all the areas  
9 shown her in this reddish orange color were what  
10 we think were the 1925 additions.

11 The areas shown in purple are the 1980s  
12 additions including the breezeway, the garage and  
13 I don't know if that's an in-law apartment or  
14 just apartments that are part of the garage, but  
15 this isn't really contributing and we didn't  
16 really spend much time looking into this.

17 Also shown in this graphic is my  
18 proposal for what we can add to the house to kind  
19 of bring it up and modernize it to some degree.  
20 Having walked through the house one of the  
21 biggest deficiencies was really the lack of  
22 bedrooms, so really the addition that we're  
23 adding on here is really focused on improving the  
24 bedroom situation to the house. So what this is  
25 proposing is we're going to infill the U-shape

1 here on the first floor and then a two-story  
2 addition off the back. The addition would be  
3 about 20 feet wide by 30 feet long and would  
4 extend out into the backyard. I've also  
5 incorporated some exterior space and a patio here  
6 off the kitchen and a patio here off the living  
7 room.

8           So zooming in here this is an  
9 enlargement of that first floor plan and I took  
10 some liberties just because of a lot of the  
11 layout that is in this area of the house isn't  
12 really conducive, it's pretty chopped up, it's  
13 not 1925. I think it was altered at some time in  
14 the '50s based on the cabinetry that was in  
15 there. So what I tried to do is kind of  
16 redevelop this area, infill this portion here  
17 with a new addition and come off the back with a  
18 new addition here. So the idea is this would be  
19 the kitchen, we can put a modern kitchen in this  
20 area with a large bank of cabinets here, back of  
21 cabinets here with an island, with some  
22 additional space for a dinette table in this  
23 area.

24           The areas in green which is the  
25 original house which has the original



1 floorboards, the center chimneys would become  
2 more of the formal space of this plan, so this  
3 room here would get repurposed to be the formal  
4 dining room which could be fairly attractive with  
5 the fireplace here.

6 The 1925 addition to the front has  
7 built-in bookcases. That can kind of get  
8 repurposed into being a servery --

9 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: You have 5 minutes.

10 DAVID GOSLIN: -- a servery for the  
11 dining area. Then on the opposite side of the  
12 center chimney would be a private library taking  
13 advantage of the character of the center chimney,  
14 and there's also a little 1925 nook here would  
15 make a good reading nook.

16 To the river side this would  
17 incorporate the living room. It's a few steps  
18 down from the main level so the living room would  
19 occur here with an outdoor extension of a patio,  
20 again taking advantage of the river views. The  
21 kitchen also would have outdoor terrace access  
22 directly off the kitchen.

23 Coming in from the breezeway there  
24 would be mud room, a laundry room, an outer room  
25 with a walk-in pantry in this area, and then to

1 the addition to the back would incorporate a two-  
2 story bedroom addition. The first floor would be  
3 a master bedroom suite with master bath, walk-in  
4 closet in the bedroom outfacing towards the  
5 views.

6 We would incorporate a stair going up  
7 to the second floor which would then provide  
8 access to a new second floor addition which would  
9 have two bedrooms and a bathroom. And the  
10 existing second floor over the original house is  
11 kind of -- I don't even know how they even lived  
12 in it or got furniture up there because the  
13 stairs are very narrow and I think they were  
14 modified in the 1925 addition and they got  
15 winders and they're Z-shaped, but that second  
16 floor can be either a bonus room, attic space or  
17 additional bedrooms depending how it wants to get  
18 used.

19 So the original house had a total of  
20 2,717 square feet ballpark. The proposed  
21 addition would add another 1,326 square feet. So  
22 the plans that are showing here would result in a  
23 three-bedroom house with bonus rooms that is  
24 roughly about 4,000 square feet which puts it  
25 well within the market of the other structures

1 that are in that area of Norwalk.

2 So I think this concept here kind of  
3 incorporates the old historic features but it  
4 also kind of modernizes the house in the layout  
5 for contemporary needs. So I think this proposal  
6 actually is a good compromise for kind of saving  
7 the building and renovating it and putting it  
8 back in service.

9 And at this point that concludes my  
10 presentation. So Brad, I don't know if you want  
11 to have any final words or --

12 BRAD SCHIDE: No. That concludes our  
13 presentation.

14 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Very good. Thank  
15 you.

16 I'll open it up to questions from  
17 Council.

18 (Pause.)

19 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: I'll get it started  
20 then.

21 You have mentioned the 1925 additions.  
22 Did the town records confirm any of that, the  
23 details, and if those records exist?

24 DAVID GOSLIN: No, we did not. We just  
25 went on what was listed in the nomination and

1 based on what we found in the field when we  
2 visited it was pretty consistent with our  
3 findings.

4 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Okay. What about  
5 public water and septic? Is that provided in the  
6 community or do you need to enlarge the septic  
7 for the new bedrooms?

8 BRAD SCHIDE: We didn't spend time on  
9 that. Mr. Glazer maybe can answer that question.

10 ANDY GLAZER: Yeah, when we get to that  
11 I can answer.

12 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Okay. And then the  
13 last question I have is how does the addition  
14 work with the setbacks from the river and the  
15 wetlands?

16 BRAD SCHIDE: Well, I think maybe Mr.  
17 Glazer can probably answer this more concretely.  
18 I think the building predated some of the  
19 regulations and maybe some of the setbacks. I do  
20 know, and Mr. Glazer can certainly address this  
21 in his proposal, there are some new setback rules  
22 that he does have to comply with and he can maybe  
23 talk through some of those variance issues he  
24 might have to face.

25 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Okay. That was it

1 for my questions.

2 Council members? Sara?

3 SARA NELSON: I've got a couple  
4 questions. Thank you for asking the question  
5 about the setback from the river. That was one  
6 of my questions.

7 I want to just ask Todd and Brad to  
8 clarify. So if there were a proposal that took  
9 down the garage and reimagined it and the  
10 breezeway, the 1980 work, that would be an  
11 acceptable alteration to the house, that the only  
12 historic core that we're really talking about is  
13 the 1812 and 1922-23?

14 TODD LEVINE: Right.

15 BRAD SCHIDE: That's my -- I think  
16 that's what we agreed on, right, Todd? I think  
17 when we --

18 TODD LEVINE: Correct.

19 BRAD SCHIDE: -- looked at the -- yeah,  
20 correct. As David said and I said we didn't  
21 really walk through the garage, I mean it really  
22 wasn't much to look at, you know.

23 ANDY GLAZER: Yeah. It's an illegal  
24 structure too.

25 BRAD SCHIDE: Yeah, well, that's

1 another matter again.

2 SARA NELSON: Okay. Thank you.

3 MARGARET MAHER: It's Margaret. I've  
4 got a question. I don't see the hand raising  
5 feature. May I go ahead?

6 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Go ahead, Margaret,  
7 yes.

8 MARGARET MAYER: Thank you. I'm just  
9 wondering about the fireplace. The first one  
10 that I saw I couldn't really see in the material  
11 I had at home, is there a bake oven in the back  
12 of that fireplace?

13 ANDY GLAZER: Yes.

14 MARGARET MAYER: Thank you.

15 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Other questions from  
16 council members?

17 LEAH GLASER: This is Leah. Usually  
18 alterations to a building that's in issue that  
19 would be from the public right of way, but from  
20 what I just saw from the map there when you're  
21 going over the bridge you sort of -- I don't know  
22 if one can see the back of the house where I  
23 guess there will be a lot of alterations and if  
24 that's an issue even though -- because it's not  
25 from the actual road, it's, you know, coming over

1 the bridge.

2 BRAD SCHIDE: Yes, when you go across  
3 the bridge you certainly can see the house. It's  
4 right there. It's right on the corner -- yeah,  
5 it's right on the corner there. It is set back  
6 from the bridge but, yeah, it would be noticeable  
7 once the construction started there, yes.

8 DAVID GOSLIN: It's also visible from  
9 the properties across the river.

10 BRAD SCHIDE: Correct. Yeah, from the  
11 backyard you can see the tavern, you can see I  
12 think Mr. Glazer has a house right across the  
13 water there as well that's been all renovated.

14 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Okay. Thank you.  
15 Other questions from council members? Yes,  
16 Margaret.

17 MARGARET FABER: So just back to the  
18 fireplace situation. So in David's opinion is  
19 the entire chimney structure original, you know,  
20 including the bricks, you know, coming out of the  
21 house. And also is there any chance of a second  
22 floor fireplace? Did you investigate that at  
23 all?

24 DAVID GOSLIN: I think the chimney is  
25 original. We couldn't tell -- at least I looked

1 when we were up on the second floor. I didn't  
2 see any evidence of a second floor fireplace.  
3 That's not to say there is one that's buried  
4 behind some modifications that were made but I  
5 would say those fireplaces are original.

