HISTORIC DISTRICTS COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 19, 2016

Pursuant to notice duly filed with the Town Clerk's office, the Town of Concord Historic Districts Commission held a public meeting on Thursday, May 19, 2016 at 7:00 P.M. in the First Floor Conference Room, 141 Keyes Road, Concord, Massachusetts.

Present:

Full Members
Terry Gregory, Chair
Mark Giddings
Nea Glenn

Associate Members
Luis Berrizbeitia
Kathleen Chartener
Satish Dhingra
Peter Nobile
Melinda Shumway

Lara Kritzer, Senior Planner

Chair Terry Gregory called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. Voting Members for the meeting were Mr. Berrizbeitia, Mr. Giddings, Ms. Glenn, Mr. Gregory, and Ms. Shumway. Ms. Chartener was not present at the start of the meeting and arrived during the Concord Museum discussion.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Patrick McWhinney, 25 Barnes Hill Road, Barrett Farm Historic District, for new lighting, paving, and new driveway

This application was continued to allow time for a site visit which has been scheduled for May 31. There was no discussion at this time but the time of the site visit was confirmed for 8:30 A.M.

Ian and Kelsey Calhoun, 362 Barretts Mill Road, Barrett Farm Historic District, for addition with attached garage, new lighting, paving, and dormers

Owners Ian and Kelsey Calhoun and Architect Robert Drew were present for the discussion, which began with a review of the morning's site visit to the property. A Commission Member stated her concern with the steep grade change at the edge of the septic system. She asked for more information on the slope in the front right corner of the property and noted that the Commission was sensitive to changes in grade. She was concerned by the extent of the changes to the existing topography and with the preservation of the area's trees. The Architect explained that the elevation at the front right corner of the new garage would be 134.5' and that it would drop to 130' over 7'. He reviewed the site plan with the Commission.

After reviewing the plans, a Commission Member stated that he had been concerned with the slope at the site visit but now did not think that it would be as steep as he had originally thought. A second Member noted that the Owner had mentioned that there was an ideal location for the septic system on

the opposite side of the house. The Owner agreed that there was a good location on the left of the house but explained that they were not sure that it could be installed there. He asked the Commission to approve the proposed location, and noted that anything on the left side of the house would be more visible and would need to be done carefully. Members discussed the options for locating the septic system. A third Member asked if the Board of Health had looked at the placement. The Owner stated that they had and that the Board of Health had been present when they had done their test pits. The Owner noted the constraints of the site and its existing location, noting that they were already aware that the septic system needed to be upgraded. The third Member asked if the Owner would continue to look at alternative locations if the proposed septic location was approved. The Owner stated that they had already done quite a bit of work to get this far with their proposal, and was not sure that another alternative was possible.

A Commission Member noted that all of the Members shared a concern with the steep drop off at the edge of the proposed septic system. He noted that in the far right corner of the site, the grade would be lowered by 2' over a distance of 7'. He suggested that this drop could be screened with plantings and asked if the Owner would consider installing native plants. The Owner stated that he would be willing to consider this, noting that the area was currently covered in invasive plants. He stated that they were considering using lilacs or other plantings in the area that they were planning to rework. A second Member agreed that native plantings could be used to soften the impact of the grade change and suggested blueberry bushes. Three other Members agreed with this approach.

The Architect explained that the body and trim of the house and addition would be painted in "Gropius White" (California Paints) with "Templeton Gray" (BM HC161) for the doors and Black for the shutters. The new windows would be Pella Aluminum Clad wood windows and the new addition was proposed to have aluminum gutters to match the house. It was noted that the house was currently vinyl sided and would be resided in wood as part of the project and that the new roof on the addition would be architectural shingles to match the color of the existing house roof. A Lightology brand "Admiral Classic" style wall sconce was proposed for over the garage doors and a recessed light would be installed in the new side entrance. A Commission Member asked if a new light would be installed at the existing front door. The Owner stated that there was currently a light over the door. He expected that they would want to replace this but that they had not considered the new fixture yet. He also noted that the property had a light post in the yard.

