



HISTORIC DISTRICTS COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, June 2, 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, June 2, 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
Justin King

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. Giddings, Ms. Glenn, Mr. Gregory, Mr. King and Mr. Nobile.

Other Business

Meeting Setup and Presentations – Members discussed alternative ways to set up the room to make it easier for both the public to see the materials under review. It was suggested that the Commission try using a projector to display plans and photos and Members agreed to test this method out at the next meeting. It was agreed that Applicants will still need to bring hard copies of plans and materials to the meetings so that both the electronic and physical plans are available for review if needed.

Summer Meeting Schedule – Members were asked to check their schedules and let staff know as soon as possible if they would be missing any meetings. It was noted that several Members would be away for the July 7 meeting. It was also suggested that the Commission only meet once in August.

Approval of Minutes – Members had reviewed the February 11 draft minutes prior to the meeting. Mr. King moved to approve the February 11 minutes as revised. Mr. Nobile seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Members next reviewed the May 5 draft minutes and Ms. Glenn submitted edits at this time. Mr. Giddings moved to approve the May 5 minutes as revised. Mr. Nobile seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Lastly, Members reviewed the site visit minutes for May 19 and May 31. Mr. Giddings moved to approve both sets of draft Minutes as submitted. Mr. Nobile seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

On the subject of Minutes, Mr. Dhingra stated that he felt it was important that the wording of the decisions be precise and expressed concern that more should be done to both highlight them and ensure that there are no questions in their interpretation. He had written a list of discussion points which he had sent to the Chair. Mr. Gregory stated that he would send those points to Staff and Commission Members. Staff was asked to incorporate them into future draft minutes.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Town of Concord, 33A Barrett's Mill Road, Barrett Farm Historic District, to install new trailhead kiosk

Assistant Natural Resources Director Lori Capone was present for the Commission's review of the Town's plans to install a new kiosk at the Barrett's Mill Conservation Land. The Applicant explained that the new kiosk would match the one approved by the Commission and installed across from Keyes Road. She explained that they proposed to install the kiosk behind the existing sign for the area. There would be no lettering on the kiosk so they wanted it to be visible to those entering the Conservation Land. She noted that the trees surrounding the area would screen the kiosk from view to the West. She presented photos of the proposed site and kiosk, which had already been built and was waiting at Barrett Mill Farm for approval to be installed. She explained that the informational panels would include the trail guide, which provided information on the whole Barrett's Mill area. She reviewed the trails with the Commission and noted that they included a Small Pox Cemetery and a pond along their routes. She explained that the new maps rerouted the Bay Circuit trail down Strawberry Hill Road and through the agricultural land to the sidewalk.

Commission Members reviewed the submitted materials and agreed that it was very thorough. They asked if the Applicant had considered any alternative locations for the kiosk. She responded that they could look at other locations but that the proposal was their first choice. A Commission Member asked if there were new trails in the area. The Applicant answered that they were all existing trails, many of which were mowed trails through the area's fields. A second Member asked if the Town was planning to install any more kiosks. The Applicant explained that they were already located at the Town Forest, Annursnac Hill, and Punkatasset. She noted that most of the large conservation areas had a kiosk but that some of them were older and not of this design. The Town did plan to use this design for future replacements however, and she was planning for one more kiosk this year.

A Commission Member asked if the homosote panels would be treated. The Applicant stated that they would not be treated but would be protected and stood up well to the weather. She noted that they were also easy to replace if necessary. Members agreed that they were satisfied that the siting of the kiosk behind the existing sign made sense. Another Member asked if the Applicants had had any comments from adjacent homeowners and she stated that they had not.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Giddings moved *"to approve the installation of a new 9' tall, 53" wide wooden trailhead kiosk behind the sign for the Barrett's Mill Conservation Land according to the design and materials submitted."* Mr. Nobile seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

David J. Nerrow, 393 Main Street, Main Street Historic District, for fencing, paving and alterations to roof

Owner Monique Medici was present to review the proposed changes to the existing building and site. Beginning with the roof changes, she explained that they had decided to keep the existing balustrade and now only wanted to remove the flagpole. She explained that the balustrade did need to be replaced but that they would rebuild it in kind.

Moving to the paving, she noted that the Commission had previously approved a crushed bluestone parking area adjacent to the garage and that they now wanted to pave an additional strip of the backyard to connect the driveway to the parking area. She explained that this parking area was also a snow removal area, and that the additional paving would allow a plow to push the stone into the backyard. The new paving would be the same quality of materials as the previously approved areas, and no trees would need to be removed. She noted that they were still several feet from the maple tree in their yard and that the Commission had already approved the crushed bluestone along the full length of the garage.

