



Town of Concord, Massachusetts
22 Monument Square, Concord, MA 01742

Historic Districts Commission Meeting Minutes 01-07-16

Pursuant to notice duly filed with the Town Clerk's office, the Town of Concord Historic Districts Commission held a public meeting on Thursday, January 7, 2016 at 7:00 P.M. in the First Floor Conference Room, 141 Keyes Road, Concord, Massachusetts.

Present:

Full Members

Terry Gregory, Chair
 Dennis Fiori
 Mark Giddings
 Nea Glenn

Associate Members

Luis Berrizbeitia
 Satish Dhingra
 Peter Nobile
 Justin King

Lara Kritzer, Senior Planner

Chair Terry Gregory called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. Voting Members for the meeting were Mr. Fiori, Mr. Giddings, Ms. Glenn, Mr. Gregory, and Mr. King.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Lisa Soleau, 252 Main Street, Main Street Historic District, for terrace, paving, and granite bollards

Architects Lisa Adamiak and Holly Cratsley, Nashawtuc Architects, reviewed the proposed new bollards, rear terrace, and walkways proposed for the site. It was noted that the Commission had had a site visit to the property since the last meeting to review the location and visibility of the changes. The Architects also confirmed that the rear terrace would be 10' deep and run the length of the rear façade. A Commission Member noted that the site visit had explained that the terrace would be about 1½' to 2' above the existing grade. The Architect agreed and explained that the land would be gradually sloped up to the terrace so that it would not need to have any retaining walls. She noted that the idea of retaining walls had been discussed at the site visit and that the Owner had decided to use a simpler plan.

Members noted that the new bollards would also include lettering. The Architect explained that these numbers were required by the Fire Department because the house was set so far back from the street. She noted that they could do it on a separate sign, but would prefer to place it on the bollard. Members asked if the bollards would have two numbers and expressed concern that the site had been divided into separate properties. The Architect stated that the bollards could just have the number of the new house as the original house had its address number painted on the front stairs. A Commission Member asked if anyone was concerned with too much uniformity between the bollards on the site. The Architect pointed out that the walkway bollards were smaller and closer to the street than the ones at the driveways, which were taller and set farther back. The new bollards would be set back to match those on the adjacent driveway.

A Commission Member stated that he had no issues with the proposed bollards but had concerns with the new terrace on the rear façade. He thought that it might be too visible from the Concord River and be one too many changes to the site. It was noted that Members had walked down to the Concord River during the site visit and agreed that the raised area would be visible, but not the paving itself. Members agreed that there were no concerns with the proposed new stone walkways.

A Commission member stated his feeling that the HDC had made a lot of exceptions to get the project to this point and was reluctant to make any more. He felt that while it was understandable that the Owner would want a paved area behind the house, there was already too much going on at the property to add a terrace to it. Another Member thought that the Commission had made every effort to make the new building an extension of the house but that in the end, it looked like two separate houses, one large and one small.

He did not think that it had been successful and was concerned that anything more on the site would only serve to separate the structures further. He was also concerned that a large paved surface with furniture behind the house would only emphasize the new building over the original one. He felt that the Commission had wanted to see a big house with attachments but that had not been done here. A third Member disagreed and thought that the proposed changes would be fine. A fourth Member was fine with the new terrace but was concerned with how the lawn would be graded up to it. She suggested that the Architect's make the change over more than 10' if possible so that there was no visible bump or change in grade. She was also concerned how the new terrace would interact with the boat house, which was too close to gently handle the 18" change in grade. She worried about how this area would be dealt with and noted that no one would want to see the patio surface so an effort would be needed to make it visually disappear. A fifth Member agreed that the slopes around the terrace would be steep and expressed concern that this would be a safety as well as a visual issue to address. He was not sure what the solution should be but agreed with the concern and the need to develop a careful solution.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Mr. King moved to approve the application to install new bollards at the driveway entrance, a new terrace behind the new house, and new walkways on the site as submitted with the condition that only a single address be carved into the bollards. Mr. Fiori seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Rotary Club of Concord, 12 Main Street, Monument Square/North Bridge Historic District, to remove existing granite and paving and install new USS Concord Bell memorial