The Architect explained that the new driveway would be black asphalt to match the existing driveway. Member suggested that the Owner consider rolling stonedust into the top coat or looking into other surfaces that would have a softer appearance. A question was raised as to whether the new driveway would be visible and it was noted that it might be well screened by vegetation.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Giddings moved "*to approve the plans as submitted for the new addition, dormers attached two car garage, and driveway expansion on the condition that a landscape plan showing the proposed screening for the SE corner of the site and the proposed septic system be submitted and approved before any permits are issued.*" Mr. Berrizbeitia seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The Chair then signed and dated the approved plans.

The rest of the continued items were discussed after the new public hearings.

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

Following the Concord Museum discussion, Applicants Johanna Boynton and Mark Brennan met with the Commission to discuss the direction of their project at 12 Bow Street. They explained that they had looked at the 2001 plans approved by the HDC for a new house on the site as a reference for what might work here. They noted that those plans had turned the house into a garage. They explained that they had investigated reusing the existing house and noted that it was built on an improper slab foundation that was splitting and allowing the walls to move outward. Structurally, they would need to start from scratch and rebuild the foundation completely and so they had looked at what could be done there if the house was completely removed, which had led to the new plans shown at the last meeting. As requested, they had done a cost analysis on what it would cost to restore the existing building. They had found that it would cost about $225,000 to replace the existing foundation, not counting the cost to restore the structure. They went on to explain that part of their reason for replacing the existing structure is that they had not wanted to build a new house in the back and disturb the surrounding neighbors. They added that they had read through a report on the existing house created in 2001 which had found the house to be a non-contributing element of the District and not a significant structure.

The Applicants presented photos of other new houses in the Districts and explained that they felt their proposed new design respected the streetscape as it was a little lower and faced away from the abutting neighbors. They asked for guidance on how to proceed and feedback on the currently proposed design. They explained that they would be happy to work with the Commission on a solution for this site. They had also considered the massing of the existing house and new construction and understood that this needed to be part of the conversation.

A Commission Member asked for the square footage of the existing and proposed new house. The Applicants stated that the existing house was around 1,900 sf. and that the proposed new house had been 4,000sf. The Member stated that he had concerns with the size of the proposed house, which would be larger than most of the homes in this area. It was noted that the new house proposed in 2001 had been closer to 2,800 sf. and other Members agreed that size was a significant issue and an area of concern. The Commission Member stated that he was also concerned with losing the character of the existing house and changing the look of this corner of the District.

A Commission Member noted that there were a number of beautiful trees on the site and asked the applicants to be sensitive to this in their new design. The Applicants stated that the 2001 plans would have taken down more trees than their current design. They explained that they wanted to include a first floor master bedroom in the house and that this added to the footprint. He added that the house that they had built on Lexington Road was 3,300 sf. but looked smaller from the street. A second Member agreed that that house had been successful but noted that the Lexington Road site was very different from this one. The first Member asked the Applicants to consider the scale of the surrounding buildings. It was noted that 20 Bow Street was around 3,300 sf. and he suggested that the Applicants look at the existing building and reconsider their design. A third Member agreed that a new building along the lines of the existing one was moving in the right direction and noted that if they matched the existing design, it could be approved as replacement in kind. A fourth Member found the existing house to be small but gracious and noted the historical relevance of the house. He noted that the Commission had reviewed another Cape style house this morning, and how the original structure was being preserved and expanded there rather than replaced.

Members reviewed the size of surrounding houses. It was noted that the homes on Munroe Place were roughly 1,600 sf. The Applicants were encouraged to look at gambrel styles and to avoid looking at Lowell Road for examples as those homes were very different in size, scale and design from the ones on Bow, Munroe and Lang. Members agreed that it would be appropriate to consider the house next door at 3,300 sf. as an example of an appropriate sized building. A Commission Member asked if the building needed to be a 1 ½ story structure. Members noted their decision at the last meeting concerning the house at 585 Lexington Road, where they had stated that the style and proportions of the street facades must be retained but that more flexibility could be given to the rear facade. Members agreed that this was a good direction for this property as well, but allowed that improvements such as overhangs and gutters could be incorporated into the primary facades. A Commission Member encouraged the Applicants to avoid adding much more massing than what is currently on the site and to be sensitive to the neighbor's concerns.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment at this time. Kristin Johnson, 61 Lang Street, noted that the last resident of 12 Bow Street had been an important hymn writer. Her own house was one of the largest of Lang Street and was 3,100 sf. on a half-acre lot. She understood the Applicant's goals but was concerned that this property is an investment property for them and wondered if it really needed everything that was being proposed there. She compared the house to its neighbor at 20 Bow Street, which was a mix of styles, and felt that any other design at this location would negatively impact the District. She was against using square footage as a guideline and as concerned that they would lose their evaluating tools if the house was torn down. She felt that any additional construction on the site should be subservient.

