HISTORIC DISTRICTS COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, September 1, 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, September 1, 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
Dennis Fiori
Nea Glenn
Justin King

Associate Members
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. Fiori, Ms. Glenn, Mr. Giddings, Mr. Gregory and Mr. King.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Town of Concord, 141 Keyes Road, Main Street Historic District, for paving

Planning and Land Management Director Marcia Rasmussen was present to provide additional information on the continued application. She explained that the foundation of the existing brick walkway was crumbling and that the bricks needed to be completely removed and the walkway reconstructed. The contractor for the project had suggested that the Town consider using granite instead of brick and the granite sample was shown to the Commission. She explained that the granite would have a rougher finish which would provide better footing than the brick in bad weather and would stand up better to salting. The building already had granite at its entrances which was original to the building. She explained that they were not able to match the existing granite and that the sample proposed was the only option available. She thought that the Town could try cleaning the existing granite to make it more closely match the new material, but noted that the entrance was well used and that the new granite would weather relatively quickly. The proposed walkway would be done in a random pattern of square (12"x12") and rectangular (12" x 18" or 24") granite slabs.

A Commission Member asked if there were any other brick walkways on the site. The Director noted that there was a brick walkway at 135 Keyes Road but no other ones leading to this building. Another Member thought that the proposed granite sample was fine and agreed that it would last longer than the brick. A third Member asked if the existing metal railing would be reinstalled in its current location and the Director answered that that was the Town's intention.

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 granite walkway with a random pattern of square and rectangular stones (12”x12” and 12”x 24”) using the existing walkway footprint and railings. Mr. King seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

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

The Chair noted that all of the Members present had had an opportunity to view the site and expressed appreciation for the efforts taken by the Applicant to show the proposed height and dimensions of the new building. The Chair then read into the record the letters received from Stacey Koch (52 Bow Street), Kristin Johnson (61 Lang Street) and Sarah Weiner (20 Bow Street) expressing concern with the design, size, massing, and siting of the proposed new structure.

Applicant Mark Brennan and Architect Ben Nickerson were present for the discussion. The Applicant noted that during their previous meetings with the Commission they had decided to hold further review until after a site visit and had discussed whether or not to continue with the present design. The Chair noted that the proposed new house was 28’ wide and narrower than the existing house, which is 35’ wide. Another Member noted the questions that had been raised about the size of the house and noted that it was similar in size to 310 Lexington Road which the Applicant had also built within the District. The Applicant explained that this lot was approximately 19,000 sf. and fairly large for the area. The second Commission Member asked if they could build a new house which was the same size as the existing house and the Applicant stated that they did not think they could sell it for the amount that would need to be spent to construct it. A third Member noted that if the Applicants chose to keep the existing house, they could add a 1,000 sf. addition to the rear and there would be no issue because the new addition would be considered subservient and would have little visibility to the public way. The Applicant noted that there was a lot of construction underway in Concord and felt that the proposed new building was not out of line with what was being built elsewhere. He noted that the new building would be 3,300 sf. with a 22’x 24’ detached two car garage that would add about 500 sf. to the site.

A Commission Member asked why the Applicants were not proposing to replicate, restore or add on to the existing building. The Applicant explained that the existing house had no real foundation and in bad condition. A second Member noted that the original builder of the house was noted for these foundations which were not deep enough and did not stand up over time. The first Member pointed out that if the Applicant presented a design which replicated and expanded the existing structure that it would probably be easier to approve than an entirely different structure.

A Commission Member stated that he had found the site visit to show that much of the new house would not be visible from the street. He thought that the proposed was a good design. The Applicant stated that if they replicated or rebuilt the house, they would need to move it to the left as the existing house was a little too close to the right property line. In its current location, it would be hard to construct overhangs on the building and stay within the existing zoning requirements.