Rotary representative Henry Dane presented the revised plans for the new memorial area for the USS Concord Bell. He stated that the plans had been revised as discussed at the last meeting to remove the bollards and chain fencing and to keep the existing stone wall along the sidewalk. He explained that they had removed the benches that had been originally proposed, but had added a new one across from the memorial along its edge with the Veteran's Memorial. He explained that he did not have a rendering of the Bell's plinth but had a drawing. He explained that they had reduced the size of the base to be closer to the size of the bell. Their Architect had still insisted on a small lip at the bottom of the plinth, however, to keep people back slightly from the Bell.

Their revised lighting plan called for two light posts with overhead fixtures. The Applicant explained that their Architect had wanted to match the other street fixtures in the area but that he had been concerned that those fixtures were too similar in form to the Bell. He proposed a bronze contemporary style fixture instead that was similar to the ones used at the Nashoba Brook School parking lots.

The fixtures would be installed on 12 ½' poles and angled so that the light would flow over the bell. A Commission Member asked why the lighting was necessary and whether the area was lit now. The Applicant explained that there was one light post there now that was not in use and that two would be installed in its place. He explained why he thought lighting would be useful in the area.

Commission Members reviewed the area, its current lighting, the surrounding street lighting, and who would be maintaining it. The Commission Member thought that creating a nighttime memorial with lighting would have a much larger impact on the area than the daytime memorial. He noted that the existing memorials were not lit now and suggested that lighting was not necessary. The Applicant stated that if the Commission felt that lighting was not appropriate, it could be removed from the design. Commission Members agreed that the lighting should be removed from the current design, noting that if the Applicants found it necessary in the future, they could always come back with that request. A second Member noted that lighting was complicated and thought that if the quality of light produced by the new fixtures was different from the street lights, then it would create a concern. A third Member agreed and suggested that they save the lighting for the future if necessary.

A Commission Member noted that the rendering used a different color for the column and base of the plinth and asked if they were different materials. He thought that it looked like marble would be used. The Applicant agreed that it looked to be different but thought that it could all be granite if that was preferred by the Commission. Members agreed that the entire plinth should be granite.

Further discussion was continued at this time until after the new public hearings. At that time, the Applicant noted that the base of the plinth would be granite. The plinth was proposed to be 32" wide and he estimated that the base would be about 40" wide. He estimated that the plinth would be 54" tall. A question was raised about the existing bike racks on the property and whether they would be reused. The Applicant stated that this could be done as they had only included the bike racks to accommodate others. The Commission liked the idea of reusing the existing bike racks.

A Commission Member asked about the proposed paving material and they were noted to be Boston City pavers, which the Applicant believed was already on the site. Commission Members asked if the new bench would reuse the existing granite slabs on site. The Applicant was not sure and thought that they might prefer to match the memorial instead. A Commission Member expressed concern that the Bell Memorial not be given the same significance as the Veteran's Memorial area. She thought that it should be subsidiary to the adjacent site and less formal in design. She encouraged them to reuse the rustic granite slabs. Another Member agreed that the existing stone should be repurposed and thought that a rough bench would match the rusticated stone wall. He asked for more information on the finish of the Bell's plinth as well. The Applicant stated that the plinth would only be engraved on one side and would have the name of the ship and its designation, "CL10." Members asked for a shop drawing of the plinth with the professional information on fonts and details.

Members thought that the project was moving in the right direction but wanted to see revised plans before an approval was granted. Members asked the Applicant to come back with correctly dimensioned shop drawings, the proposed finish for the new bench to

match the granite slab walls, the lighting removed from the plans, and information as to whether the bike racks would be relocated and reused. Members also agreed that a running bond paving pattern would be appropriate and asked that it be added to the plan. Further discussion was continued to the next meeting on January 21, 2016.