Wendy Rovelli, 42 Bow Street, stated that she supported a larger structure here but agreed with maintaining the clarity of the view from the road. She did not feel that any new structure needed to be exactly the same as the existing one and noted that if any trees were removed from the site, it would increase the visibility of the property and the HDC's review.

David Wiener, 20 Bow Street, stated that he wanted to see something done here but that it needed to be appropriate to the area. He was concerned with the 2001 plans as he felt they were more impactful than the current proposal and would like to see that idea dropped as it was inappropriate to the area.

Bruce Blumgard, 36 Lowell Road, appreciated the Commission's comments about keeping the new design in scale with the neighborhood. He noted that Concord's smaller homes had lasted for generations and expressed concern that only large homes were being built. He did not think that this was in keeping with Concord's values and thought that this project could be a great model for smaller homes in the future.

The Chair asked for the Commission's opinion on the 2001 plan. A Member noted that it was an interesting idea which allowed the house to be preserved but that this was not the only goal for the site. Members agreed that there were other options that were more appropriate to the property and neighborhood.

Milltarry Offices Registered, LLP, 91 Lowell Road, Main Street Historic District, for new building, lighting, landscaping and grading

Architects Tom Kearns, DSK Architects, stated that they were returning to the Commission at this time for approval of the proposed changes at 91 Lowell Road, including the construction of the new market

building. He noted that this was their fifth trip to the HDC and that they were back this time with a proposed new parking deck that was mandated by the Planning Board (PB). They had had a positive meeting with the Natural Resources Commission NRC) the night before and had reached a point where the final decisions have been made to the plans. He also noted that the building, deck and site had been reviewed favorably by both the PB and NRC.

The Architect noted that there were three elements for the Commission's approval at this time – the market building, the parking deck, and the overall site's landscape design. Beginning with the Market, he explained that the design had not changed since the Commission had last reviewed it in October. He explained that the solar panels had been completely removed from the design and that there were no plans to install them. He reviewed the overall design, noting that the clapboard siding would be Hardi Board painted White.

Moving on to the parking deck, he explained that this would add 17 spaces to the site and would be at grade with a guard rail only around those portions of the deck that were elevated. They had proposed to restore the surrounding Town land by cleaning it up and removing the invasive species and this plan had been supported by both the NRC and PB. The newly restored area would be more visually appealing with an improved habitat that would work with the new parking deck. The new deck was a natural extension of the existing parking lots and the area would continue to serve its current function as a storm drainage zone. They did plan to remove some of the mature trees and would replace them with more appropriate, high quality trees. The Town had also asked for two new picnic tables to be installed in the grassy area near Keyes Road and for additional streetlights along Keyes Road to improve pedestrian access to the property.

A Commission Member asked about the material of the new decks. The Architect stated that it would be a concrete pile structure and thought that it will work with the other concrete elements on the site. The new railings were proposed to be natural wood railings, which the Architect felt was an appropriate language for the area. The Architect presented potential views of the new deck on the property and noted that it would be surrounded by a fairly dense vegetative area. A second Commission Member asked if the parking lot now met the required number of spaces. The Architect stated that they were still asking for relief from the parking requirements and would be going to the Zoning Board of Appeals for approval in June. The Member asked about the required side entrance to the Market and the Architect confirmed its location on the revised plans.

The Architect next moved to the proposed changes to the landscape. He noted that a shopping corral was proposed for the center of the parking lot and would be natural galvanized, unpainted metal. Members reviewed the proposed location and the Architect noted the locations of the two proposed compactors for recycling and trash. He explained that these would be screened behind an 8' vertical wood fence that will be painted forest green. New fencing was also proposed for along the Mill Brook which would be similar in detail to fencing proposed at the service area. Members reviewed the plans to screen the service elements and their organization. It was noted that the existing Rite Aid entrance would be altered to work with changes in grade on the site and would include new concrete steps surrounded by low form concrete walls. The Architect explained that there would also be a ramp and that the steps would be in front of a central gathering area defined by decorative brickwork.