6 BRAD SCHIDE: They might have been --  
7 the surrounds might have been changed out inside  
8 and there might have been some rebricking of the  
9 actual openings but, you know, certainly the  
10 chimney and the open structure we believe is  
11 original of the house.

12 MARGARET FABER: Okay. Including the  
13 hardware, the crane.

14 BRAD SCHIDE: I'm sorry, that what?

15 MARGARET FABER: The crane, the cooking  
16 crane.

17 BRAD SCHIDE: Yes. Yeah, right.

18 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Margaret, was your  
19 question about the upstairs fireplace, are there  
20 remnants of one or could one be added?

21 MARGARET FABER: No, no. Are there  
22 remnants of an original one. You know, often  
23 there would be one in the bedroom so it would be  
24 interesting to know.

25 BRAD SCHIDE: As David said the rooms



1 are so tiny I'm not even sure -- if you had a  
2 fireplace up there you'd smoke yourself out of  
3 the room. It's a very small space up there.

4 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Okay.

5 KATHLEEN MAHER: And Brad, it's Kathy.  
6 Are you pretty firm on 1812? Could there be a  
7 possibility that there is earlier remnants?

8 BRAD SCHIDE: Well, we're just going by  
9 the National Register nomination. I think you  
10 have Jim's report about the structural --  
11 certainly the basement and all the structure at  
12 the basement level has to be original or  
13 certainly repaired. By the way in great shape to  
14 have been repointed and really well-cared for.

15 Is it 1812? You know, it's -- we  
16 believe it is and we're going by really the  
17 nomination.

18 David, do you want to add anything?

19 DAVID GOSLIN: Yeah. Nina from our  
20 office researched it and she really couldn't find  
21 any photographs or anything just more definitive  
22 in the records other than what was listed in the  
23 nomination. So we kind of got a lot of dead ends  
24 on our end.

25 KATHLEEN MAHER: I only ask relevantly

1 and I know this isn't about the history only  
2 because late 18<sup>th</sup> Century, I think 1780 was the  
3 burning of Norwalk so there was a lot of  
4 reconstruction, a lot of reconstruction after  
5 that devastation, that there could potentially be  
6 a connection where somebody was burned out of  
7 their house and --

8 BRAD SCHIDE: Yeah. We didn't spend  
9 any time on that but, yeah, you could be right.

10 KATHLEEN MAHER: Yeah.

11 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Yes, Christine?

12 BETH ACLY: If you're done I've got a  
13 couple of thoughts and a question too. From what  
14 I have seen, you know, the bake oven in the back  
15 like that is more 18<sup>th</sup> Century so --

16 ANDY GLAZER: That's what I think too.

17 CHRISINE NELSON: So Kathy, you might  
18 be right on there.

19 KATHLEEN MAHER: I think -- I was  
20 thinking the same thing. I think there's some  
21 expanded history that the National Register might  
22 have missed. I know this is not about that but  
23 the burning of Norwalk was a turning point  
24 certainly for Connecticut.

25 ANDY GLAZER: For what it's worth I do

1 believe that fireplace is 18<sup>th</sup> Century based on  
2 what I've seen before, the bake ovens and the  
3 arms, the cooking arms and all of that.

4 BETH ACLY: Yep. And I think too with  
5 regard to Margaret's question about the  
6 fireplaces upstairs, it looks to me like it was  
7 an attic space previously so it just would have  
8 been the chimney.

9 And to build off that I do have a  
10 question about the flood plain. Are we in the  
11 flood plain? Have we done any research on that?

12 ANDY GLAZER: I have all that. I have  
13 to, you know, I have all state and my survey show  
14 it the flood plain is far enough away on the  
15 property where we can do the alterations or  
16 additions that we want and be okay with that.  
17 I've already met with the conservation department  
18 on that.

19 BETH ACLY: Okay.

20 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Christine, I see  
21 your hand?

22 CHRISTINE NELSON: Thank you. I'm  
23 looking at the setback line, the front setback  
24 line is required to be 40 feet and it's located  
25 on Perry Avenue instead of Old King's Highway

1 which is the address and the access in the front  
2 of the building. Is there any reason for that?

3 ANDY GLAZER: Take Perry as the front  
4 yard -- as the street that the address is on --  
5 or not that, the house is on. The zoning uses  
6 Perry as the frontage and not Old Kings. Don't  
7 ask me why.

8 CHRISTINE NELSON: Okay. As long as,  
9 you know, that will --

10 ANDY GLAZER: I think that's just the  
11 zoning in Norwalk in going through leaving  
12 preexisting nonconformings and any additions, new  
13 additions to that have to be behind the setback.

14 CHRISTINE NELSON: Right. Thank you.

15 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Any other questions  
16 from Council?

17 Okay. With that then, Mr. Glazer, I'm  
18 going to hand it over to you for your  
19 presentation.

20 ANDY GLAZER: Great. Thank you so  
21 much. Thanks to all of you for taking the time  
22 on this.

23 Very quickly, probably over the last 15  
24 years I've been a developer, builder and designer  
25 for most of my career. For over the last

1 probably 10 to 15 years I have worked on many  
2 renovations of and preservations of old  
3 structures. Typically when I look at them I  
4 found that usually the original iteration is  
5 probably the best iteration. Unfortunately time  
6 is never wonderful to these structures and the  
7 additions or the changes that are made many times  
8 they compromise, many times they change the look  
9 of them.

10 Silvermine quite honestly is lucky  
11 enough to have most of the historic houses still  
12 look in terms of if you just looked at them from  
13 the street like, you know, reasonably like they  
14 probably were in their original iteration and  
15 that's a wonderful thing. When we took on the  
16 tavern and the inn and all of that I dug into as  
17 far back as I could find which is usually what I  
18 do, the oldest footprints, the oldest  
19 photographs, the oldest anything to give us a  
20 sense of what these buildings looked like.

21 I understand there's this -- and I have  
22 read pretty closely the Secretary of Interior  
23 guidelines on renovation, restoration,  
24 preservation and reproduction and there's a lot  
25 of different ways. And quite honestly when we

1 take on like the Silvermine Tavern it's like an  
2 archeological dig. I mean what we first do is  
3 take out -- because there's been so many bad  
4 renovations, that place did burn down once and  
5 probably should have burned down again -- we take  
6 it down to the bones which is to me really what  
7 the structure is about. Obviously windows, a lot  
8 of other details go into it but we, you know, we  
9 study that and we work with it. Many times we do  
10 it exactly in place because we think structurally  
11 though not perfect it's legitimate. Sometimes we  
12 sister alongside side of these themes to preserve  
13 them but take the load off them, so to speak, and  
14 then some that are rotten we replace, and we do  
15 this on a step-by-step basis.

16 With regards to 1 Old Kings my problem  
17 with it was a number of things. One, it was hard  
18 to define it as, you know, you look it at and you  
19 go, okay, I see what this place was, you know, I  
20 know what this thing is, you know, and I can work  
21 with it like most of the other buildings and  
22 structures that I've worked with over the years.

23 1 Old Kings really didn't show itself  
24 to that. It clearly had, as we've established,  
25 as Brad and David have and I appreciate, first of

1 all, both of them working with -- had a meeting  
2 with me in working on it, that clearly the  
3 foundation is a great old stone foundation. I  
4 love working off of those. The fireplace is as  
5 it is, I do think it's an 18<sup>th</sup> Century fireplace  
6 but nevertheless because it shows those type of  
7 details, nevertheless it is. And, you know, the  
8 floorboards are the floorboards, the beams are  
9 the beams. They're not the best hand-hewn beams  
10 I've ever seen or worked with and they've been  
11 kind of chopped and added onto.

12 With that, when I opened up all the  
13 rest of the walls looking as we do, you know, for  
14 other areas of detail we found a lot of  
15 dimensional lumber, i.e. 2-by's and things like  
16 that, nothing to give us a sense, you know,  
17 nothing to give us a path to where this structure  
18 originally was.

19 So that coupled with a couple of other  
20 things, one, obviously it's way over the setback,  
21 two, there's some elevation issues relative to  
22 the lot where the house sits well above. Trying  
23 to meld in an addition to that is challenging.

24 But what I have come to and we have  
25 been working on it, there's another feature

1 actually that wasn't mentioned, they're both  
2 exterior. Out of the back of the building with  
3 those jalousie windows is a sort of -- it's  
4 buried under the branches and brambles, a kind of  
5 really cool old stone steps that just -- I don't  
6 know where they are, I don't know where they are  
7 or were they went to, I don't know what they were  
8 for, but they're kind of interesting and we're  
9 going to sort of work to bring that into play  
10 with the house, and then also the old well which  
11 is still there which of course we would leave.