Boynton Brennan Builders, LLC, 12 Bow Street, Monument Square/North Bridge Historic District to demolish the existing house and garage and construct a new house and garage

Applicants Joanne Boynton and Mark Brennan were present for the discussion. It was noted that the project had been continued from the last meeting to allow time for the site visit to the property. The Applicants stated that they had looked at the cost of repairing the structure as requested and presented an itemized list. They explained that because the house sat on a slab, it would be harder to pick up and move than if it had a subfloor. They would need to install 4' footing and a new foundation to reuse the building and explained that the easiest way to do that would be to move the house temporarily.

A Commission Member asked if the Applicants had seen the 2001 approved plans for the site which proposed converting the house into a garage. The Applicant had liked that plan until they had realized how much work the existing house needed. Whether the building was a house or a garage, it would still need a new foundation to be useable. The Commission Member noted that this plan would present fewer changes to the streetscape. A second Member noted that the proposed reconstruction was estimated at \$225,000. The Applicant noted that this was the cost to stabilize the structure and did not include renovations, as it would not need interior work if it was turned into a garage. He noted that they could eliminate \$13,000 as it would need less interior framing as a garage. The Applicants were asked what percentage this would be of the overall house budget. The Applicant responded that they had paid \$800,000 for the site and were planning to sell the new house for about twice that.

A Commission member asked if the cost of the restoration should be a consideration of its demolition. He thought that the Commission should instead focus on whether this demolishing the house would be appropriate within the Historic District. A second Member stated that he was not in favor of demolition and would prefer to see the house restored. A question was asked about replacement in kind and Members agreed that that could be an option. A third Member stated that he also did not want to see the house demolished as it was significant to the streetscape, a piece of the District's history and was sensitive to the scale of the neighborhood. Staff noted that the house had been the home of Katherine Davis, who wrote "The Little Drummer Boy." Members thought that the 2001 plans provided a very clever way to look at the site and existing building.

A Commission Member noted that it was a very big deal to tear down a house within the Historic Districts but was not convinced that this house must be preserved. Another Member stated that he could understand begin on the fence on this question, but noted the difference in details between a new and existing house. He felt that the Commission had learned from Lowell Road to be very careful about changes within the Districts and their impact on the streetscape. A third Member noted that this house fit very well with the context of the area in both scale and style. A fourth Member agreed that the house fit into the streetscape and noted that it was well situated on a very visible property. It was noted that the Commission had allowed the demolition of 310 Lexington Road, but that that property had lacked context and had been located in an area of mixed development.

The Applicant asked if the house could be replaced in kind. Members agreed that they were open to considering that option. A Commission Member stated that he would be concerned that the new house maintained the character and scale of the existing structure. A second Member agreed that the Commission would need to see it but thought that it could be done.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment at this time. David Wiener, 20 Bow Street, spoke in support of preserving the house. He noted that his home had been enlarged in the 1990s but thought that it had started as a Cape. He appreciated the Commission's comments and the uniqueness of their neighborhood and preferred to see an addition that was appropriately scaled to the neighborhood.

David Brownell, 36 Bow Street, stated that this was one of three houses constructed on Bow Street in the 1950s and that he lived in one of the Mansard cottages from the 1870s farther down the street. He would like to see the flavor of the house retained and for something smaller than the 4,000 sf. new house initially proposed by the Applicants. He did not think a house of that size would fit into the drama of the existing space.

Kristen Johnson, 61 Lang Street, noted that 60 Lang Street had replaced a mold infested house and that while well done, it was obviously new to the street. She was concerned that if replaced, the new structure should not look like a completely new house. She also thought that if the existing house was expanded, any new addition should be subservient to the main house and sensitive to the site.

Bruce Blumberg, 36 Lowell Road, agreed with the Commission's comments and was concerned that any new house retain the scale of the area. He noted that he had moved to his home in 2001 and had seen the new plans which would have put a house directly behind his house. He thought that maintaining the scale of the existing buildings was important to the streetscape. He added that Katherine Davis had also been a preeminent writer of sacred music.