The Architect stated that he hoped to have a vote on the application tonight. A Commission Member asked if there were any stone walls proposed on the site. The Architect stated that the only stone wall would be along Lowell Road. A second Member asked about the changes to the back of the Rite Aid building. The Architect stated that this area had been extensively reviewed and was now proposed to

have three curb cuts to remove any doubts or conflicts. They planned on adding to the landscaped presence of the area and on making additional sidewalk improvements. The service areas would have mountable granite curbs and the Architect reviewed the access to the loading docks. They were working with the PB to enhance the safety of the area while still adding greenery to the site.

Members reviewed the proposed plan and the Architect stated that the detailed list of plants was part of their agreement for PB approval. A Commission Member asked if some of the parking spaces were on Town land. The Architect stated that the Owner currently leased about 400' behind the Rite Aid building from the Town and that the PB would be recommending that that lease continue. The Architect reviewed the evergreens and native plants proposed, explaining that many of these would be deciduous trees that are 5' to 12' in height. It was noted that the central gathering space would have a removable bollard to prevent anyone driving in that area.

A question was raised about the roof of the new Market and the location of all vents and mechanical equipment. The Architect confirmed that all of the roof equipment would be organized and located in a zone over the kitchen. The area would be screened with painted aluminum louvers and nothing was proposed for the Main gable roof. The cupola would be glass but would not be lit. A Commission Member asked about the width of the eaves and the Architect stated that they would have 18' projections.

A Commission Member stated that he thought the design was well done. Another Member agreed and found the landscaping proposed to be impressive. It was noted that no work would be done to the Rite Aid building, but that it had been painted over the last few years. A Member asked if any existing trees would be removed. The Architect explained that they would be removing a number of trees from the site, including the linden trees at the center of the parking area that were in bad condition. The Member thought that the plan to clean up the edges of the site was an improvement over its existing condition.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment. David Brownell, 36 Bow Street expressed his concern for the traffic and parking on the site. He was not sure if the traffic study was complete but noted that during events in the past, both sides of Bow and Lang Streets had been clogged with parked cars and that this issue was of concern to the neighbors. He thought that the building was too big for the neighborhood and wished that it had been designed for this site.

David Wiener, 20 Bow Street, stated that he was concerned with the proposed parking structure and with the location of the new building. He thought that the building was too close to Lowell Road and noted that the landscaping would add twelve trees but that more should be added to screen the neighbors from the new building, which he thought would light up their area. He suggested that more trees would be helpful on the far side of Lowell Road to assist with screening.

Kristin Johnson, 61 Lang Street, noted that the Applicants had been looking at doing something on this site for several years and had worked hard to develop these plans. She explained that a neighborhood group was working with the Applicants to address their concerns with traffic issues. She noted the proposed stone walls along Lowell Road and expressed concern that the traffic and one lane entry/exit to the site would be a problem. She suggested that the Lowell Road entrance be a right turn only entrance and was strongly opposed to a two way entry there. She felt that the design was not set in stone and could be altered, and also agreed with her neighbor's concern with lighting. She stated that she could see 100 Keyes Road from her property now and felt that the lighting in the new market building would negatively impact their properties.

It was noted that the land across Lowell Street from the new Market was marsh land and that nothing could be planted there for screening. Members suggested that the neighborhood work with the Applicants on the hours of operation for the store. It was noted that the building had a deep recess at its large central opening of about 6' and that this would help to address light spillage. The building would also be located fairly far back, 40', from the road.

Mr. Wiener stated that he would like to see more landscaping along Lowell Road for screening. The Architect noted that they had purposely kept the landscape open in the front as they did not feel that the area needed to be embellished. A Commission Member noted that this was already a commercial area and that the Architect had worked hard to address the design on all sides of the building. She thought that the new building was attractive and that the proposal was a nice use of the land and a wonderful design for the site. Ms. Johnson stated that the neighborhood was frustrated that the parking and traffic issues were not being addressed.

A Commission Member wondered whether the Commission was ready to proceed or needed another meeting to review the project. The Architect noted that they would be back in later for all of the site's lighting and signage. A second Member stated that he had no concerns with the proposed design of the building. A third stated that he did not want the HDC's approval to be seen as an endorsement of the parking plan. He thought that this was an issue of historic context and he respectfully disagreed with the residents who felt the building was out of scale as he thought it was appropriate given the context of the area. He thought that this project could be the key to improving the area and suggested that the Commission move forward with a vote.