12 So in this course of discussion with  
13 Todd and the stuff that Brad and David sent we  
14 worked on it, tried to come up with something,  
15 and basically what we did and I sent it to  
16 Marena, and if you want to pop it up, Marena, you  
17 can.

18 Basically what you're looking at is the  
19 green box is essentially the oldest part. The  
20 red box is that additional step-down room, and  
21 both of these -- this structure, this footprint  
22 is what I'm going to say because I want to be  
23 very clear about this, this footprint, the  
24 foundation, the fireplace, the floor beams to the  
25 extent that they're, you know, that they're good



1 or if not we sister alongside, is something I can  
2 work out and keep.

3 The walls, I don't know. I mean with  
4 all due respect to everybody here when you're in  
5 the field doing this work it is a very, you know,  
6 trying to make some sense of this, especially  
7 when you do not have a very clear image of what  
8 this thing was. It's difficult to go, okay, how  
9 do we do this. You're out there with your  
10 framers, your carpenters and trying to understand  
11 it.

12 Typically, as I said, we peel them back  
13 to see what we can find and work with it. We may  
14 keep all of these walls, we may keep some of  
15 these walls, we may keep none of these walls.  
16 What I would agree to is keeping, and I think it  
17 was cited by Brad, is the sort of undefinably  
18 historic elements that we can see, i.e. the stone  
19 foundation, the fireplace and the floor boards  
20 and beams on the first floor. We'll put  
21 additions onto them. What you can see with this  
22 building addition to the right of the X's, the  
23 green and red X, part of that I guess, I don't  
24 even -- probably not, that will probably have to  
25 be built new and I have to figure out a way to

1 deal with zoning on that but that's my issue, not  
2 yours.

3 The other two new structures, the  
4 garage is a -- it was built illegally, it's over  
5 the setback, it violated a variance and it has to  
6 be torn down. It's doesn't matter, it's garbage  
7 anyway. It was a mess.

8 Any new structures that you see there,  
9 there are two wings that are rebuilt. The garage  
10 will be probably a barn that we'll bring down and  
11 rebuild there. They will sit back behind  
12 obviously the setback line, and then they're well  
13 away from the flood line setback that is required  
14 on the lot that I've worked with the conversation  
15 on.

16 So, you know, that's kind of my  
17 thoughts on this, that it's really two reasons.  
18 One, would I rather quite honestly in terms of  
19 building a house, yeah, I'd probably rather take  
20 it all down. Typically I farm the materials when  
21 I can, you know, save it. In this case probably  
22 two things, one, out of respect quite honestly  
23 for working with Todd and these guys and, you  
24 know, I consider myself -- and I really don't  
25 give a damn what other people think -- I consider

1 myself a preservationist. I've gone to bat  
2 against developers who wanted to take down  
3 houses. I believe strongly in the history of it,  
4 I support it and love it when I get involved in  
5 one of these projects, and there's no easy and  
6 perfect way to do these. They're hard. But I  
7 think with the best intentions for both the  
8 history of it and the sort of honoring the  
9 workmanship that went into these things a long  
10 time ago, you know, I believe strongly in trying  
11 to when we can to save what we can.

12 This is not the easiest one because,  
13 again, there's not a lot of definition. But I  
14 think what I propose is what -- and I can, you  
15 know, I can detail it out more with Todd going  
16 forward but that's kind of where I am and I'm  
17 happy to answer any questions.

18 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Thank you, Mr.  
19 Glazer.

20 Yes, Christine.

21 CHRISTINE NELSON: Mr. Glazer, could  
22 you speak to us about the preservation treatment  
23 you would choose for the exterior of the  
24 structure to remain?

25 ANDY GLAZER: Quite honestly I would

1 not guarantee any of the exterior treatment  
2 standing, the walls. That's siding is not  
3 original, the windows are not original, they're  
4 not even that old. So I'm not going to be when  
5 we -- basically what we'll do is we'll take the  
6 siding off and look at the structure. Where we  
7 can use the walls we'll use the walls. Where we  
8 have to reframe -- because I have to create  
9 essentially a new saltbox house here. It's not  
10 going to look like that, the photos you've seen,  
11 simply not. And I really, you know, whether  
12 people call re-creational architecture I really  
13 don't care. It's not a viable structure the way  
14 it is and, you know, as I said you've got -- and  
15 I'm looking at the image, you've got this bump-  
16 out that no one really quite understands whether  
17 it was original, not original, and we have to  
18 find that out. And again, when we take it apart  
19 we'll have a better idea of what we can use and  
20 what we can't use.

21 BETH ACLY: Mr. Glazer, I have a couple  
22 of questions for you. It sounds to me like as  
23 you're talking about opening things up that  
24 you're not sure at this point if the original  
25 posts are still in the walls; is that accurate?

1                   ANDY GLAZER: Yeah, they're not. I  
2 opened them, we found dimensional framing.

3                   BETH ACLY: Oh, in the corners and  
4 everything?

5                   ANDY GLAZER: Yeah, which is strange.  
6 I traced them up through the basement and  
7 typically anyone that knows this type of post and  
8 beam that existed then the corners were obviously  
9 the important pieces because they held up the  
10 structure. We did not find a corner post in  
11 there which a little strange. I don't know, you  
12 know, because -- and we found no -- above the  
13 first floor we found no lumber that I would say  
14 is clearly, you know, back -- and I'm used to  
15 seeing it all the time because I work with a lot  
16 of these 18<sup>th</sup> Century and 19<sup>th</sup> Century early 1800s  
17 structures -- no sign of anything other than  
18 dimensional lumber. It is a little strange and  
19 it's -- quite honestly what's frustrating about  
20 this project is there's not a lot of roadmap.

21                   BETH ACLY: That's interesting. That's  
22 for that. And the second question I have is  
23 based on the sort of schematic green and red  
24 squares that you have there on the plan, it looks  
25 to me like the thought was that the 1925 bump-out

1 in the front in that foundation would not --  
2 would not --

3 ANDY GLAZER: I don't think so. Now, I  
4 may find out that that might be the front wall,  
5 the foundation is directly under there. That's  
6 one thing I have not checked. If in fact it is  
7 where the foundation ends under that then we  
8 would probably go up off of that (unintelligible)  
9 would be, the front would be sort of the story,  
10 one-story straight structure. This is kind of a  
11 -- I don't even know how to describe it because  
12 it's a weird bump-out and really not something  
13 you've ever seen before on these type structures.

14 So I don't know. I have to sort of --  
15 we may, you know, simply -- if that's the outside  
16 foundation wall they'll both probably come right  
17 off of that and who knows whether we'll leave the  
18 framing there and sister alongside of it, I don't  
19 know if it's worth doing. And I mean worth doing  
20 means that it's a, you know, it's old timbers.

21 BETH ACLY: Okay, thanks.

22 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Thank you.

23 Christine?

24 CHRISTINE NELSON: So in reconstructing  
25 the walls is it for public health and safety or

1 is it just for the function of it, better  
2 function?

3 ANDY GLAZER: It's for everything. I  
4 mean it's for, you know, it's for code. You  
5 know, we still have to -- this is a modified  
6 house, it still has to meet all the code  
7 regulations that -- the building code  
8 regulations. And you know, I must tell you when  
9 you do these projects the building inspector,  
10 engineers come in, I mean they really don't know  
11 what to make of these things.

12 When we did the inn, the inn was the  
13 cotton factory so it had a very strong post and  
14 beam structure. Awesome. Left it in place. You  
15 know, we had to fix some things but when an  
16 engineer comes in he goes, okay, how am I  
17 supposed to, you know, validate the structural  
18 integrity of these. I said, you know, we all go  
19 okay, it's been here 200 years. Good enough for  
20 us.

21 So, you know, it's a difficult process,  
22 even in the building inspector too. Some of this  
23 stuff preexisting doesn't meet code regulations.  
24 But we go through the process and I've worked  
25 enough with the inspectors who know me and we're

1           able to walk the line between preserving and, you  
2           know, code compliance so to speak.

3                   CHRISTINE NELSON:  When do you think  
4           that you'll have an idea as to what you will keep  
5           and won't keep?

6                   ANDY GLAZER:  Well, what I will commit  
7           to keep, okay, and we can determine this and then  
8           you guys can vote whether you want to go to the  
9           AG or not, what I will commit to keep is -- and  
10          I'll put it in writing otherwise it could get to  
11          Todd, but I'll put it in more formal writing is  
12          the foundation, the fireplaces and the first  
13          floor.  I will not commit to anything else.

14                   You know, quite honestly I'm my own  
15          sort of judge and jury on some of this stuff  
16          because I happen to care about it and believe  
17          that the history of these structures tells lots  
18          of stories and the bones are important, so I make  
19          decisions, I leave bones in place, I do a lot of  
20          this really on my own.  But for the purpose of  
21          this hearing and commitment on paper I'm  
22          committing to the foundation, to the fireplaces  
23          and the first floor deck and beams.