A Commission Member noted that the size of any new construction was a sensitive issue as was the context of the area. He noted

that the Applicants had done a nice job on the Lexington Road house and felt that they could find a way to work with this one as well. The Applicant asked to continue the discussion to allow them time to rethink their plans. The Commission agreed to continue the project indefinitely. The Applicants will contact Staff when they are ready to proceed.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Classic Signs, Inc. on behalf of Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage, 11 Main Street, Main Street Historic District, for signage

Applicant Paul Tripp, Classic Signs, Inc., was present on behalf of the Owner to request approval to replace the existing wooden wall sign with a new sign. The Applicant proposed to use the same design and color scheme but would make the sign out of High Density Urethane. He explained that wood did not last long now that lead paint could not be used and that there would be no change in the location or design of the sign. Members reviewed photo of the site and a rendering of the proposed sign. The Applicant presented a sample of the new material which he explained had been outside for 8 years. He presented a sample of the blue color to be used for the background and explained that they could use a glossy or matte sheen.

Members reviewed the materials and agreed that aside from the material, the project was replacement in kind. A Commission Member asked if the Owner might want to reduce the size of the sign and the Applicant stated that they wanted to keep it the existing size. A second Member recommended that they use the matte finish and the other Members agreed.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Mr. King moved to approve the installation of a new High Density Urethane wall sign in place of the existing wood wall sign using the same design and dimensions and with the matte finish proposed. Mr. Fiori seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Nick Lunig on behalf of Michael Feeney, 616 Lowell Road, Barrett Farm Historic District, to replace gutters and shingles

Contractor Nick Lunig was present on behalf of the Owner to request approval to replace the wood roof on the main house and to install new gutters on the building. He explained that the house currently had a wood shingle roof and that the barn had an asphalt shingle roof. He proposed to replace the wood shingle roof with a 50 year asphalt shingle roof in "Weathered Wood" to match the roof of the barn. He continued that the house already had several types of gutters – the Barnes Hill façade had a copper gutter, the front façade a copper lined wood gutter, the driveway side a plain wood gutter, and the barn had aluminum gutters. He proposed to replace all of the existing gutters with aluminum in standard white to match the gutters on the barn.

A Commission Member asked if the Applicant had considered using fiberglass gutters instead. The Applicant stated that they worked well but were expensive and not cost effective. Members noted that aluminum gutters were not generally considered to be appropriate within the Historic Districts. The Applicant explained that he could leave the copper in place on Barnes Hill Road and repair the wood gutter on the front façade, but would like to use aluminum on the driveway side due to the amount of water that the gutters had to handle there. He understood the Commission's concern with maintaining the front façade but did not think that the driveway side was very visible and preferred not to use copper in that location.

A Commission Member asked if the Applicant could use Fiberglass on the front façade. The Applicant responded that it was an unusual design and that he would just reline the wood gutters with new copper. Both Commission Members and the Applicant agreed that this was the best option for the front façade. The Barnes Hill Road side of the building had copper gutters which could remain in place so no work would be necessary on that side. The barn was on the south side of the building, and the Applicant did not think that much of that side was visible from a public way.

A Commission Member asked about the age of the wood shingle roof. The Applicant stated that it was about 30 years old. Members reviewed the photos and noted that a new wood roof would never last for that long today. Members agreed that they had no concerns with changing the roof materials to match the asphalt shingle roof on the barn.

Members noted that the gutters on the Barnes Hill Road façade and Barn facades would be unchanged, and that the front façade gutters would be repaired in kind. The only gutters proposed to be changed were those facing the driveway. Members expressed concern with the use of aluminum gutters on a significant house within the Districts and asked if a copper or fiberglass gutter could be used in place of the wood gutter. The Applicant noted that the Barnes Hill Road façade had a half round copper gutter but thought that it would be too shallow to work on the driveway side of the house. He thought that a copper K style gutter might be able to deal with the water capacity but he was reluctant to use a different style gutter in this location. It was noted that fiberglass gutters were more expensive but were very durable and could handle more water. A Commission Member felt that if the area was visible then the Applicant should use either the K style copper or a fiberglass gutter. Three other Members agreed, and a fourth thought that the area would definitely be visible.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Members agreed that a copper K style gutter was acceptable. The Applicant reiterated his concern that it would not match the gutters on the opposite side of the house. Members