A Commission Member asked if the Applicant had considered a gambrel roof for their new building to match the existing roof design. The Applicant stated that they had considered a gambrel roof as well as Mansard roofs, which were also found in the area. A second Member stated that he was concerned with the scale of the new house and how it fit within the context of this area. He felt that the existing neighborhood had a unique and intimate scale which the proposed new building lacked. A third Member stated that she had been taken aback at the site visit by the size of the building and thought that

much of the side façade would be easily visible from the public way. She realized that they had given the Applicant a guideline of not exceeding 3,300 sf. but noted how this number could be interpreted in many ways. She pointed out that 20 Bow Street had the same square footage as the proposed new house but had a much more compact design and footprint. She thought that the proposed building was an attractive design but was not sure that it was right for this site. She added that this is a neighborhood of charming homes and that the new house could be contemporary in design but still needed to resonate with the neighborhood. A fourth Member agreed, explaining that she had looked at the site from an angle (in front of 20 Bow Street) and felt that the long side façade would be very visible from the street. She thought that the various rooflines of the side façade would fill in the site and that the new house would have a jarring impact on the streetscape. She had also been surprised by the relative size of 20 Bow Street, which was taller and more substantial than she had previously thought.

A Commission Member stated that he was intrigued by the market for smaller homes and asked if there was any opportunity for these homes in Concord. The Applicant responded that the market was untested here and explained that the cost of building a large versus a small home were not that different. A second Member stated that he had been interested at the site visit by how 20 Bow Street had a very different street presence from the proposed. He was struggling with the idea of replacing the existing design and encouraged the Applicant to consider preserving the character of the site but reusing the existing house style. He suggested that they lose the existing wing on the side of the house and build a house with a full second story that could have a smaller footprint. A third Member noted that a new house with a full second floor would be higher than the existing house and the Applicant confirmed that it would increase the height of the proposed house by at least 2'. The first Member agreed that this proposed change in design would be a move in the right direction. Another Member stated that she also was concerned with changing the style of the house and thought that using the existing house as a reference point was important

A Commission Member asked about the proposed new garage and its proposed location was discussed. Commission Members asked the Applicant to take another look at the existing house and could back with a new design that is closer to it. The Applicant asked if the new design should have a gambrel roof and Members agreed that it should replicate the existing house's design. Members reiterated that the new house design was nice but not appropriate for this location.

The Chair opened the discussion for Public Comment. Wendy Rovelli, 42 Bow Street, stated that six of the houses on Bow Street were 2,200 sf. in size and that the proposed 3,300 sf. of the new house was still very large for the area. Stephen Procissi, 46 Lang Street, felt that the footprint of the original house was not adequately documented in the new materials and passed out a highlighted site plan to show the differences between the new and proposed structures

Further discussion was continued until the September 15 Meeting.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Robert Robillard, 65 Main Street, Main Street Historic District, for new door surround and window changes at the rear of the building

Contractor Robert Robillard and Building Owner Joan Kolligan were present with an application to make changes to the rear entrance of the building. The Contractor explained that the first change proposed would install a new wood door surround around the rear entrance leading to the Concord Bookshop. The proposed new design would dress up the existing entrance and make it more inviting to

customers. He presented his proposed plans and explained that the new surround would pick up its detailing from the existing front entrance on Main Street. The rear door was painted "Tarrytown Green" and would remain the same color and the new trim would be painted "White Dove" to match the front façade. The Owner noted that they were also planning to repaint the front facades as part of this work but would not be changing any colors. Members agreed that the proposed change was appropriate to the building and had no questions.

The Contractor explained that the second proposed change was also on the rear façade. There were currently four high windows on the rear façade to the right of the rear entrance which were blocked off on the inside by shelving. Several of the windows were broken and all were in bad condition. He proposed to remove all of the existing grates, windows, and sills and to fill in the openings with brick to match the surrounding wall. He believed that they could match the running band of the existing masonry walls but was not sure about whether it would be exactly the same. A Commission Member asked if the brick would match. The Contractor believed that the color would not be hard to match but questions were raised about the dimensions of the new bricks in comparison to the existing ones. It was suggested that the new brick be recessed into the existing openings to make it clear that this was a later change. Members felt that this would be a more successful way to deal with the window's removal and the Owner thought that the change would give the rear façade a more decorative appearance.