24                   CHRISTINE NELSON:  If you had some more  
25          time would you be able to let us know what parts



1 of the exterior could be preserved?

2 ANDY GLAZER: I've had 120 days to  
3 think about this since. I've gone back, forward,  
4 sideways, every which way possible. There's no  
5 real way to know until we peel back. There  
6 really isn't. And I'm not, you know, other than  
7 examining, you know, the structure in terms of  
8 okay, what's behind these walls, you know, we pop  
9 open areas to see. Other than that, no. But  
10 once we take it down do the frame and I can see  
11 it then, you know, because it's just, it's not an  
12 easy fix to make this look like a bona fide  
13 structure. And this house has had numbers of  
14 iterations, I mean it just has. Again, it lacks  
15 the defining original look that makes it a lot  
16 easier to do these projects and that's what's so  
17 challenging about this. I mean that's my work  
18 and that's my job, but still it doesn't make it  
19 easy when you're dealing with a structure like  
20 this.

21 BETH ACLY: When you start taking, you  
22 know, removing finishes will you start with  
23 interior finishes or exterior?

24 ANDY GLAZER: Typically in this case --  
25 I don't know to be honest with you. I'm looking

1 at the picture of it myself so if I'm looking  
2 away from you. It's a lot of work to peel away  
3 both interior (unintelligible) but that's what  
4 we'll probably have to do. We'll strip the roof  
5 off, we'll decide, I'll look closely at the  
6 siding. You know, with the Silvermine Tavern we  
7 used 90 percent of the original siding, stripped  
8 it down, probably refinished it and left it even  
9 though it wasn't perfect.

10 This case, depending on how the plan  
11 lays out, the door is not is not going to be  
12 there. The door is going to be to the right of  
13 the chimney as I'm looking at this photo, I  
14 believe. And I'm still working on this plan but  
15 I basically boxed this area out and said okay,  
16 this is going to stay, just the box that you're  
17 looking at, and then we're going to build off of  
18 it and the box we're going to keep, you know,  
19 we'll see what we have in there. And I think  
20 Brad said that it's hard with the roof to  
21 understand kind of what went on there, you know,  
22 where's what and what's what. So it's very hard  
23 to tell until you really, you know, when you open  
24 up the interior walls those give you a road map  
25 to, oh, okay, this is what they did here, okay,

1 this is what they were trying to do there. But  
2 you really can't see it until you open up the  
3 interior walls.

4 So I guess a long answer to your  
5 question is I guess we'd start in the interior.

6 BETH ACLY: I mean the bonus of that is  
7 that it gives you some time without the, you  
8 know, the framing being exposed so that if it  
9 does make sense to keep some of it you --

10 ANDY GLAZER: Yeah. Yeah. Um-hum.

11 BETH ACLY: So one other question from  
12 me. I don't know Norwalk particularly well.  
13 What is the process being in the historic  
14 district for getting Historic Preservation  
15 Commission approvals and things like that?

16 ANDY GLAZER: We don't. If I put in  
17 for a renovation we wouldn't be talking.

18 BETH ACLY: Okay. Got it.

19 KATHLEEN MAHER: Tom, it's Kathy.

20 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Yes.

21 KATHLEEN MAHER: I just to -- just  
22 apologize for circling back on this. Am I  
23 correct that Todd and Brad had not seen this  
24 proposed drawing?

25 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Yes.

1                   KATHLEEN MAHER: So in light of that  
2                   how does the game change as far as the discussion  
3                   is concerned? Todd?

4                   TODD LEVINE: Yeah. So you know,  
5                   again, what we have here is two periods of  
6                   building. We have the 1812 and the 1925. The  
7                   1812 Andy has said I'm willing to keep. The  
8                   1925, you know, is the unknown. But in the two  
9                   points I think are important to that, one is that  
10                  according to the nomination that is a fair  
11                  assessment. However, there's been a number of  
12                  iterations to even the exterior walls where  
13                  there's, you know, dimensional lumber, you know,  
14                  gypsum board. There's other things here that  
15                  have changed over time that lose its historic  
16                  significance past that 1925 point.

17                  We don't know how much of all that is  
18                  from 1925 except the form. So they could have  
19                  done a number of things that took away historic  
20                  fabric while leaving the form. So, you know,  
21                  we're talking about a period of significance that  
22                  includes the form but the material may no longer  
23                  be historic fabric. It's a difficult situation  
24                  for sure.

25                  CHRISTINE NELSON: Margaret, I believe

1 you had a question?

2 MARGARET FABER: Thank you. I'm sorry.  
3 I don't know how to get my hand up.

4 So I just wanted to thank Mr. Glazer  
5 for being so cooperative in answering all our  
6 questions, but I was just wondering how did he  
7 feel about -- how do you feel about the feasible  
8 alternative offered to you by Crosskey  
9 Architects?

10 ANDY GLAZER: It's interesting but  
11 relative to sort of where I'm going and how I see  
12 this site because don't forget there are -- with  
13 additions there are massing issues, how it  
14 relates and a certain type of vernacular that I  
15 want to create. So I appreciate where David went  
16 and I did study it and took it into advisement  
17 but kind of -- I have to design for the whole  
18 site. I actually have to design for the whole  
19 neighborhood. I happen to live in the old mill  
20 right across the river from it, and how it sits  
21 on the site, how it incorporates into all the  
22 other things that are going on here is very  
23 important to the context, the larger context of  
24 the project.

25 So though I appreciate what David did,

1           what I'm doing is more programmatically and site-  
2           wise where I want to be.

3                   MARGARET FABER:   Okay.  I have a  
4           follow-up question.  So did you -- when you  
5           purchased the house, and I read the MLS listing  
6           and the first word is historic, so I'm wondering  
7           if you purchased it with the intent to demolish  
8           in that you applied for the demo permit in  
9           January and then closed on the sale in February.  
10          So I don't know how you could apply for a demo  
11          permit without being the owner.  But I'm just  
12          wondering how that played out and if you intended  
13          to demolish originally and if you knew it was on  
14          the National Register.

15                   ANDY GLAZER:  I didn't know it was on  
16          the National Register and, no, I didn't intend to  
17          demolish it because I don't do that when I work  
18          with historic houses.  I spent a lot of time -- I  
19          was trying to buy the lot over a year ago,  
20          actually probably a little bit more.  We weren't  
21          able to do it but I did a lot of work on it at  
22          that time and, you know, as I've stated and  
23          others have it was not so cut and dried.  I could  
24          look at five houses within a stone's throw of  
25          this one, we wouldn't be talking because, you

1 know, they're prefect examples of the period  
2 architecture and definable. This one was a bit  
3 of a conundrum and as some of the other people  
4 have stated it's not that easy to figure out. So  
5 I went back and forth.

6 Really, irregardless of all of you my  
7 own struggle to try to figure out a way to make  
8 sense of this because it wasn't that easy because  
9 there are other site conditions besides what  
10 you're staring at. One of them is elevations  
11 because there's a very big dropoff because the  
12 house where it's sitting is very high up, well  
13 above sort of the normal height of some of the  
14 other properties around and I don't know that but  
15 it doesn't matter.

16 So my original intent was not to demo  
17 and it really kind of came to that when I was  
18 just like, okay, you know, I can't make sense of  
19 this and what am I saving? And quite honestly  
20 all the neighborhood, you know, I appreciate all  
21 these people that signed the petition from  
22 wherever they are, but the people that live right  
23 around it really don't want it there and they  
24 think it's an eyesore and not contributing to  
25 anything. It's okay. I'm the one who's sort of

1 going to do it and I think sort of -- I've gone  
2 back and forth. When Todd and I first starting  
3 talking I'm like nope, I don't care. You want to  
4 go to the AG, fine. I'll battle this out. And  
5 then I go back and forth and it's my own struggle  
6 on design.

7 And, you know, I again went back to it,  
8 my wife and I sat there, there's a couple of  
9 other elements that we're trying to incorporate  
10 that are there, i.e. those old stairs that are in  
11 the back, and we said okay, let's try to make  
12 this work. And you know, this is kind of where  
13 we come.

14 Irregardless of the Historic Commission  
15 except totally out of respect for the Historic  
16 Commission, but my decision, I own this property,  
17 I have the financial risk on it, my decision is  
18 based on, you know, both okay, if I can keep  
19 these what we know are definable historic  
20 structures to a period and build a viable house,  
21 then maybe that's a solution to all of this, it  
22 serves everybody.