agreed that the Applicant had the option of using the fiberglass as well, or to keep the existing wood gutters. Mr. Giddings then moved to approve the installation of "Weathered Wood" color asphalt shingles on the main house to match the barn, and the installation of either copper K style or fiberglass gutters on the driveway side of the house with the understanding that the front façade gutters would be relined in copper and that the gutters on the Barnes Hill Road façade would be left as installed. Mr. King seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

John & Marilyn Brady, 105 Lexington Road, American Mile Historic District, for lighting

Owners John and Marilyn Brady presented their application to install two new replacement light posts on their property. They explained that they had had two light posts in the past – one at their front entrance and one at the driveway. They presented photos of the two former light posts, both of which were broken and had been largely hidden by vegetation. They had recently removed the overgrown plantings and replaced the light posts before they realized that a review was required. The new posts were wooden and painted white, with Northeast Lantern brand "Boston 1073" style glass lantern fixtures.

Members reviewed the photos of the installed new fixtures and noted that they did not appear to be Dark Sky Compliant. A Commission Member explained that the HDC was working to cut down on light pollution and was very concerned with keeping light focused down as much as possible. He noted how these fixtures were generally designed and explained why the existing lantern did not meet those requirements. It was noted that other applicants had been able to retrofit their light fixtures by installing a metal plate to prevent the light from going into the top of the fixture. The Applicants were also encouraged to talk to the lighting manufacturer to see if they had pieces that could be installed to meet these requirements. Members also suggested using seeded glass instead of clear glass in the lantern fixtures.

Members expressed concern that they needed to be consistent in how lighting fixtures were reviewed whether or not they had already been installed. Members agreed that the Owners could install seeded glass to help address the issue. Members agreed that the new fixtures were better than the original ones and noted that the house was beautifully situated. A Commission Member noted that the Dark Sky compliance of the fixture was a major issue. Others agreed but thought that the concerns could be addressed.

A Commission Member asked about the wattage of the fixtures. It was noted that they could have up to 175 Watts but that the Owners currently had a 40 Watt bulb in the one in front of the house and a 60 Watt bulb at the driveway. Members agreed that the amount of light was fine as installed and felt that the levels were sensitive to the site. There were no concerns with the change in the color or material of the posts.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Giddings moved to approve the replacement of the two lamp posts as installed with square white wooden posts topped with Northeast Lantern brand "Boston 1073" style fixtures so long as the fixtures are made to be Dark Sky Compliant in a manner to be determined by the Owners. Mr. Fiori seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Melissa Winstanley, 131 Monument Street, Monument Square/North Bridge Historic District, for new stone walls and patio

Owner Melissa Winstanley began by apologizing for having already built the stone wall in question. She explained that they had constructed a bluestone patio behind their house as discussed during their previous renovation project and had decided to define it with a wall. She thought that landscaping was a grey area of review and had not realized that the HDC's approval was required for the change. She added that she had worked with a local mason and landscape architect and that neither of them had realized that a review was required either. She noted that several of her neighbors had installed internal walls and had not contacted the Commission. She felt that the review requirements were sometimes unclear.

In regards to the new stone wall, the Owner stated that she had tried to fit it in with the character of her house and the neighborhood. She thought that it fit into the tradition of New England stone walls and had designed it to match other walls in the areas. She stated that she had received positive feedback from her neighbors and presented photos of the existing wall and other walls in the area.