The Chair opened the discussion for Public Comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Fiori moved to approve the installation of a new wood door surround as submitted and to remove the four windows to the right of the rear entrance and infill their openings with recessed brick. Mr. King seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Robin Woolford, 77 Lexington Road, American Mile Historic District, to replace windows

Jamie Morin from Renewal by Andersen Windows was present on behalf of the Owners to explain the proposed changes in the windows. The Applicant proposed to replace the existing sliding casement windows in a small addition on the rear left corner of the house as well as two double hung windows in the third floor, gable end of the left façade. Members reviewed the photos and asked if the double hung windows were wood and whether they were early windows or later replacements. The Applicant was not familiar with these windows and Members agreed that more information was needed before a decision was made about their replacement. Members noted that only two of the four sliding casement windows were visible to the public way and that the existing windows were aluminum framed windows. The Applicant presented a sample of a Simulated Divided Light replacement window and explained that the new frames would be a black composite material.

Members agreed that the material and design for the sliding casement windows were not an issue, but that no decision could be made on replacing the double hung windows at this time. Further discussion was continued until the September 15 meeting to allow additional time for the Applicant to submit further information on the existing windows.

Joseph Emde, 352 Lexington Road, American Mile Historic District, for new dormer, addition, front entrance, windows, siding and garage doors

Owners Laurel and Joe Emde and their Architect, Tim Whitney, presented the proposed plans to expand and alter the existing house. The Architect explained that the house is a one and a half story Ranch/Cape style house on the front façade which expands to three stories in the rear. He pointed out the additions made to the building over time including a new roof and the installation of Anderson 400 Series

Simulated Divided Light replacement windows. He noted that the site was heavily vegetated on both sides and that the rear façade was very difficult to see from any public ways.

The Architect reviewed the proposed changes to the house beginning with the removal of all of the existing finishes in order to install new cedar clapboards with Azek trim. He pointed out that the house had an existing 3' wide overhang across the front of the house which was currently unused space and would be converted into an open porch by adding beams and posts that would be structural as well as decorative. A new dormer was proposed on the front façade over the porch to provide additional space to the existing second floor. He noted that the house had two entrances on the front façade and proposed to create a new entrance foyer around the left hand door and to remove the right hand door completely. He reviewed the detailing of the new front façade and noted that all of the new posts would be square and that the new foyer would be a glass box using French door style Simulated Divided Light panels. New garage doors were also proposed with a row of windows at their top and the house would be repainted a green/gray color with white (Canvas) trim. He noted that the garage doors would be painted to match the trim color of the house. On the right side of the house, the project would remove four existing awning windows and install one new window in its place.

A Commission Member asked about the detailing of the gable end element over the front entrance. The Architect explained that he had wanted to make this element a little different from the dormers above, although the gable end elements would all be similar in proportion. He proposed to finish the entry gable with painted flush board and painted the same color as the house. He added that 1" x 10" columns would be installed on the entry and 1"x 8" columns used in the porch. A second Member asked about the color of the existing roof. It was noted to be a medium gray and all new roofing will match it.
In terms of site work, the Architect stated that a new bluestone terrace would be installed at the front entry and would match the bluestone in the existing porch. The Owner explained that they had lived in the house for 14 years and that their intent was to create a more modern and functional interior. The Owner explained that they had chosen to update and keep as much of the existing house as possible. He noted that they had already put a lot of thought into this project and asked the Commission to keep that in mind during their review.

The Architect briefly reviewed the changes to the rear façade and Members agreed that they would not be visible from the public way. A Member noted that there was a lot going on in this project and suggested that a site visit would be helpful. Another Member asked if Azek composite material had been approved in the past. It was noted that the Commission had approved it in specific cases including other buildings of this period. Members agreed that it was a well thought out plan and that a better understanding of the context of the site would be helpful. A site visit was scheduled for 8:30 A.M. on Thursday, September 15 and further discussion was continued until the next meeting.

Marilyn Mudry, Lincoln, stated that she had owned the Hawthorne Inn and lived there for many years. She thought that the existing house was bland and loved the proposed design which she felt would be accurate for the street.

Archbishop of Boston Corp., 12 Monument Square, Monument Square/North Bridge Historic District, for new sign and planter

Mr. Giddings recused himself from this discussion and Mr. Nobile was appointed to vote in his place. Architect Elise Stone, Designer John McConnell and Project Representative Sandra Shaughnessy and Marilyn Mudry were present with a new application for a sign in front of the church building. The Architect explained that they had looked for new ideas after their last meeting with the Commission and

the Designer had developed the proposal to install a new planter in the left corner of the front stairs, the front of which would serve as a carved granite sign. The Designer explained that the new granite will match the existing stairs and would measure 3' deep by 8' wide. The new planter would take up one bay of the existing stairs and would begin on the third tread of the second flight of stairs from the bottom.