Members reviewed the locations of the existing and proposed paving on the site plan. A Commission Member asked how this was different from the last approval and the Owner explained that this application would add a wedge of paving to connect the driveway to the parking area. Otherwise, the change was the same and would not impact or change the previously approved crushed bluestone area.

The Applicant explained that they also wanted to replace a 6' high wooden stockade fence along the right property line with a new 8' tall board fence. She explained that the Commission had previously approved the same fence at the rear of the property along the MBTA tracks and that they thought it would be best to be consistent. It was noted that the fence stopped about one section short of the street. On the left side of the property, their neighbors had a 6' wooden fence of the same style.

Members reviewed the changes proposed and noted that the flagpole was a mid-twentieth century addition to the site. Members also reviewed the previous approval to understand the location of the existing and proposed paving. A Commission Member asked if additional landscaping was proposed. The Applicant stated that they had no plans for that yet and that landscaping would probably be a fall project. She noted that they had already started removing the brick paving to replace it with the approved crushed bluestone. She explained that rather than use crushed bluestone for the new wedge area, they thought that paving would make the most sense. Another Commission Member stated that his greatest concern was that they avoid any harm to the trees and root systems in the yard. The Applicant stated that they were taking care to remain well away from the trees with any paving.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. A Commission Member asked if Members were in agreement about removing the flagpole. Members noted that it had no historic value or relationship to the house. Concerning the new 8' fence, Members expressed concern that 8' was too much for a side yard fence. While they had allowed an exception at the rear of the site because of the proximity of the train tracks, they thought that a 6' board fence was more traditional for a fence dividing two properties. Members agreed that an 8' fence would be too disruptive to the openness of the area and that a 6' fence would be more appropriate. The Owner stated that she would be fine with a 6' fence so long as it was a board fence as she felt it had a nicer appearance than the stockade and would better match the rear fence.

A Commission Member stated that he was still concerned with the additional paving and protecting the trees. Another Member agreed but noted that the dripline for the major trees was outside of the bluestone paving area and that the proposed new paving was even farther away. It was noted that the new paving would be black asphalt to match the existing driveway.

Mr. Giddings moved “to approve the application as submitted to remove the flagpole from the roof; install a 6’ tall wood board fence in place of the existing stockade fence along the right property line, and to add new black macadam paving to connect the existing driveway with the area of crushed stone as shown on the plans with the exception that the balustrade on the roof will be repaired and not removed.” Mr. King seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

John and Madeline Kathe, 40 Lowell Road, North Bridge/Monument Square Historic District, for fencing

Mr. King recused himself from the discussion as he is a friend of the owner. Mr. Berrizbeitia was appointed to vote in his place.

Owner John Kathe presented his application to replace the existing fencing along the front edge of his property line. He explained that he had previously received approval to remove the existing fence but had decided that they wanted to replace it instead. The existing fence was a unique wood fence, though, and he had been unable to find someone to reconstruct it. He had repaired the fence twice but at this point it was rotting and falling apart. He presented photos of the existing fence and explained that it sat on top of a granite foundation that varied in height. A 10’ section of the fence to the right of the driveway would be done by his neighbors and he noted that the section to the right of the mailbox was the lowest point of the granite. The fence itself was 32” tall and the granite ranged from 2” to roughly 20” in height. As he was not able to reproduce the fence, he proposed to install a new 36” tall cedar fence that would match similar fences at neighboring properties. He explained that the new fence would be painted white and would have narrower posts – the current posts were 9” square and the new ones would be 5” square. He also noted that the new fence would use square spindles rather than the round ones on the existing fence.

Members reviewed the photos of the existing and proposed new fence. A Member asked if the new fence would have posts that were higher than the balustrade to match the existing fence. The Owner stated that he would like to do this but that he could not find a design that matched his existing fence. He explained how the new fence would match the neighbor’s fence and that it would still sit on the granite foundation. A second Member asked if the Owner had a choice of dimensions between the rail and picket heights. The Owner stated that he did not believe he could vary the stock design and explained that it was an Oakridge Fence. A third Member asked if the lower rail would sit on the granite. The Owner stated that it would sit just slightly above the granite. The picket dimensions were believed to be 1”x1.5”.