23 But, you know, I don't understand -- I  
24 mean I appreciate the sort of criticism but when  
25 you're not in the field, when you're not the ones



1           figuring this out, it's a bit of luxury that we  
2           don't have when we're out there trying to do it  
3           on a very undefinable structure.

4                   MARGARET FABER: So I just have one  
5           more question. Now knowing it's on the National  
6           Register and the complications inherent in  
7           restoring it, would you consider selling it?  
8           Have you considered selling this property as an  
9           alternative to demolition?

10                   ANDY GLAZER: That would be absolutely  
11           150,000 percent no.

12                   MARGARET FABER: Thank you.

13                   CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Sara, you had a  
14           question?

15                   SARA NELSON: I have about three  
16           questions that aren't related to one another.  
17           The first one is a housekeeping question.

18                   So Mr. Glazer, our agenda packet had  
19           the earlier design that you have and I am  
20           inferring by your presentation to date but just  
21           want to confirm it with you that you are no  
22           longer proposing to do the design of the new  
23           house, the only design consideration that we're  
24           talking about right now is the one that you  
25           presented.

1                   ANDY GLAZER: Yes.

2                   SARA NELSON: Okay. So thank you for  
3 clarifying that.

4                   And the next question is to clarify as  
5 you were talking about the work rectangles of the  
6 house, the 1812 and the 1922, and I understand  
7 that you can't find a discernible sort of design  
8 history but I was uncertain when you were talking  
9 about the massing and the facades, and you  
10 implied that there was a little bit of an  
11 evolution which I readily understand. But are  
12 you still proposing volumetrically that the ridge  
13 height would be the same ridge height as what  
14 we're seeing right now for what we believe is the  
15 1812 historic or is that too totally in flux?  
16 And I'm really talking about the 3-dimensional  
17 mass now.

18                   ANDY GLAZER: Yeah, no, I get that, and  
19 quite honestly that is probably one of the  
20 biggest struggles. I don't see going higher than  
21 the ridge because it's only going to be a one-  
22 story structure. I am not going to put rooms  
23 above this. So it essentially is going to be a  
24 one-story structure even though there are rooms  
25 above Brad mentioned, maybe David did, they're

1 not -- I don't know what they're going to be but  
2 they're not going to be -- in my mind right now  
3 they're not going to be -- I'm not designing this  
4 house with a second floor at all in this main  
5 massing. So I would -- again, the only problem  
6 is there's this step, I don't know if you people  
7 can see it, you know, you have it but it's the  
8 steps -- it's this front, it steps up to another  
9 roof, a leak (phonetic). Again, I can't, you  
10 know, normally I would have framed off the front  
11 roof and go to, you know, to a pitch, to a ridge  
12 height but I don't know until -- my feeling is  
13 we'll frame off of that front bump-out because  
14 again I think the foundation goes to there and if  
15 it does obviously we're going to work off of  
16 that.

17 But if you walked in the front door of  
18 that little bump-out you're not, you're not  
19 anywhere. I mean it's not even a foyer, it's a  
20 weird little space that you can't figure out. I  
21 do think it's an old space. I do. Anytime a  
22 stairs is that small and windy typically that's  
23 a, you know, that's a pretty old stair. I mean  
24 it's falling apart at this point and you can fall  
25 through it. But again, yeah, I'm just trying to

1 figure out these pieces. Go ahead.

2 BRAD SCHIDE: Yeah, I'm sorry, Brad  
3 Schide. Sorry, just to answer your question and  
4 David can certainly affirm, the second floor of  
5 the original house as we pointed out is very  
6 small, very tight. David, I believe all we said  
7 there was that it was attic space. I think that,  
8 you know, thought that was probably what it was  
9 originally too.

10 So when he's talking about -- we're  
11 talking about roof line and everything the issue  
12 becomes how useable is that space above. And we  
13 did not solve that. We left it intact but it's  
14 not -- it's probably attic space if he did keep  
15 it at all. Is that fair?

16 ANDY GLAZER: Yep.

17 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Sara, you had more  
18 questions?

19 SARA NELSON: The third question was  
20 just -- to go back to what Christine was asking a  
21 little while ago and it's about the timeline for  
22 development. So understanding that this is a new  
23 design you thought there's work that needs to be  
24 done in terms of investigative demolition,  
25 figuring out the massing. We've got a motion

1 before us right now and we've got a demolition  
2 permit that you've applied for. Are you willing  
3 to withdraw the demolition permit to facilitate  
4 your having the time to work out the things that  
5 naturally take time, (unintelligible) sign, sign  
6 development? And if -- so a two-part question,  
7 would you withdraw the permit and how much time  
8 would you need to reevaluate everything 3-  
9 dimensionally to your satisfaction?

10 ANDY GLAZER: I appreciate -- let me  
11 put that question on demolition aside. Here's  
12 the way it would work. I would develop these  
13 plans because I need to get a permit to renovate  
14 and a new structure that would that would go --  
15 we'd develop the plans, we'd go to zoning, they'd  
16 have to approve it, septic, all the typical  
17 things in that building, and once we got a permit  
18 to renovate and build new we would start the  
19 process of renovating, i.e. we'll take down the  
20 parts we're not using. The garage definitely,  
21 the breezeway and the link there, and start to  
22 open up the walls and do the processes.  
23 We do as well as the same time also, you know,  
24 laying out foundations for the new sections, all  
25 these things.

1                   So it's, you know, it's a typical  
2 renovation process. And as I said if I had put  
3 this forward first as a renovation we wouldn't be  
4 talking at this point.

5                   Now, based on that would I be willing  
6 to remove my demo permit? Well, yes, I'm not  
7 demolishing the structure, not looking to  
8 demolish the structure. So then it's not a  
9 demolition and I would remove that and then  
10 simply work on a set of plans on a renovation  
11 permit.

12                   SARA NELSON: And Tom, one of the  
13 things that I'm thinking about if, you know,  
14 sometimes in this process we allow people the  
15 opportunity to continue to develop their ideas  
16 and come back to us in two, three months and this  
17 is a discussion with the owner in terms of  
18 allowing them to complete development of new  
19 thoughts before we actually vote to refer.

20                   ANDY GLAZER: And that would not be  
21 acceptable to me in any way, shape or form.

22                   SARA NELSON: Okay.

23                   CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Okay. Thank you.

24                   A couple of quick questions for you,  
25 Mr. Glazer. Can you talk to us a little bit

1 about the septic and/or -- not and/or but and the  
2 setbacks from the river, and does this design  
3 conform to existing code standards and wetland  
4 setbacks, 50 and 100 foot?

5 ANDY GLAZER: Yes. There's two septic  
6 systems there now. We will probably take out  
7 both of them and replace them with a new system.  
8 The soil is, when you're on a river you have  
9 river bank soil, (unintelligible) gravel, all the  
10 systems in that area are very, very good so it's  
11 not had to get, when we go we can fit one in  
12 within the scheme of our plan where as I said  
13 I've met with Conservation, Norwalk Conservation  
14 going over, you know, the areas that we're  
15 building they get to review anyway, approval  
16 process, but I think very clear and I have  
17 already sort of stakes out there where the  
18 different flood zones change and where we can  
19 build with all of that. And again, that is part  
20 of the approval process. Numbers of departments  
21 have bites at the apple.

22 To make this simpler because again it  
23 is my understanding, and Todd can elaborate on  
24 this, if I do pull this demo permit legally and I  
25 apply for a permit, listen, anybody can appeal a

1 permit, I am out of your jurisdiction. Now,  
2 having said that, because I do care about the  
3 department, I'm happy to both stay in touch with  
4 Todd and David, Brad because, you know, quite  
5 honestly they've all been very helpful honest  
6 brokers, you know, we can have reasonable  
7 discussions in the field because they understand  
8 the issues that come up and I'm happy to do that  
9 and bring them out to do site visits and things  
10 like that. Because quite honestly when you do  
11 these projects sometimes it's kind of lonely to  
12 figure what the hell are we doing with his or do  
13 how we figure that out.

14 So to the extent that I'm -- obviously  
15 they don't get paid for their time but the extent  
16 that they'd be willing to do that I'm happy to do  
17 that also and show them what we're doing. Again,  
18 legally I do not think once I pull that demo  
19 permit and apply for a renovation permit, you  
20 know, as I said this whole process would go away  
21 and then there are other obviously aspects to the  
22 permitting process that others could look at.  
23 But, you know.

24 TODD LEVINE: Andy, it's Todd. I have  
25 a question. So in your investigation moving



1 forward if you were to find that the front  
2 elevation is worth keeping you would keep that  
3 form and you would -- I mean obviously you're  
4 relocating the front door.