Ms. Johnson stated her concern that a vote would send a signal that this was an acceptable parking and traffic plan for the site. A Commission Member stated that he was surprised that the NRC was allowing the parking deck but noted that parking and traffic issues were not the purview of the HDC. A second Member agreed and thought that all of the elements had been addressed. A third Member thought that the Architect's firm had done an outstanding job and other Members agreed that the project was very thoroughly designed.

Ms. Glenn moved to approve the application as submitted for the construction of a new freestanding market building according to the plans dated October 1, 2015 and the New Material Checklist and Specifications Sheets dated August 11, 2015; and the construction of a new parking deck, stairs and ramp leading to the Rite Aid building, paving, fencing and other site improvements as shown in the site plan and materials dated May 5, 2016 and submitted for the May 19, 2016 meeting with the exception of any lighting or signage which will be reviewed separately at a later date. Mr. Berrizbeitia seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Frances Walker, 201 Lexington Road, American Mile Historic District, for new windows

Owners Frances and Bruce Walker presented their application to replace three windows on the left façade of their house. They explained that they were renovating the second story of their home and had planned to restore these three windows. However, when the walls were opened up, they had discovered that the inoperable windows were screwed in place with double jams and had been installed with no weight pockets. There was no way to make the existing windows operable so they were proposing to replace the windows instead. The Owners noted that the windows were very visible to Lexington Road

and were old windows but did not appear to be original to the house. They explained that after looking at the framing, they believed the windows had been reused from another location.

The proposed new windows would be all wood double hung windows with the same six over nine lights pattern as the existing windows. The new sash frames would be the same size as the existing window frames but the 1/8" muntins will be slightly wider than the existing window muntins, which are very narrow. The Owner explained that the windows still had nice glass and felt that it was a shame that the windows could not be reused.

Commission Members reviewed photos of the house and noted that it was a very old house with a mix of architectural styles. Members agreed that the proposed new windows would be close in appearance to the existing windows and that replacement made sense in this case.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Ms. Glenn moved *"to approve the replacement of the three windows on the second floor of the left façade with new all wood six over nine double hung windows of the same size and dimensions."* Mr. Giddings seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

<u>Archstone Builders LLC, 427 Lowell Road, Barrett Farm Historic District, for new walkways/paving</u>

Landscape Architect Kim Ahearn and Owner David Guthrie presented their proposal to add new walkways to the site. The Landscape Architect reviewed the work underway to install plantings on the property. She had handpicked the new materials for the site and much of it was already in place. The new materials met the height requirements and she was pleased with the installation so far. The Owner explained that they had forgotten to add the walkways to the previously approved site plan and had wanted to come back before the Commission to clarify it. The new walkways were proposed to lead from the driveway to the front and side doors, and from the rear garage door to the backyard. All of the walkways would be bluestone and the last one would include steps.

A Commission Member asked how the bluestone would be shaped. The Owner stated that the front walkway would use random shapes and that the side walkway would be squared off. A second Member asked if the stoops were bluestone and the Owner confirmed that they are. He explained that they were also requesting the stairs at the rear of the garage doors to provide access to the backyard but was not sure that these would be at all visible. A third Member noted that water runoff concerns had recently been raised and asked if the grading had been addressed. The Landscape Architect showed the water retention area on the plans and explained how the swale had been installed. She added that she was taking care with the new plantings to make sure that they did not cause any issues. The third Member asked about the landscaping on the left side of the site and whether they had considered how to avoid having water stream onto the neighbor's driveway. The Landscape Architect stated that she had installed conifers in that location and that the soil was very permeable. She added that they could discuss adding a small dip behind the stone walls if necessary.

A Commission Member asked when all of the plantings would be in place. The Landscape Architect stated that they would be planting for the new few days and hoped to have it all installed by early next week. The Owner asked if there would be any substitutions from the plants approved. The Landscape Architect stated that she was not aware of any changes but that they were considering installing one more conifer to better block the view to the building. She added that if the plantings were thick enough on the south side of the property, she could move one of the approved plantings to the north side. The

Commission agreed to leave those decisions to the Landscape Architect with the note that the front left (Southwest) corner was the most important one to screen.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Ms. Glenn moved "*to approve the installation of new bluestone walkways at the front, side and rear garage doors and the bluestone steps leading into the backyard as submitted.*" Mr. Giddings seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The approved plans were then signed and dated by Chair Terry Gregory.