A Commission Member asked if the Applicants had considered installing the sign without the planter. The Representatives explained that they had looked in to that option but thought that the planter looked more organic and preferable for the site. They explained how the existing railing would continue along the side of the planter. The Member stated that he liked the design but had a general concern with the plantings in these types of planters. A Representative stated that the plantings would be maintained and designed to be welcoming and bright. She thought that they would add color and texture to the building and that they would be changed seasonally.

The Representatives explained how the new planter would be used to complement the existing structure. It was noted that the area was hollow below the stairs and that they could install a means for watering the plants. A Commission Member asked if the new planter would include lighting. The Representatives stated that they had no plans to add lights to the planter and that a street light was very close to the stairs.

A Commission Member noted the asymmetrical look created by the addition of the planter. He thought that it was ok but asked if the Representatives had considered a planter on the right side as well. The Representatives noted the stone walls and Old Burying Hill Cemetery just to the right of the church and explained that they had felt there was already enough going on in that area. They explained how the new granite would be chosen and aged to match the existing materials and how the installation would pick up the existing details. Another Member asked when they were planning to install the planter and the Representatives explained that they were working through the approval processes now. Members agreed that the proposed planter was a good, creative solution for the signage problem. A third Member stated that his only concern was with how quickly the stone weathered. The Representatives stated that they would reuse the existing stone steps on the sides of the planter to ensure a color match. It was noted that the front of the planter would have a flamed finish.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Ms. Glenn moved to approve the installation of a new 3'x 8' granite planter across the lower edge of the far left bay of the front staircase with signage carved into the front façade of the planner as submitted. Mr. Nobile seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The approved plans were then signed and dated by Chair Terry Gregory.

<u>The Trustees, 269 Monument Street, Monument Square/North Bridge Historic District, new sign</u>

Applicant Tom Beardsley was present with the proposed new main sign for the property. He explained that the existing sign was installed in 1999 and would be replaced with the proposed new sign. The Trustees had recently changed their logo and color scheme and were updating all of their site signage to match their new design. The new sign would be the same size as the existing sign and would hang from the existing post.

A Commission Member asked if this sign had been installed at other locations. The Applicant stated that the new signage had been implemented at many of the Trustees rural sites and that the organization was about 1/3 of the way through their existing properties. He explained that they were also updating all of

their exterior signs to match the new color scheme and that the organization had changed its name from The Trustees of Reservations to just Trustees. Another Member asked if these signs had been approved by any other historic districts and the Applicant was not sure.

Members noted that the new signage was very bold and hard to visualize in Concord. The Applicant was asked if there was a less vivid alternative available and whether the sign could be carved rather than flat. Members thought that the proposed sign was too modern, bold and reflective for the historic districts. The Applicant agreed to look into alternatives to the proposed design. Another Member asked if the old color scheme could be used with the new design. The Applicant explained that the new color scheme was designed to designate the type of property, and that the bold purple background had been chosen for cultural resources. The Applicant suggested putting the sign into the existing wood frame and agreed to go back to the organization to see about making changes to the design. Members thought that the scale, format, goal and location of the signage was fine, but asked that the Applicant address the concerns with the color and reflective quality of the sign and asked the Applicant to see if the sign design or coloring could be calmer and use a matte finish. The Applicant agreed to go back to the Trustees with these suggestions. Further discussion was continued to the October 6 meeting.

Continued Public Hearings:

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 DesignLab Architects and Landscape Architect Lisa Giersbach were present along with a Museum Board Representative. The Architects began by explaining that the Museum was expanding and broadening its education program to better showcase its collection of materials. He explained that the Museum buildings had always been designed to pick up on their surroundings – the 1935 Little Building was designed to reflect the original home of the Museum in the Georgian style home at 77 Lexington Road. The 1990s Gund addition was an interpretation of the Little House. What was most important to the complex now, though, was the landscape and they were working to reflect that portions of the property had once been part of Emerson's orchard and fields. The new design would create an outdoor space and improve the access and parking on the site by developing a new connection on Lexington Road. They recognized that the building had two primary facades and explained how the principle entrance would remain facing the Cambridge Turnpike but that they understood the need to make the Lexington Road façade more welcoming and inviting. The Architects explained how the glass link between the existing and new building would provide a window into the museum and its educational programs. They reviewed the design of the new addition and explained that the shed style addition had been added later to hold the mechanical equipment and loading areas.