Commission Members noted that the photos included in the application were excellent and thought that the new wall was sensitive to the context of the site. A Commission Member noted that the Commission preferred to be informed of projects before the work was done and reviewed the process. The Owner noted that she had also submitted several emails of support from neighbors. Two other Members agreed that the wall had turned out well and one stated that she understood that there could be confusion over landscape details. A fourth thought that as a matter of principle, the Commission should review the project as if the wall had not already been built. A fifth Member stated that his first concern was context and whether the new wall was sensitive in location and material. He noted that the height of the new wall lined up with the foundation of the house and that the wall was rectilinear in form. The wall was also 20" wide which was very typical of New England stone walls.

A Commission Member observed that the new wall was a very geometric object and felt that its perfect geometry drew attention away from the rest of the site. He thought that it could be better integrated into the site with vegetation and suggested planting trees or other plants to break up the straight lines. The Owner explained that the site looked sparse now because of the season but that the area would have a different feel during the summer. She noted that there were plantings on the inside of the wall that would spill over it.

The Commission Member thought that the wall looked fabricated and not like a New England stone wall. He thought that it was too loyal to its references to appear natural. A second Member asked if the Owner was open to installing additional plantings. The Owner thought that the wall looked more classic without vegetation around it. She added that they had chosen the stone to match the shape and coloration of the stone in the foundation. A third Member appreciated the point made that the wall looked very structural but thought that it worked in this location. A fourth Member thought that it looked like an additional foundation wall extending from the building. He agreed that it could use some softening.

Several Members agreed that the wall was appropriate to the site. It was suggested that the Owner add plantings closer to the street to screen the view. The Owner answered that it was too shady near the street for plants to grow. A Commission Member agreed that the wall looked too stark and could use some softening to integrate it into the site. Other Members did not feel that vegetation needed to be a condition of the approval.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment. Kristen Johnson, 61 Lang Street, thought that it was a beautiful patio that reminded her of Western Massachusetts. She thought that it was well done and very tasteful and did not want to see landscaping added if the Owner did not want it.

Mr. Giddings moved to approve the installation of the new field stone walls surrounding the bluestone patio on the left side of the house as constructed. Ms. Glenn seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The Chair then signed and dated the approved landscape plan.

Elise Stone on behalf of Pomaw LLC, 50 Monument Street, Monument Square/North Bridge Historic District, for paint colors, windows, and garage doors

Architect Elise Stone and Contractor Fabio Andrade were present to discuss the proposed new windows, paint colors and garage doors for the house. The Architect stated that they would like to replace all but two of the windows on the house. In the new addition, they proposed to use fiberglass clad wood windows with a black finish. For the front of the house, she explained that they would prefer to replace rather than to fix the existing single paned wood windows. These windows were ca. 1951 replacement windows with the exception of two windows on the sides that were believed to be original. They proposed to keep the two original windows, and replace the rest with Woodwright All Wood Simulated Divided Light windows. It was noted that the existing windows were six over six double hung windows with aluminum storm windows.

Commission Members reviewed the photos of the house and window information. A Commission Member stated that he thought it would be good to remove the storm windows. Another Member asked about the size of the muntins in the existing windows. The Architect answered that they are 3/4" and that the new ones would have the same dimensions. It was noted that the profile of the muntins would be very similar as well. Members agreed that they did not have an issue with using clad windows on the rear of the house but were concerned that only wood windows be used on the historic house and front façade. The Architect explained that the Woodwright windows were all wood windows. Members agreed that the 1951 replacement windows were not significant and that all of the windows needed to be wood with the exception of those facing the rear of the property.

Discussion turned to the paint colors. The Architect stated that the house and trim would remain white, but that they wanted to change the colors of the shutters and doors to Essex Green or black. A Commission Member noted that they planned to have black windows and asked if they would be matching them. After some discussion, the Applicants agreed that they would prefer Essex Green for the doors and shutters. The shutters were noted to be working wood shutters.