Meghan & Dustin Clinard, 414 Main Street, Main Street Historic District, for new lighting, paving, and paint colors

Owner Meghan Clinard presented her application for new landscape paving, lighting, and paint color changes to the property. She stated that her family had just purchased the property, which had been in the same family for 100 years. Beginning with new paint colors, she proposed changing the shutters from dark green to black. She planned to have the existing windows refurbished and requested to paint the white window sash black. A Commission Member asked for more details on the work proposed for the window sash. The Owner stated that they planned to restore and repair the existing windows and would replace the window mechanisms so that they were all working again. They also had an estimate for new fiberglass storm windows which they planned to install in place of the old aluminum ones.

The Owner explained that the front door was a French style door that she hoped to be able to strip and stain. If it was not possible to stain the door, then she proposed to paint it "Heritage Red" (BM). Commission Members thought that it would be fine to go ahead and strip the door, but asked that the Owner gain more information on whether it was possible to stain the door and the type of stain proposed before moving forward on this element. The Owner added that she expected to replace the storm door at some point too but was not sure when. Storm windows were also proposed to replace the existing ones on the house and would be black to match the sash. Members agreed that the new storm windows could be considered replacement in kind.

Proposed site work included removing all of the existing concrete on the site with the exception of a few paving stones. She showed photos of her driveway and explained that the street end flooded regularly and that the driveway needed to be regraded. A Commission Member asked if they planned to expand the footprint of the driveway. The Owner stated that the existing driveway was two cars wide at the garage but narrowed down to one car width at the street. She proposed to have the driveway be two cars wide to the street and to install a flare at the roadway which she believed was necessary to prevent driving over the yard. Referring to the site plan, the Owner explained that they were also proposing a new brick walkway to the front door and bluestone walkways and a patio area behind the house. Members agreed that they would like to see the type of brick to be used.

Members agreed that a site visit would be helpful and asked that the owner stake out the location of the proposed walkways and expanded driveway. They also asked for more information on the new materials. The Owner noted that they were considering installing an arbor as well. Members asked that she use something to show the location of the arbor and noted that any garden furniture or other changes would require review. The Owner stated that she might not install the arbor for another year and would hold off on that element for now.

Lastly, the Owner explained that they had two light fixtures at the front door, located under the porch roof, which she wanted to replace. Members explained their concerns with wattage and that they might

ask for a lower wattage bulb to be used. The Owner was advised to come back with a Dark Sky compatible option for discussion.

Members agreed to have a site visit to the property on Tuesday, May 31, at 8:00 A.M. Further discussion was continued to the June 2 meeting.

Concord Museum, 200 Lexington Road, American Mile Historic District, to demolish the existing Davis Building and construct new addition with site improvements including a courtyard, passenger drop-off, expanded parking, lighting, landscaping, and signage

Architects Bob Miklos and Mary Ann Upton of Design Lab Architects, Landscape Architect Lisa Giersbach of G Design Studio, and Concord Museum Board of Directors representative Ralph Earle were present to discuss the Museum's proposal to replace the Davis Building with a new addition and to make further changes to the site.

The Architects explained that they had been working with the Museum for two years to complete a comprehensive Masterplan and assess the needs and goals of the Museum for the site. The Board Representative explained that the Masterplan was designed to revitalize the campus and that they had been looking at a variety of options over the last year. The Museum was looking for more gallery space as well as a dedicated education space and separate office space – currently it looked out over the learning areas. They had been working on design development for about six months now and had spent 2.5 years working through their ideas and goals for the site. He thought that the proposed new addition would accomplish all of the goals of the Masterplan and explained how it was intended to work with both the original ca. 1930s Little residential style building and the ca. 1990s Gund addition. The Davis building is a ca. 1980s structure that was designed to look like a barn and is disconnected from the Museum.