The Owner stated that he would prefer a smaller, more open fence as he liked the ability to see through it. He noted that the handmade details of the existing fence were hard to replicate. A Commission Member stated that he believed it was the same design fence as the one at the Emerson House. Members reviewed the streetscape and elevations. The Commission member stated that he thought the variety of fencing in the streetscape was important and noted that a formula was emerging. He asked for opinions from the Commission who agreed that the streetscape should not be monolithic. Another Member noted that the house and the fence were a unit and contextual. A Third Member asked if the Owner was keeping the fence adjacent to the house. The Owner stated that he was keeping that portion of the fence as it was not in as bad condition as the fence along the sidewalk. Members felt that it was important that the new fence match the surviving fence on the site. The Third Commission member noted that the existing fence provided variety between the new and old fencing in the area.

A Commission Member asked if the new fence design could be altered to remove every other spindle, which would bring it closer in design to the existing fence. He suggested that the Owner speak to the manufacturer to see if this was possible, and whether they could match the height of the spindles on the neighboring fence. The Owner stated that he was open to looking into those changes. Commission Members stated that they wanted to work with the Owner to find a good solution for such an important architectural element. Further discussion was continued to the June 16 meeting to allow the Owner time to contact the fence company. Members also suggested that he see if wider posts could also be installed.

Nancy Reilly, 145 Monument Street, North Bridge/Monument Square Historic District, for new addition

Mr. Dhingra disclosed that he knew the Owners of the property well but felt he could be impartial. There were no objections and he took part in the following discussion.

Owner Nancy Reilly and Architect Holly Cratsley presented the plans to install a new sunroom on the side of the house. The Owner stated that she had lived in the house for 30 years and had added a clapboard addition to the left side of the house, designed by Holly Cratsley, a number of years ago. They now wanted to balance out the house with a conservatory addition on the right side of the house. The Architect noted that this was a complicated wall with brick and that they would situate the addition to avoid the existing windows. The addition would be set farther back from the street and would engage the existing chimney. The new addition would create a 13.5' x 19' garden room. The Architect showed a photoshopped image of the house with the new room in place and noted that the addition would be screened by existing vegetation from the street. She noted that there were a lot of sunrooms in the Districts, many of which were set back and less visible. She presented examples of other houses in the immediate area with similar rooms and explained that the new room would open into the existing kitchen and provide light to that space.

The Architect explained that the new windows would be six over six double hung windows with lights that were more vertical in design but still spoke to the house. A monitor is proposed for the center of the roof and the Architect explained that it was important to the plan as the room was on the North side of the house and they wanted to pull in as much light as possible. She felt that the proposed monitor was more interesting than a skylight and better suited to the space. A Commission Member asked if there would be any uplighting and the Architect answered no, that they felt the additional space would balance with the layers of the addition. Another Member asked if the Architect had any concerns with objects becoming trapped between the existing building and the new roof. The Architect stated that she did not think it would be a problem and explained how the new roof would be sloped.

The Architect also noted that the new addition would include one new light fixture for the new rear entrance and noted that the house was built in 1926. She explained that the unusual window in the chimney would remain inside the room but would not be visible from the outside with the new addition. It was noted that the foundation of the new addition will be brick to match the house and that the new addition would continue the consistent language of materials found in the main structure. The steps at the rear will have brick risers and bluestone treads to match those at the front entrance.

Members were asked if they felt a site visit was necessary. Most agreed that the project was straightforward and that no site visit was needed. A Commission Member felt that this was a textbook addition and a very typical progression for this type of house. The Architect noted that they would be matching the color scheme of the existing house and would use a rubber roof on the new addition due to the pitch of the roof. A second Member thought that the applied brackets on the new addition were a

nice detail. A third Member thought that the scale, proportions, and materials were all very contextual and organic to the building. A fourth noted that the new addition would have limited visibility to the street.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Giddings moved “*to approve the construction of the new sunroom on the right façade of the house as submitted.*” Mr. Nobile seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The approved plans were then signed and dated by Chair Terry Gregory.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

This application had been continued from the May 19 meeting to allow time for the site visit on May 31. Owner Patrick McWhinney was present at this time and it was noted that the driveway as staked for the site visit had not matched the one submitted on the site plan. Members had all been fine with the driveway as staked, and it was noted that the left edge of the driveway had been staked as the right side would be in the existing trees. A Commission Member stated that this was an elegant solution and it was confirmed that the material of the new driveway would be gray Starpak. The Owner was asked about edging for the driveway and explained that he wanted something to hold back the lawn but would install it as low as possible. It was agreed that a cobblestone edge would be used. The new lightpost location had also been reviewed at the site visit and Members had noted that it would be at the back of the property but would match the existing one at the front driveway.