The Architect explained that they had looked for a simple 16 panel garage door but had had a hard time finding one. Instead, they were proposing a solid wood door with a row of windows at the top, or a three panel door with no windows. She reviewed the proposed garage door styles and noted that they had not wanted to use a raised panel door. Members agreed that a raised panel door would not be appropriate here. The proposed door was noted to be a Shaker style door with no handles or hardware. The two car garage would have two separate garage doors, both painted dark green. Members agreed that the three panel door with a row of windows across the top would be appropriate to the site.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Giddings moved to approve the installation of new Anderson 400 Series Woodwright all wood six over six simulated divided light windows to be painted black on the front and side facades of the house and new Anderson 400 Series Fiberglass clad wood windows in black on the rear façade with the understanding that the two surviving original windows on the side façade will remain in place; the use of "Essex Green" paint for the shutters, doors, and garage doors; and the installation of two wood "Medina" style wood doors with a row of windows across the top of the door. Mr. Fiori seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Barretts Mill Farm, 449 Barretts Mill Road, Barrett Farm Historic District, to construct greenhouse and bench

Mr. Giddings recused himself from this discussion as he is an abutter to the property. Mr. Berrizbeitia was appointed to vote in his place.

Applicant's Lise Holdorf and Melissa Maxwell, Barrett Mill Farm, presented their application to install a second greenhouse on the farm. They explained that they had run out of space in the existing greenhouse and would like to construct a second greenhouse adjacent to the farmhouse. The proposed location would allow easier access for utilities and the red barn near the road would help to screen the structure from view. The proposed new greenhouse would be economical and removable but would allow them to increase their current capacity and allow year round production. The new structure was proposed to be 26'x48' and would consist of a metal frame with a plastic film roof and walls. The door would be a sliding polycarbonate door.

Members reviewed the proposed site plan and photos of similar greenhouse designs. A Commission Member noted that the greenhouse would be located behind deciduous plantings and was significantly set back from the road. Members reviewed the visibility of the area and the proposed location. Another Member asked why the Town, who owned the site, was not the applicant for this work. The Applicants explained that their operations were separate from the Town and that they leased the land. They had discussed the potential need for a new greenhouse when the lease was signed and would retain ownership of the removable structure if they ever moved from this site. The Chair read an email received from an abutter, Colleen Giddings, 474 Barrett's Mill Road, expressing concern with the project and the opinion that this should be a Town application. The email noted that the greenhouse had originally been proposed for a location at the rear of the house and Ms. Giddings was concerned with the impact of the new structure on the vistas of the site. She thought another location would be better.

The Applicants explained that they were two years in to a five year lease on the site. The proposed new greenhouse would line up with the rear corner of the house and would not block any views to the site. They had initially thought about putting it farther back on the site but had relocated it after considering the work involved to bring utilities and water to the building. Moving it farther from the house would increase the cost of utilities for the project.

A Commission Member thought that this project was very similar to the chicken coops proposed for the adjacent fields earlier in the year. A second Member agreed as the project was similarly not aesthetic but was appropriate to the nature and use of the site. She asked what condition the site would be in if the greenhouse was ever moved. The Applicants responded that they would need to flatten the area for the greenhouse and bring out utilities, but that there would be no substantial changes to the existing site.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment at this time. Nancy Nelson, Superintendent of the Minuteman National Historical Park, expressed concern with the visual impact of the new greenhouse on the National Park. She asked if the greenhouse could be sited with sensitivity to the views from the Barrett House and stated that she was very supportive of the work of the farm. Members reviewed the location and its visibility, noting that the structure would be 14' tall at its corner, which was taller than some of the trees in the area.

Colleen Giddings, 474 Barrett's Mill Road, stated that she was very concerned with this project. She noted that the Applicants had previously discussed putting up hoop houses behind the house and that the neighbors had been ok with that proposal because the structure would be lower and farther back from the street. She was not sure whether the Lee Drive residents received a notice of the meeting but felt that their views would also be negatively impacted and felt that the greenhouse would be better sited farther back on the property. She thought that it should align with the rear of the house if possible. The Applicants explained that that location was difficult because of the location of the septic system. Ms. Giddings also expressed concern that the structure would be located on the drainage channel. The Applicants stated that they were aware of the drain and would stay to one side of it.

Ms. Nelson added that in regard to the previously proposed chicken coops, those had been low profile, moveable structures of a different style.