5 ANDY GLAZER: Yes.

6 TODD LEVINE: But the form would  
7 remain; is that correct?

8 ANDY GLAZER: Yes. I mean, you know,  
9 the troubling piece is that bump-out. It doesn't  
10 lend itself. I'm going to take that -- but  
11 chances are if that is the front wall we would  
12 sister on to whatever studs are there and take it  
13 up probably a couple more feet to a typical --  
14 something more in line of something like this  
15 this that -- I don't know if everybody can see  
16 this, but more a form like that so it's --  
17 because this front, that could have been a porch  
18 for all we know. Typically when you have a small  
19 shed like that typically they're porches.

20 Now, I don't know, who knows whether  
21 that was a porch at one time. We won't know  
22 until we really get into it, but that front wall  
23 as I said I would probably scab onto, take it up  
24 to where I need to and then have to reframe my  
25 whole roof. The roof does not work the way it is

1 right now is that I can't see it, and I think  
2 Brad and David saw it out there and they were  
3 kind of like, you know, which is what and what is  
4 where.

5 And so, you know, I don't have all the  
6 answers. When I walk into these projects I  
7 usually don't have all the answers. It's a  
8 process that is worked out in the field.

9 TODD LEVINE: Thank you.

10 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: Did you have a  
11 question?

12 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Marena, how are we  
13 doing on time?

14 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: It is 12:21, so we  
15 should probably move to public comment. However,  
16 Margaret, you had one more question?

17 MARGARET FABER: A quick one, yeah.

18 So what is the extent of demolition  
19 that can take place under renovation permits?

20 ANDY GLAZER: I think your plans spell  
21 out what's to be removed, what's not to be  
22 removed. And I don't mind submitting those, my  
23 plans, you know, my working drawings which say,  
24 okay, this to be removed, this to, you know, not  
25 to, this is this. And so they spell out what's

1 to be removed and what's not to be removed.

2 MARGARET FABER: Thanks.

3 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Okay. Thank you,  
4 Mr. Glazer. Appreciate the response to all those  
5 questions.

6 Marena, let's open this up now to the  
7 public speakers. Can you identify them so I can  
8 write them down and we can catch their names in  
9 the --

10 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: Yes. I will  
11 announce them as they come up to speak.

12 The first speaker is Tod Bryant.

13 TOD BRYANT: Good I guess afternoon  
14 everyone. Thank you for allowing me to speak  
15 here today. My name is Tod Bryant, I am  
16 President of the Norwalk Preservation Trust. I  
17 am also historic preservation consultant at  
18 Heritage Resources. I've been working in the  
19 field for about 20 years now.

20 I've got a couple of points before I  
21 get into my comments. I have a deed research  
22 that was done by Madeline Eckert who once lived  
23 in the house. Her mother owned this house. And  
24 it goes back to 1740. The land was brought in  
25 1740 and then when it sold by Andrew Aiken and

1 when it's sold in 1746 it sold with a dwelling  
2 house. So that chimney stack could easily be  
3 from that 1740 era as could the fireplace with  
4 the oven inside the hearth. And there might have  
5 been something a little bit later but there's  
6 continual mention of a dwelling house from 1746  
7 on. So there's that.

8           Also, I'm sorry, Kathy, but I don't  
9 think the burning of Norwalk got -- I don't think  
10 they burned that far north. I think they didn't  
11 get much further than the present day Cross  
12 Street.

13           KATHLEEN MAHER: No, I don't think they  
14 did but the people that survived had to go  
15 someplace.

16           TOD BRYANT: Right. Oh, exactly.  
17 Yeah, absolutely.

18           KATHLEEN MAHER: Yep. So there's  
19 collateral there.

20           TOD BRYANT: Oh, yeah. Yeah. Well,  
21 Randy Grieg's (phonetic) house for example where  
22 there's -- I don't think there's a single piece  
23 of wood in that house that was cut for it.  
24 There's joist pockets everywhere.

25           And the other is -- I'm reading now

1 from section 7, page 2 of the National Register  
2 nomination. It says some of the period  
3 interpretive value of the district has been lost  
4 to changes but most of those changes are  
5 recognized as evolutionary and therefore  
6 contributing. So I think that this house is one  
7 of the things that they were talking about when  
8 they wrote that into the nomination.

9 It's not beautiful, it's a little  
10 quirky to be -- as an understatement, but it is  
11 what it is, and that's the whole point of  
12 historic preservation. These houses don't have  
13 to be perfect and they very often aren't, and the  
14 nomination acknowledges the evolution of these  
15 houses over time. This one is a little funky for  
16 sure but it is acknowledged in the nomination.

17 Also, I hadn't seen any of either  
18 Dave's drawings or Andy's current ones. And  
19 Dave's drawings --

20 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: You have two  
21 minutes.

22 TOD BRYANT: Dave's drawings respect  
23 the integrity of the house whereas Andy's current  
24 plan is in fact demolition thinly veiled with an  
25 attempt to claim it's historic preservation.

1           There would be nothing left of this house.  It  
2           would be totally rebuilt in some fantasy -- to  
3           fit someone's fantasy.  I don't believe that is  
4           what the -- I don't believe that is historic  
5           preservation.  I believe it's new construction.

6                       CHAIR TOM ELMORE:  Thank you, Mr.  
7           Bryant.

8                       Marena, next?

9                       MARENA WISNIEWSKI:  I did have someone  
10          yesterday who wanted to speak named Georgette  
11          Blau (phonetic) but I do not believe she is on,  
12          however we may just want to give her one minute  
13          to see.

14                      CHAIR TOM ELMORE:  Okay.

15                      MARENA WISNIEWSKI:  And then I did have  
16          a last minute registrant this morning.  I don't  
17          believe Georgette is on so we have a third  
18          speaker from this morning, Lee Grant, who I can  
19          see.

20                      CHAIR TOM ELMORE:  Very good.

21                      Lee, you're up.  Unmute your computer  
22          so we can hear you please.

23                      LEE GRANT:  Yes.  I apologize that I'm  
24          late.

25                      CHAIR TOM ELMORE:  No problem.

1                   LEE GRANT: Did you want me to go  
2 ahead?

3                   CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Yes, please. You  
4 have five minutes if you would like it.

5                   LEE GRANT: Okay. My name is Lee  
6 Grant. The Silvermine Center historic district  
7 met criterion A and criterion B for the National  
8 Register, criterion A as a notable arts colony  
9 and criterion B as part of the early industrial  
10 history of Connecticut. In this case a mill  
11 industry based on a lumber, grain, cider and  
12 cotton.

13                   1 Old Kings Highway, the Andrew Aiken  
14 house, is situated at the core of the district  
15 and is a contributing building. The house itself  
16 has not changed since the National Historic  
17 District was approved. Parts of it go back to  
18 circa 1746. The core district included the Red  
19 Mill, White Mill, Joseph Cocker cotton factory,  
20 aka Silvermine Tavern, and today's gray barns,  
21 BATTERY Mill and the and the Andrew Aiken Mill.  
22 Of this following the interest in the area by the  
23 founders of the artist colony circa 1900, and  
24 because of these very mills their owner's houses  
25 and the artists' perception of the area as a sort

1 of New England, quote, fly in amber, the artists  
2 made an effort to reuse these old buildings as  
3 dwellings and studios and to celebrate them in  
4 their art.

5 The Andrew Aiken house is beautifully  
6 situated on a long triangle of land between the  
7 Perry Avenue Stone Arch Bridge also on the  
8 National Register. The waterfall from Guthrie  
9 Pond and Old Kings Highway, you can see how close  
10 to the road it is in the photos. Certainly  
11 today's zoning setbacks would never again allow  
12 this siting, this dwelling house to prominent  
13 mill owner's family and during the artist colony  
14 a midwestern sculptor. It faces the Red Mill and  
15 the Cocker cotton factory. Once it also faced  
16 the White Mill across the Silvermine River  
17 flowing down from the waterfall. That mill was  
18 moved across the bridge to Perry Avenue to become  
19 a house. Of these mills only the Buttery Mill  
20 originally constructed in 1688 fell to the 1955  
21 flood.

22 I ask you as a former president of the  
23 Norwalk Association of Silvermine Homeowners who  
24 paid for this district to be put in, a principal  
25 in establishing this district, a primary



1 researcher and a resident who finds the Andrew  
2 Aiken House an evocative presence in the center  
3 of the district, please preserve it as best you  
4 can. It is this group of core buildings that  
5 define the history and beauty of our area.

6 Thank you very much.

7 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Thank you. We  
8 appreciate that.

9 Just taking some notes here. Hang on a  
10 second.

11 (Pause.)

12 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Okay. Marena,  
13 anybody else?

14 MARENA WISNIEWSKI: Those were all the  
15 registered speakers.

16 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Okay. It's now  
17 12:30. Do council members have any other  
18 questions? Do you have sufficient information?