The changes to the front driveway were reviewed and the Owner was asked if two types of running bond were proposed. The Owner answered yes, that he would like to see both used and blended as shown on the submitted materials. All was proposed to be done in front with a cobblestone edge. He added that a screening of plantings would also be installed around the drives.

Members agreed with the proposed design but expressed concern that the correct layout for the new barn driveway was not shown on the submitted plans. The Owner agreed to submit a corrected plan. Members were asked whether the lighting as proposed was appropriate or whether it should be more utilitarian. Members agreed that the new light would be tucked away at the back of the site with limited view, but saw the point in having it match the light at the front.

The Chair asked for Public Comment and there was none at this time. The Owner requested that any approval be granted for a year rather than six months to allow time to complete all the work. Members agreed but felt that the revised plans must be submitted before the project could be approved. It was agreed that the Owner would submit the plans for the June 16 for the Commission’s review and approval at that time, but would not have to be present for the discussion. Further discussion was continued to the June 16 meeting.

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

The Owner was not able to be present at this time and had requested prior to the meeting to continue the discussion to the June 16 meeting. Members agreed and there was no discussion of the application at this time.

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

Architect Bob Miklos, Design Lab Architects, and Landscape Architect Lisa Giersbach, G Design Studio, were present for the discussion. All of the Members had attended the site visit earlier in the day to view the existing Davis Building and the proposed new layout for the site.

A Commission Member began the discussion by noting that he had a better sense of the project after the site visit. He noted that the existing Davis Building would be completely removed as part of this project and felt that the proposed program for the new building was fine. He felt that there was a mandate for the Museum to adapt to modern needs and the increased bus traffic at the site but was concerned that the character of the neighborhood be maintained. He felt that blending the new addition into the site was the biggest challenge of the project. He had no issues with the massing or height but was concerned with the fenestration, which he thought was too contemporary and commercial for this location. He did not think that the proposed new building belonged on the site and pointed to the Gund addition, which he thought was a well done and sensitive addition to the residential nature of the original Museum building. He was concerned that the Architect was using the wrong vocabulary with the glazing and felt that the new building should be closer to the style and vocabulary of the existing Museum buildings. He also thought that the fieldstone on the new building was out of place and should be replaced with brick.

A second Member asked why the Architect had not duplicated the existing buildings style and materials. The Architect noted that the Gund addition had been controversial at the time it was constructed but thought that it was ultimately a successful and skillfully done addition. He explained that they had talked a lot about doing the addition in brick as they were also concerned with changing the nature of the area. He was concerned, though, that they would change the scale of the existing complex if they used brick in the new addition. He wanted the new addition to be clearly supportive of the original building and noted that the Gund building was very different from the original Little building but that the changes were subtle and utilized wit. The Architect felt that it was more important to tie the landscape together and had liked the idea of using a barn form with stone walls to accomplish this. He respected the Commission Member's comments and acknowledged that they had also debated how best to address their National Register mandate for the site. He noted that each building was clearly of its time period and that they had wanted to present a modern building and expand the audience for the site. He believed that the new building should stand for its current time period and thought that it would be difficult to mimic the existing structures. The first Commission Member felt that this was a large campus and that there was nothing wrong with mimicking the styles of the other structure. He did not think that the new structure needed to stand out. Instead, he thought that it should support the original building and pick up on their styles and materials.

Discussion turned to the question of demolishing the existing Davis building. A Commission member noted that the Commission was always concerned with requests for demolition within the Districts. That said, he had no real concern with allowing this structure to be demolished as it is a ca. 1980s structure with only applied historic materials included in its construction. He noted that the Museum planned to reuse the hand forged hardware and that these were the only elements determined to be worth saving. It was noted that the weathered barn board used in the interiors had been popular at the building's construction but were not necessarily authentic to the period that the building was trying to portray. The Architects stated that they were working to develop more authentic interiors and a correct kitchen in the new addition. It was noted that this building was not included in the Historic Resource Survey and did not contribute to the character of the American Mile Historic Districts. Members had no objections to

the removal of the structure and thought that it could be best for the development of the site. The Commission Member stated that he had looked closely at the Davis building and agreed that it was not necessary to save it. Another Member agreed that the Davis building was incongruous to the site and felt that it should be removed as it was a detriment and served no purpose on the site.