The Representatives explained that the new plan offered a better route through the gallery space and would provide new storage and office space in the same location. The site currently had inadequate parking and access and the Museum was working with the Landscape Architect to address those issues. The Representative also noted that the Museum was on the site of Emerson's former orchard and that their proposed new courtyard was intended to be reminiscent of the former orchard. The Museum hoped to ease access to the site by providing a new access point on Lexington Road and to increase the parking in a substantial way. A new bus drop off area is also proposed as the Museum regularly has four bus loads a day accessing the site. The new courtyard would serve as an informal gathering space for the Museum and will create a gateway for all of the attractions on site.

The Architect explained that the proposed design had not changed since the informal discussion with the Commission several meetings ago. The proposed lighting had been developed based on that discussion and photos of the proposed pole lights were included with the application.

A Commission Member asked about a perimeter walkway for the site and thought that it would encourage a pedestrian connection to Lexington Road. The Landscape Architect stated that they were interested in relocating the crosswalks on Lexington Road and explained how the grading in that area was an issue. She added that they planned to replace trees that needed to be removed but that many of the existing trees were Norway Maples or damaged. The retaining wall along Lexington Road was proposed to be pushed back to create an accessible path to Lexington Road and was part of their plans for the relocated crosswalk. This part of the site was tricky, though, due to the higher elevation of Lexington Road in relation to the rest of the Museum site. The Member thought that it would be

important to the Town to have that connection and access to Lexington Road and that it would be nice to invite people into the site from there. The Representative stated that the Town was already looking at redoing the Cambridge Turnpike next year and that the two projects will work together and hopefully create a more defined road and sidewalk area. It was noted that a connection between the Museum and Heywood Meadow would be a benefit

A Commission Member asked why the Commission should allow the Davis Building to be demolished. The Architects explained that the building was a hybrid of heavy timber and steel frame construction. The walls did not meet current building code for wind bracing and the central beam had cracked, causing structural problems. The envelope of the building needed upgrading and there was no accessibility to the upper floors. The building was difficult to maintain, the Lexington Road elevation was unattractive, and the structure was badly located and situated on the site. The Architects explained that the Davis Building had an 8,000 sf. and that the new one would have 12,000 with a just under 5,000 sf. footprint. The Davis Building's footprint is 90'x 42', approximately 2,800 sf. The Davis Building was built in 1979 and had incorporated some old beams but these were decorative and not structural. The Museum was looking at what could be salvaged from the building and the Architects were looking to repurpose the hand forged iron hardware in the building.

The Architects explained that the ridgeline of the new building would be lower than the current ridge. The range of proposed exterior colors had been submitted with the application along with material samples. The exterior is proposed to be a smooth hardiplank and is intended to look like native white pine. The siding will be primed and painted after installation. The Architects noted that the existing Little and Gund buildings have warm stone color trim and explained their idea to paint the new building to be somewhere between white and tan. They planned to do a mockup to get a better sense of the right color when the project is underway.

A Commission Member asked if real stone would be used and the Architects answered yes, that fieldstone would be used in the side facades and extended into the walls of the courtyard. The Architects also noted that board and batten siding was proposed to add additional details.

Lighting on the building would include a new light at the Gund entrance, where two new walls were also proposed to allow for an accessible ramp to the front entrance. The lights on the ramps would be installed on the back of the new brick walls. They were considering installing similar lighting on the courtyard walls as they were interested in throwing the light along them. The new light fixtures would have a temperature of 3,000K and they would be working with preliminary lights to measure the throw of the light. Within the parking lot, the Architects had initially proposed bollard lights but the Town would not allow them as their visibility was not good in snow. They were currently looking at other types of light fixtures and were considering contemporary but agricultural styles. A Commission Member thought that the RLM fixtures spoke to the barn design of the new addition. The Architects stated that they were still exploring their options but wanted to go in that direction.

A Commission Member asked what the Applicants would like to see from tonight's meeting. The Representatives stated that they would like to receive approval to remove the Davis Building. Members discussed the review process and their concerns with the demolition of the Davis building. A Member asked whether the style of the wall surrounding the orchard courtyard would be formal or relaxed. The Architect answered that it would be neat and tidy but also of the building. They noted the more relaxed style of the wall along Lexington Road and stated that the new wall would match others in the area. The new fieldstone used would be crisp and horizontal in form but with the texture of natural material. Another Member noted that this would not be quite like the existing site or building. A third Member

thought that the guideline should be that the walls be somewhere between perfect and a pile of stones. He felt that the wall should speak to the context and integrity of the site and should not be a farmer's wall. A fourth Member felt confident that a balance could be found.