19 Christine, did you raise your hand?  
20 Sara?

21 SARA NELSON: So this is Sara. So the  
22 new plan that was presented today sort of opens  
23 up some intriguing possibilities, but I feel that  
24 the information presented because of it's sort of  
25 late-breaking nature is not complete, so we're

1 spending a lot of time talking about what would  
2 the massing be like, what do we know. And we're  
3 sort of being asked to either refer or to take a  
4 matter on blind faith that it's going to be  
5 designed in an appropriate way, when part of what  
6 we're dealing with is a 3-dimensional massing  
7 that's sort of irregularity -- the vernacularness  
8 of this house. And I'm troubled by this kind of  
9 open-endedness at this moment in time up against  
10 the demolition delay permit which is  
11 necessitating a vote to refer. And I would love  
12 to see more continued comment, evaluation of the  
13 building than has happened at this point with  
14 this new plan on the table.

15 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Yes, Margaret?

16 MARGARET FABER: I'm sorry. Yeah, so I  
17 agree with Sara completely and I'm wondering if  
18 we do refer it to the Attorney General's Office  
19 won't the conversation continue there?

20 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Todd?

21 TODD LEVINE: Of course. Yes, it will.

22 MARGARET FABER: Right. Thank you.

23 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Anyone else? Yes,  
24 Christine.

25 CHRISTINE NELSON: Unfortunately

1 without knowing what truly what the alternative  
2 is to the destruction of the exterior of the  
3 house I don't see that we have a choice other  
4 than to refer it to the Attorney General for  
5 further conversation.

6 The Historic Preservation Board found  
7 the house is still reasonable, that it's still  
8 contributing to the resource as a whole. And the  
9 alternative that was presented is really not a  
10 plan. It's basically a concept for which the  
11 conversation about its feasibility is -- it seems  
12 to be hopeful that there's some feasibility but  
13 it doesn't seem to be a necessary alternative to  
14 the destruction, and so I'm having a hard time  
15 seeing it as preservation despite Mr. Glazer's  
16 history and experience and passion for doing so.

17 ANDY GLAZER: If I could ask a question  
18 to all of you, what exactly would you call  
19 preservation? Just somebody give me an idea.  
20 Windows, roofs, new shingles, siding, doorknobs.  
21 I mean with all due respect to all of you, you  
22 know, I appreciate what you're doing and what you  
23 believe in because I do believe in that, but you  
24 really do not understand and no one can define  
25 for me, not Tod Bryant with all due respect to

1 him, what exactly preservation is. It's easy  
2 when you have a very clean structure. In this  
3 case where you've got multiple iterations and  
4 just because it was done in a 1920 or 40 or 50 or  
5 60 does not make it, you know, viable in terms of  
6 what Lee Grant was talking about which is, you  
7 know, the historic area of Silvermine back then,  
8 and I do believe it is a 17 period structure.

9 I mean this is a very subjective  
10 conversation that does not work in the field at  
11 all and, you know, again I'm going to -- you can  
12 go to the Attorney General, I really don't care.  
13 I'm going to follow this process the way I know  
14 I'm legally entitled to do, I'm -- you know, work  
15 and I'm agreeing to work with Todd if you will,  
16 Levine, and to that extent David and Brad, but I  
17 know this process better than most without  
18 sounding like a complete egotistical because I've  
19 done it. I've stood there and looked at how to  
20 make these things work and still maintain them.  
21 And it's a lot easier to stand far away and look  
22 through the window and make comments and  
23 judgments on things that people do without  
24 actually have to do the work with the cost of it,  
25 with the understanding of it and with the

1 workmanship that you have to do to preserve these  
2 things.

3 So it's a little frustrating, you know,  
4 and I know it's all well-intended, but you people  
5 are not in the field and you really -- not any of  
6 you can really define what's a legitimate  
7 preservation restoration. The secretary  
8 guidelines are very clear and I've read them all  
9 and I work with them closely and I will work with  
10 them closely on this one, but I am not going to  
11 be swayed by the Attorney General or anyone else  
12 who really has not participated in this process  
13 to do what is right by the historic nature of the  
14 structure or by building a viable house on a  
15 property that has to fit into a larger area that  
16 we're doing here.

17 KATHLEEN MAHER: And Tom? It's Kathy.

18 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Yes, Kathy.

19 KATHLEEN MAHER: So I appreciate your  
20 passion, Mr. Glazer. Don't assume you're the  
21 only one that's in the trenches. But in light of  
22 that the conclusion of the National Register  
23 states regardless of changes over time the area  
24 retains cohesive 18<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> Century representation  
25 existing in the built character of Silvermine.

1                   So if there's no problem with you  
2                   taking this conversation to the Attorney General  
3                   I recommend that we make the decision now.

4                   ANDY GLAZER:   And what is the Attorney  
5                   General going to do?

6                   BRIDE SCHIDE:   Well, Todd should weigh  
7                   in on this.

8                   TODD LEVINE:   Yeah, I'm happy to kind  
9                   of go over it with you, Andy, but what is on the  
10                  table right now is that this body would be voting  
11                  to refer the matter to the Attorney General's  
12                  Office.   The Attorney General's Office would then  
13                  begin their own investigation on whether they  
14                  have a prudent and feasible alternative to  
15                  demolition and if they do so potentially to put a  
16                  temporary or permanent injunction on the  
17                  destruction of the National Register resource.

18                  BRAD SCHIDE:   And I should just add,  
19                  append that, is what we typically do when the  
20                  Attorney General is involved doing his research  
21                  we all work together with the owner to try to  
22                  firm up and revise and get to what is feasible.

23                  What Mr. Glazer has been talking about  
24                  is means and methods, once you get out in the  
25                  field there are things that you change and, you

1 know, again usually when the Attorney General is  
2 involved it usually does bring everybody together  
3 to look at possible solutions. So I thought I'd  
4 add that.

5 BETH ACLY: I thing as a commission  
6 here we have a pretty black and white decision to  
7 make whereas when it goes to the Attorney General  
8 the gray areas can be looked at a little more.  
9 Is that fair?

10 ANDY GLAZER: I'm not sure what that  
11 means.

12 TODD LEVINE: Well, what it means is  
13 this body's role is to refer or not to refer.  
14 It's binary. When we get to the Attorney  
15 General's Office there is -- after it's referred  
16 to the Attorney General's Office and they do  
17 their investigation and you and I, Andy, will  
18 continue to try to find a solution that does not  
19 include the destruction of the resource. And  
20 there is some certainly negotiations through that  
21 process. That's what she means by, you know, a  
22 little more gray area.

23 ANDY GLAZER: I mean to be clear I am  
24 responding to the report that was written that  
25 said essentially there were three historic

1 elements that were definable in the structure;  
2 foundation, floor boards, chimney. All those  
3 will be part of my renovation plan. And quite  
4 honestly if I pull my demo permit, which it will  
5 be my intent, again I'm going to go through --  
6 you can refer whatever you want to the Attorney  
7 General but I'm not asking to demolish a house.  
8 Right?

9 TODD LEVINE: That would be correct.  
10 Even if it's my understanding, and I'll refer --  
11 I'll talk to the Attorney General's Office to  
12 make sure I'm correct on this, but if you  
13 withdraw the demolition permit application which  
14 you have ongoing --

15 ANDY GLAZER: Right.

16 TODD LEVINE: -- and you know, we would  
17 talk to the municipality to make sure it resets  
18 the 120 days because if you come back in a month  
19 from now saying you know what, I'm going back  
20 with the demo permit --

21 ANDY GLAZER: Yeah, I get that.

22 TODD LEVINE: -- the clock would not  
23 continue. You would reside to 120 --

24 ANDY GLAZER: Understood.

25 TODD LEVINE: -- frankly. Then our



1 role here will be, you know, other than technical  
2 assistance which we would be happy to continue to  
3 provide to you, Andy, as you endeavor to save as  
4 much as you can.

5 ANDY GLAZER: Yep.

6 TODD LEVINE: You know, there is no  
7 longer a lawsuit I believe.

8 ANDY GLAZER: Yeah.

9 TODD LEVINE: You withdraw the  
10 demolition permit, you're no longer doing  
11 destruction.

12 ANDY GLAZER: Yeah. And then I feel  
13 quite honestly it would fall back on the  
14 departments that I have to get approval from to  
15 you.

16 Now, having said that I have no problem  
17 with showing you, David, Brad what I'm doing  
18 because I do value that insight and I'm not  
19 looking, you know, with all due respect to Tod  
20 Bryant, I am not here to surreptitiously come up  
21 with a way to go around and, you know, and do  
22 this. I take huge offense given the work I've  
23 done with that type of comment. And I would  
24 commit to, you know, to talking to you, Todd, to  
25 the time -- I know you're busy, or David and Brad

1 too as representatives of the state to show them  
2 what I'm doing and listen to their ideas too.  
3 Like I say, I don't have all the answers on this  
4 one. I don't.