Members were asked if there was agreement with the demolition of the existing building. Members expressed reluctance for any demolition in the Districts but agreed that the building was not a significant historic structure, did not contribute to the character of the streetscape or the American Mile Historic District, and did not serve the site or Museum well. A Commission Member noted the concerns of the neighborhood and the abutting neighbors and a second Member stated that he felt the Museum needed a better building. After a brief discussion, Members agreed that there were no objections to the demolition of the Davis Building.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment at this time. Chris Park, 215 Lexington Road, stated that they lived across the street from the Museum and saw themselves as caretakers of their historic home. He had looked carefully at the plan and felt that their property would be the most impacted by the changes to the site. He had five points on the proposed changes. First, in regards to the proposed demolition of the Davis House, he explained that when they had purchased a home in the historic districts they had believed that this level of change was restricted and were surprised that a structure of this size could be demolished. He felt that the definition of demolition was inconsistent with the Historic Districts and was concerned with the massing of the building that would replace the existing structure. He felt that the Davis Building had a very residential scale and thought that the new building would fundamentally change the character of the site and streetscape. He was concerned with having a continuous structure along Lexington Road and noted that the new building would add 200 feet of structure along that property line. He thought that this would be the largest single structure by far in the Historic Districts. He was also concerned with the design and material choice for the new building, particularly the stone walls and standing seam roof. He did not believe that these materials were common in this area and felt they were inconsistent with the Historic District. Mr. Park stated that he was supportive of making traffic and pedestrian crossing changes in the area, but was concerned with the impact of adding a new driveway on Lexington Road. He noted the current traffic issues in the area and thought that the new entrance could make them worse. He expressed concern that the new design would be a large structure surrounded by asphalt and that the new driveway would become a cut through for those trying to avoid the intersection with the Cambridge Turnpike. Lastly, he thought that as one of the most significant institutions, the Museum should take up the role of looking at how improvements could be made to make the area more pedestrian and bike friendly. He thought that the area could be improved and wanted to see the Museum engage the community in a larger discussion on this point.

A Commission Member noted that the Commission had also dealt with demolition and the difficulty of accommodating increased needs at a contained site at Trinity Church. He noted that that had been a complicated process but that a successful conclusion had been found.

Another Commission Member expressed the opinion that using new materials to separate the new building from the existing brick structures was appropriate given the scale and length of the new structure. He liked that the new design tried to be part of the landscape and felt that the new materials and choice of a standing seam roof were very agricultural in nature. His favorite part of the new concept was the courtyard which he felt embraced the existing structures and set the stage for a new generation or growth on the site. He thought that the new addition and changes were appropriate to their time period and should be separate from the original 1930s structure. He also thought that the landscape design had been thoughtfully developed but agreed that there were a few elements still needed on the

Lexington Road façade to soften the landscape. He appreciated the concerns expressed with traffic flow and explained that this was outside of the HDC's jurisdiction but would be addressed by the Planning Board. The Architect explained that they would be completing a traffic study for the Planning Board.

A Commission Member thought that this was an exciting proposal and that the survey of the site had been thorough. He thought that the only flaw in the plans was that it neglected the Lexington Road façade, which felt long and institutional in design. A second Member stated that he was struggling with the design of the dormers. He felt that they were a very contemporary element and suggested that they be closer to an historic dormer in design. He noted that the building would have a very different massing without them. A third Member felt that the design was not congruous with what was already on the site. He felt that this was a substantial problem and that there were no common elements between the buildings. He suggested that the new building should be pushed farther and that the Architect should see what could be done with non-natural elements using the Louvre as an example. He thought that the language of the building and the courtyard was magnificent but agreed that the Applicants were missing an opportunity to engage with Lexington Road. He felt that the Lexington Road façade was not inviting or fluid and wanted the Architect to find a way to compel pedestrians to want to go there. Right now, the Lexington Road façade was the functional façade but this was a crucial streetscape in Concord that many people must walk by. He thought that those pedestrians should be drawn to enter the site and that it was a lost opportunity not to address those passersby. He felt that the materials were neither here nor there, that the building was not a barn and not a contemporary building either.

A Commission Member agreed that the standing seam roof was incongruous with the Historic District. The Architect explained that it was intended to be zinc colored to work with the slate roofs of the existing buildings. A second Member noted that the slate roofs were not all the same and had less concern with the new material. A third Member asked if there were any concerns with the glass façade facing Lexington Road. Members agreed that this façade was a missed opportunity to draw people onto the site. The Architect explained how the site was oriented and that multiple entrances would be a struggle for the Museum. Members agreed that a physical entrance was not necessary on Lexington Road but that pedestrians should be visually drawn in by that façade. They asked for an architectural message that encouraged pedestrians to walk through the site to the Museum entrance.