A Commission Member asked if the project would increase the existing parking. The Landscape Architect answered yes, that the site currently had 16 spaces and would go up to 36 spaces with the new design. She noted that the Museum also had 14 spaces on the north side of the Cambridge Turnpike and that two of these spaces would be lost. There was a possibility that the utilities along the road would be depressed with the new roadway project, which would give them a few more spaces as well.

A Commission Member asked about the funding of the project. The Representative expected that the Museum will have raised the funds by October but would not begin construction until all of the funding was in place. A second Member thought that the Applicants should show how changes in the design of the Cambridge Turnpike project might impact this site. Members discussed those plans and whether they had been finalized.

The Architect noted that the new roof would be a metal standing seam roof. He explained that the existing building had slate shingle roofs in three different colors for the old slate, Gund era slate, and new replacement slate. They were different but all compatible.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Discussion at this time. Monika Park, 215 Lexington Road, stated that her husband is an architect but could not be present for this meeting. Their house faced the back of the Davis building and she thought that any improvement to that area of the Museum was a good idea. She agreed with the comments made about creating a cohesive historic experience as well as with the challenge of crossing Lexington Road in this area. She expressed concern with the idea of a new entrance on Lexington Road as the area was already subject to bad traffic and congestion. She had safety concerns for this new entrance. She noted that people were generally looking to turn left into Concord Center and that if it was right only this still might not solve the problem.as people regularly made U turns on the street and caused congestion. She agreed that there was a need for more parking on the site and was supportive of the educational development goals of the Museum. Concerning the new building, she was concerned that it did not integrate into the rest of the Museum campus, as well as with the big, open windows. She did not think that these windows were characteristic of Lexington Road and felt that the street façade of the new structure had a very business-like appearance. She was not sure about the metal roof and questioned whether it would be allowed on any other building in the Districts. She invited Members to walk by the property on Lexington Road and consider the impact of another entrance point. She added that there were no other businesses on Lexington Road and that she would like to see the new building's design integrated into the feel of the existing neighborhood.

Irmingard Doane, 242 Lexington Road, stated that she abutted the property and that her main concern was the proposed new entrance on Lexington Road. She explained that people regularly drive down her driveway to turn around now and is concerned that the new entrance would increase the problem. She noted that the corner proposed for the new entrance had a steep incline between the existing field and Lexington Road and asked how this would be addressed. The Landscape Architect explained that they planned to add fill and a retaining wall along Ms. Doane's property line to accommodate the new driveway. They planned to plant the edge of the driveway to soften the edge of the new paving. Ms. Doane stated that she was also concerned with the proposed pole lighting and was not in favor of nighttime illumination of that area. The Landscape Architect agreed and stated that they were looking to install a timer as the lights did not need to be on all night.

A Commission Member asked about the change in grade on Lexington Road. The Landscape Architect stated that it was about 8% at its steepest point and that the new retaining wall would be 3' at its tallest point. A second Member asked if the Museum was talking to the Town about traffic issues. The Representatives stated that they would be going through a Town review and that so far, the Town had been supportive of an additional entrance to help empty the parking lot. Commission Members agreed that traffic was a concern and should be carefully looked at. A question was raised about the pavement and it was noted that it would be asphalt but that some of the parking area would need to be porous and would use a rougher aggregate.

Members agreed that a site visit was necessary for this project and one was scheduled for June 2 at 8:00 A.M. Further discussion was continued to the next meeting on June 2, 2016.

Other Business

269 Monument Street – As requested at the last meeting, the Trustees of Reservations had submitted a sample of the awning material to be used on their new art exhibit at the Old Manse. The proposed awning will be a Precontraint 502 awning in light yellow, "Chick" colored waterproof material. Members agreed that the material and color was fine for the temporary structure and had no further questions.

295 Barrett's Mill Road – Staff had been asked to check on the work underway on this property prior to the meeting. Staff reported that the new owner had been into the Planning Division to review the Historic Districts file for the property and was familiar with the HDC's requirements. All of the work currently underway was repair/replacement in kind.

Mr. Berrizbeitia moved to adjourn. Mr. Giddings seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR**.** The Meeting was adjourned at 10:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Kritzer
Senior Planner

Minutes Approved on: June 16, 2016

Nea Glenn, Secretary