The Landscape Architect explained how the revised design would activate the Lexington Road façade by incorporating the landscape into the design. She stated that they had spoken with the Town and acknowledged the issues with pedestrian crossings on Lexington Road. She noted that the Town agreed that a crossing needed to be addressed in this area. In the meantime, the revised design proposed to add new paths from Lexington Road into the Museum property. The pathways would include one with stairs and one accessible path. Landscaping would be used to create views into the courtyard and the Cambridge Turnpike area. Markers would be added along the path to create an interpretive trail for the Battle Road as well. The Landscape Architect explained that they were working with the last plans from the Town on the intersection of Lexington Road and Cambridge Turnpike and explained their ideas for the

area. She explained that the Town had asked for the Museum's site plans as well and that they would be relocating the existing poles along Cambridge Turnpike.

The Architect explained that they had taken another look at the mullion details in the dormers and explained how they harkened back to the ventilators on old barns. He pointed out that they had introduced scale to the larger dormer by adding vertical mullions to replicate the battens on the siding of the building. The proposed new siding of the addition would replicate New England techniques and install batten siding over clapboard siding. The Architect explained that the design of the new building had been derived from rural structures and was intended to be very straight forward.

Discussion turned to signage on the site. The Applicants explained that the signage marked in blue on the plans would be installed on poles/posts at the curb cuts. Other signage would be inlaid in the low stone walls near the entries to the building, and in the lintel on the brick structures. Directional signage would be installed in the locations shown in yellow on the plans. A Commission Member asked about the proposed new parking lot entry to Lexington Road. The Applicants stated that they had consulted with a traffic engineer and learned that it would be safer to have two way traffic rather than a one way exit on Lexington Road.

A Commission Member asked what the Applicants wanted to accomplish from this meeting. The Applicants stated that they were ready for a vote to approve the project and explained how all of the project reviews were dovetailed with the Museum's fundraising work. It was noted that the Museum's Board was voting next month on the project and that the new construction had been sequenced around a very important exhibit. The work was proposed to begin in late winter/spring with the site work to be completed in Phase I.

A Commission Member noted that this is a very important project and property within the Historic Districts. He pointed out that some of the materials had not been received until just before the meeting and had found it hard to see the changes in the site plan. He expressed concern with the site plan, the massing of the building, and the vocabulary of the design. He noted how another Member had previously asked the Applicants to create more visibility into the site from Lexington Road and thought that the project was still presenting a large wall to the street instead. He noted that the Commission had expressed these concerns at the last meeting and had asked the Applicants to open the building up to Lexington Road but that no changes had yet been made. He felt that this design could be located anywhere and that the Lexington Road façade needed more than just a driveway and walking path. He also felt that the material of the new and existing buildings was not cohesive in character and was concerned with the proposed stone walls. He had no issues with the idea of walkways, but was concerned with the mass of the stone on the site.

The Architect answered that the design was responding to the pragmatic needs of the museum and explained how they were limited in the ways that they could open up the structure by the need for a solid connection between the new and existing buildings. He explained how they had tried to engage the interior and exterior of the new building and to create a campus. Their proposed changes were intended to guide people onto this campus. The Commission Member felt that the design facing Lexington Road needed to be more open.

A Commission Member stated that he was fine with the proposed stone but agreed that the Commission had expressed big concerns with the Lexington Road façade at their last meeting which had not been addressed. He liked the new rendering and understood better how the new connector would create those connections with Lexington Road, but did not think it went far enough. He noted that there was a

difference in grade along Lexington Road and explained the Commission's concerns that this façade looked too industrial for such a prominent location. He added that the proposed fenestration was also an issue. Another Member thought that the Applicants had tried to use the landscaping to address the Commission's concerns and thought that this was a start but did not go far enough. The Applicants explained the programmatic issues with the building and site and how the existing design had been organized to meet them.