A Commission Member stated that he was excited to see the site better connected to the trails in Heywood Meadow and agreed that Lexington Road should be a part of the plan and goals for the site. The Architect agreed and noted that discussions were already underway to relocate the cross walk and install a more accessible entry to the site on Lexington Road. This was not an easy solution though, and was an ongoing discussion. A second Member noted that the Lexington Road façade was now the back of the building and encouraged the Architect to consider the Lexington Road façade to be as important as the Cambridge Turnpike façade to the building. A third Member agreed and thought that the building should have a 360 degree appearance and more visually open along Lexington Road. She liked the direction of the new building and was not in favor of more brick on the site.

A Commission Member asked when the Museum would next meet with the Town and the Architects explained their schedule. Commission Members discussed where they stood with their review of the building and landscape changes. It was noted that the Town had previously considered altering the intersection of Cambridge Turnpike and Lexington Road and Staff was asked to look into the status of those plans as Members agreed that they would like any redesign of the roadway to be built into the Museum's designs.

The Architect saw this area as a continuation of the Battle Road and was also interested in making the Lexington Road façade engaging. He understood the neighbor's comments about the site and did not want to disrupt the neighborhood and agreed to take a look at developing the Lexington Road façade. A Commission member noted that the courtyard was an important drawing point of the project and suggested that the Architect look at turning it 90 degrees to access Lexington Road with a second floor connection between the new and existing buildings. Another Member noted that this site was a wedge surrounded by other important places and felt this could be a hard problem to solve. He did not think that the current design provided those solutions yet. A third member thought that the current design was a bold choice and agreed with the direction of the project. He thought that there were adjustments that needed to be made but did not agree that the new building should match the old. Several other Members agreed with this point.

A Commission Member stated that she had worked with other projects that used the same materials in both new and old structures and did not feel that it would work here. She thought that the buildings were too continuous for one material to work on the site. Another Member felt that the site had no back to it and suggested looking at the joints between the new and existing building and ways to break the façade to help address the concerns raised. The Architect stated that the large dormer and meeting entrance had been designed to pick up on pieces of the Gund addition. A third Member thought that the new building should not be the attic of the Museum but should show the collections in a new light. She noted the organic growth of the Museum and thought that it would be consistent with past changes to the site for this building to be a break that spoke to this point in time. A fourth Member agreed and noted how well the modern Science building had been integrated into the Concord Academy campus and the contemporary nature of the proposed new Market building at the Millbrook Tarry. She did not have a problem with the modern design but agreed with the comments made about the Lexington Road façade. She stated that she would like to see the current appearance of closed off walls changed. She liked the contemporary approach and agreed that the new building should be a bold statement as each building needed to stand on its own.

A Commission Member noted that this is an important project and that the Applicants should take their time with the design. The Architect stated that they were past the schematic stage but not finished with the plans. The Landscape Architect explained the master planning process that had been completed to address why the current campus was not working. One of the problems noted was that visitors could not find the entrance and they had wanted to clarify this by inviting people through the landscape to a clear goal. Members agreed and reiterated that a second door was not needed, but that the public also needed to be engaged from Lexington Road. The Architect stated that they had looked at turning the project by 90 degrees earlier in the plans but that the change would add \$10 million to the project. Commission Members agreed that the courtyard was a positive element and asked the Architect to find some way for it to be seen from Lexington Road. Members also agreed to encourage the Town to begin working as well on how to safely move pedestrians through this area.

Mr. Park asked to withdraw his opposition to the demolition of the Davis house based on the evening's discussion. He was very interested in what could be done on the site and with the development of connections with pedestrian walkways.

Tom McKeen, Select Board Liaison to the HDC, stated that he would share this discussion with the Select Board and would try to help with coordination on these issues.

Irma Doane, 242 Lexington Road, agreed with the comments made about the appearance of the new addition. She thought that the new building could be modern but that the design was not there yet. She

expressed concern with traffic, noting that the curve in Lexington Road created visibility issues, and with the expansion of the parking area towards the wetlands.

Further discussion was continued to a future meeting to allow the Applicants time to revise their designs. The Applicants stated that they would contact the Commission when they were ready to continue the public hearing.

Mr. King moved to adjourn. Mr. Nobile seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The Meeting was adjourned at 10:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Kritzer
Senior Planner

Minutes Approved on: July 7, 2016

Nea Glenn, Secretary