5 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Sara, you had a  
6 question or a statement?

7 SARA NELSON: The only thing that I was  
8 going to say is just going back to what it is  
9 that we're charged with considering are there  
10 pertinent feasible alternatives to demolition and  
11 that is the basis by which we refer. And the  
12 whole conversation today has involved that there  
13 are probably many different pertinent feasible  
14 alternatives to demolition, and I feel at this  
15 point it's a simple matter of referral.

16 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Yes, Margaret?

17 MARGARET FABER: I couldn't agree more.  
18 I see several feasible and prudent alternatives  
19 to demolition and I feel much more comfortable  
20 referring this to the Attorney General.

21 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Any other council  
22 members? Marguerite?

23 MARGUERITE CARNELL: Tom, this is  
24 Marguerite. I do agree with Margaret and with  
25 Sara. I would also like to observe that it's

1 sometimes difficult for the public to understand  
2 that changes over time, iterative changes over  
3 time take on their own historical significance  
4 and so while I understand Mr. Glazer's instinct  
5 to you back to sort of the purity of, you know,  
6 what is the structure telling me, and in this  
7 case it's very muddy because there have be so  
8 many iterative changes. And although they may  
9 not all be aesthetically pleasing and they may  
10 not all have the same significance, I would like  
11 to encourage the applicant to consider some of  
12 the 1920s changes as acquiring their own  
13 significance over time as part of the Colonial  
14 revival movement.

15 ANDY GLAZER: I do that in every  
16 project I do because the projects I do date from  
17 all different times. And even when they are  
18 step-by-step, and with the tavern that was  
19 clearly the case. It did not look like Mt.  
20 Vernon when it was originally built as the cotton  
21 factory. You work with what you have, you honor  
22 the best way you can in these sort of multi-  
23 iteration types of structure. As we say, you  
24 know, if it's Washington's headquarters in  
25 Princeton, well, that's pretty easy. It looks

1           like, it looks like it would look like.

2                       And again in this case it's more of a,  
3           okay, what do we find here. It is a bit  
4           archeological where you're trying to understand  
5           what happened. In many cases people have cut  
6           headers, chopped out all kinds of structural  
7           elements and compromised. Are they legitimate or  
8           not. And then to that extent if we're treating  
9           all these iterations as pieces of history, well,  
10          they are. Unfortunately we're working in the  
11          aesthetic world too and the structural world of  
12          okay, well, they may be representative of a time  
13          but they sure as hell weren't a good  
14          representative of a time. They just didn't honor  
15          the original things.

16                      My take on historical preservation is  
17          that the original structure is the original  
18          structures and to the extent that I can find them  
19          and work with them that happens to be my sort of  
20          mission with these. And if I'm lucky enough to  
21          get one where it's there, it's great. And then  
22          sometimes you have to dig and see. In this case  
23          we'll see if there are beams and corner posts and  
24          part of a post and beam that would have been part  
25          of a 1750s house, you can bet they'll still be

1           there as we continue to go through the support  
2           system of leaving them up and then working with  
3           them. But again, this is a field situation where  
4           you have to see what's there. We've all looked.  
5           We can only see so much.

6                       CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Are there any other  
7           questions?

8                       Okay. Mr. Glazer, I have a question  
9           for you. I know it's been asked and you've  
10          answered it but given the discussion in the last  
11          five or ten minutes I guess I feel I need to ask  
12          it again. Having heard the council members is  
13          there any way you'd be willing to delay the  
14          demolition of the building and work with staff to  
15          develop a feasible and prudent alternative to  
16          demolition?

17                      ANDY GLAZER: That sounds like a  
18          motion. I would -- here's what I would agree to.  
19          A, I will agree to pull my demolition permit. B,  
20          I will work on my plans and consult and both  
21          present to as I said, Todd, David and Brad as the  
22          representatives who have some understanding of  
23          the project, you know, where I am, what it might  
24          look like and quite honestly, get into work on  
25          the main box structure that we're all talking

1 about. Have them to the extent of their ability  
2 come out to the site and look at and see what we  
3 have there and how we can make it work relative  
4 to the plan we're working on. If you want me to  
5 formally write that I'm happy to formally write  
6 that.

7 LEE GRANT: May I ask a question?

8 ANDY GLAZER: Fine with me, Lee.

9 LEE GRANT: Am I allowed to ask a  
10 question?

11 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Mrs. Grant, you can  
12 ask the question but the Council is not obligated  
13 to respond.

14 LEE GRANT: Okay. I'm just asking Mr.  
15 Glazer would you take the building entirely down  
16 to just the frame if you are working on it or  
17 what is -- I have not seen any plan from you on  
18 what would happen to it and we all know that you  
19 had some very bad luck with a building you took  
20 down to the frame in New Canaan which blew down  
21 in a thunderstorm. So I am concerned that that  
22 sort of thing not happen again.

23 ANDY GLAZER: Yeah, I'm not even going  
24 to address that, Lee. You don't even understand  
25 all the particulars on that project and I don't

1 need to explain. All the renovation work, all  
2 the restoration work I've done, that was a unique  
3 one. We were trying to do a high wire act there  
4 to save a building that never should have been  
5 saved because it was structurally deficient. And  
6 we were trying to do something that cost a  
7 tremendous amount and did not work. So that is  
8 not the case, this has no relation to the that  
9 and, you know -- I don't know. That's all I'm  
10 going to say. That's ridiculous.

11 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Thank you. It's 10  
12 to 1:00. I'm going to follow up with council  
13 members.

14 Council members, do you feel there's  
15 sufficient information to vote to refer this  
16 matter to the Office of the Attorney General to  
17 prevent unreasonable destruction of this historic  
18 property? That is the motion that is in front of  
19 us. So let me take a rollcall vote.

20 Beth Acly?

21 BETH ACLY: Aye.

22 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Beth Burgess?

23 BETH BURGESS: Aye.

24 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Marguerite Carnell?

25 MARGUERITE CARNELL: Aye.

1 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: I abstain.

2 Margaret Faber?

3 MARGARET FABER: Aye.

4 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Leah Glaser? I'm  
5 sorry, she's left. She left at 12:15.

6 Kathy Maher?

7 KATHLEEN MAHER: Aye.

8 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Christine Nelson?

9 CHRISTINE NELSON: Aye.

10 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Sara Nelson?

11 SARA NELSON: Aye.

12 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Sarah Sportman?

13 SARAH SPORTMAN: Aye.

14 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: And Ellen Zoppo.

15 ELLEN ZOPPO: Yes.

16 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Very good. The  
17 motion passes. The motion has been referred to  
18 the Office of the Attorney General.

19 Todd, will you please follow up with  
20 Mr. Glazer and outline the process this point  
21 forward with him?

22 TODD LEVINE: Yes.

23 Andy, I'll call you in a minute.

24 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: If there's no  
25 further business and no objection I'd like a



1 motion to adjourn the meeting.

2 SARA NELSON: So moved.

3 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Who was that?

4 SARA NELSON: That was Sara, Sara  
5 Nelson.

6 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Thank you.

7 MARGUERITE CARNELL: Marguerite.

8 Second.

9 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Thank you. And then  
10 final rollcall vote of today's long meeting.

11 Beth Acly?

12 BETH ACLY: Aye.

13 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Beth Burgess?

14 BETH BURGESS: Aye.

15 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Marguerite Carnell?

16 MARGUERITE CARNELL: Aye.

17 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: I abstain.

18 Margaret Faber?

19 MARGARET FABER: Aye.

20 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Leah Glaser? Oops,  
21 sorry, she's gone. That's what I get for not  
22 crossing her out.

23 Kathy Maher?

24 KATHLEEN MAHER: Aye.

25 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Christine Nelson?

1 CHRISTINE NELSON: Aye.

2 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Sara Nelson?

3 SARA NELSON: Aye.

4 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: Sarah Sportman?

5 SARAH SPORTMAN: Aye.

6 CHAIR TOM ELMORE: And Ellen Zoppo.

7 Ellen?

8 Okay. Very good. Thank you everybody.

9 Meeting is adjourned.

10 (Proceedings concluded.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

1  
2  
3 I hereby certify that the foregoing 90  
4 pages are a complete and accurate transcription  
5 to the best of my ability of the electronic  
6 recording of the HISTORIC PRESERVATION COUNCIL  
7 MEETING held before Thomas Elmore, Chair, in the  
8 matter of 1 Old Kings Highway, Norwalk,  
9 Connecticut, via Zoom Videoconference connection  
10 on May 5, 2021.  
11

*Suzanne Benoit*

12  
13 Suzanne Benoit, Transcriber

Date: 05/20/2021

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23