A Commission Member noted that the two renderings presented gave a better feeling for how the new building will engage with Lexington Road. He thought of the site as a compound and felt that the proposed plans would make pedestrians curious and draw them onto the site to discover it. He liked the proposed changes to the landscape and felt that it would draw the public's attention and that people would want to follow the paths through the site. He asked the Architects why the building was not proposed to have stone at both ends and wondered if that would help the design. The Architect explained that the west side had a very large opening in the wall already for the connector with the existing buildings, and that the stone was not proposed here because of the cost. The Landscape Architect noted that benches could also be part of the development of the Lexington Road area.

Another Commission Member stated that she loved what was planned for the landscaping but had expected more changes in the building itself. She understood their issues but felt that the existing structure read as very closed and imposing from Lexington Road. She agreed that the new building should be quiet and not compete with the surrounding historic structures but found the proposed design to be severe and unwelcoming. A second Member asked if windows could be installed to open up the façade. The Architect explained that the second floor was designed entirely for storage and could not have any openings. He thought that the façade elevation was deceptive as the dormers and chimney would act as three dimensional elements to break up the façade. He noted that the glass area facing the courtyard would be recessed and that the building would serve as a backdrop to the courtyard. He also pointed out that the siding would be installed to create a shadow pattern that would add interest and depth to the structure.

The Commission Member asked again if there was any way to add windows, a glass feature, or signage. He felt that there needed to be some way to engage the public with that façade and agreed with the first Member that the Lexington Road side needed to be softened. He felt that they needed something more than the board and batten siding to draw people in. He suggested installing a seating wall against the building and developing a courtyard along Lexington Road. Another Member suggested adding a brick element to soften and break up the façade. He agreed that they needed to look at ways to break up the façade and felt that the existing façade looked too imposing and massive. He thought that the façade could be softened with the addition of detailing. A third Member was not sure that he agreed with the suggestion that brick be added to the façade and felt that many aspects of the new design were good. He felt that the project had made progress overall and that the Lexington Road façade was improved but could still be better.

The Architect asked if the question of how to address the façade could be deferred until after it was built and the true impact was visible. Members expressed concern that the area needed more than landscaping and that there were changes needed to the building itself. A Member felt that the project was about 95% right but that the building was too important and visible to be approved before the final design was ready. She agreed that the Lexington Road facades were very prominent and large and felt that they needed something else. She liked the use of stone but felt that it added to the austerity of the building. A Second Member thought that the stone added depth and agreed that the design was almost ready. He liked the idea of a seating area on Lexington Road and felt that it was only this elevation that still needed work. He

agreed that it needed to engage more. Members agreed that there were no issues with the proposed dormers, metal roof, or overall massing of the proposed building.

The Architect thought that detail and articulation might be the answer to the Commission's concerns and agreed to look at how they could inject some warmth into the exterior of the building. The Landscape Architect thought that the suggested seating could actually make the façade more austere. A Commission Member asked if the Architect had considered using the porch area to address these concerns. Members reviewed how this could be changed to meet the Commission's concerns. The Architect explained the intent of the area for loading and Members discussed how details and lighting could be used to give the effect of an entrance without actually creating one. The Architect agreed to have a revised façade design for the meeting on Sept. 15.

Members were asked if they were otherwise comfortable with the design. One Commission Member was disappointed that a tree would be removed for the bus area. She liked the idea of adding windows, even if they were not true ones, to the Lexington Road façade as an inviting element. Another Member felt that the design was very close and was encouraged by the Applicant's efforts and several other Members agreed. It was suggested that the courtyard trees should be written into the HDC's approval because of their impact on the design, and the Applicants were urged to install trees of good size.

OTHER BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes – Members had reviewed and revised the August 4 draft minutes prior to the meeting. Mr. King moved to approve the August 4 minutes as revised. Mr. Giddings seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

427 Lowell Road – Staff reported that she had met with Mr. Gregory, Mr. Giddings, and Ms. Glenn at 427 Lowell Road that morning to review the completed construction and installed landscaping. They had discovered some discrepancies between the approved designs and as-built structure and would be reaching out to the Property Owner to address them.

Lowell Road Fence – Staff reported that a fence had been installed over the Mill Brook on Lowell Road without review by the Public Works Department. Members agreed to send a violation letter to the Department.

Mr. King moved to adjourn. Mr. Giddings seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR**.** The Meeting was adjourned at 10:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Kritzer
Senior Planner

Minutes Approved on: _____ November 3, 2016

_____
Nea Glenn, Secretary