Commission Members agreed that a site visit would be helpful and agreed to schedule one for 8:00 A.M. on Thursday, January 14, 2016. Members asked the Applicants to use a balloon or some other method for determining the height of the new building. The Applicants agreed and noted that the footprint of the building was already staked out. Further discussion was continued to the next meeting on January 21.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mill Brook Tarry Parking Deck – Project Representative Joel Kahn and Architect Chip Dewing presented the preliminary plans to construct a parking area over the wetlands adjacent to the existing parking lot. The Representative explained that they were here to keep the Commission abreast of the project and that this was being proposed to address parking concerns which had been raised during their reviews with other Commissions. They were currently working with the Planning Board and thought that they had enough parking but could build a new 17 space deck if needed. The new deck would bridge over the isolated wetlands adjacent to the existing parking lot and would need to be approved by the Natural Resources Commission as well as the HDC. The Representative explained that the deck would be designed to ensure adequate flood water storage and would have an at grade connection to the existing parking lot. The new deck would require railings, but they were not prepared to discuss the design for those yet. He explained that they planned to come back to the Commission once they had completed their other reviews to discuss the details of the parking deck and railings.

A Commission Member asked about the visibility of the new parking structure. It was noted that it was visible from several points on Keyes Road. The Representative explained that they were considering the deck as part of their request for parking relief from the Zoning Board of Appeals. He noted that they thought there was already enough parking and that the new deck would be very expensive for 17 spaces, but that they would install it if necessary for the new project. Another Member asked if this was a natural wetland or a created one. The Representative stated that it was considered to be an isolated wetland.

A Commission Member thought that this would be an impactful and different element in the landscape and found it difficult to reconcile with the other elements of the site. The Representative felt that the area would look better with the parking deck, adding that it would include landscaping as well. He thought that the new parking area could be beneficial to the area and noted that it was being proposed in an effort to improve the property. A question was raised about the amount of landscaping to be added to the site. The Representative stated that the deck would be 10' from the property line and that they would use that area for landscaping and screening. Another Member asked about whether plantings were possible in a wetland area. The Representative answered that they would be able to plant a buffer and would work with NRC on the plants to be used.

The Architect briefly reviewed their structural solution to constructing the deck and explained that they would need to install a curb to prevent drainage from going into the wetlands. He and the Representative also discussed potential screening options. The Representative stated that they would be going back to the Planning Board by the end of the month. A Commission member asked how many parking spaces would be lost to create the access to the structure. The Representative stated that they had planned for 172 spaces and were adding 17. He believed that they needed 230 spaces to meet current zoning requirements. Members thanked the representatives for coming in with the updated plans.

Minutes of the December 3 Meeting – Members had reviewed the draft minutes and revisions were submitted at this time. Mr. Giddings moved to approve the draft minutes for the December 3 meeting as revised.

New Members – The Commission welcomed new member Peter Nobile to the Commission at this time. It was noted that another new member, Kathleen Chartener, was expected to be appointed to the Commission in the next few weeks.

Violations – Members had agreed to go by Bank of America after the last meeting to view the installed gravel. Photos were passed out at this time and all Members agreed that the change was a violation of the Historic Districts Act. Staff was asked to prepare a letter to be sent to the property owner.

A Commission Member noted that the wall under construction at 55 Estabrook Road did not appear to match the approved design. Staff had also been out to view it and passed out photos. Members asked Staff to contact the engineer who had met with the Commission on the project and to write up an enforcement letter for the property.

Visibility Determinations – Staff explained that a project at 502 Lexington Road, where the work was entirely at the rear of the house, and on Edmonds Lane, on a unit at the rear of the site, had raised the question of visibility within the Districts. Members reviewed maps of both areas and agreed that neither project would be visible from a public way or place.

Mr. Giddings moved to adjourn. Mr. Fiori seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.
The Meeting was adjourned at 10:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Kritzer
Senior Planner

Minutes Approved on: 2/11/16

Nea Glenn, Secretary