

Members Present: Phyllis Halpern (PH), Steve Wagner (SW), Mara Burnett (MB), Kathy Scadden (KS), Al Aydelotte (AA), John Thompson (JT)  
Staff Present: C. Zale (CZ)

Attendees: Pam Fox, Adrienne Giske, Alicia Primer, Michael Wolfson, Tom Galvin, Amy Baxter, Paul Galbraith, Christy Lincoln, Steve Bradley, Charles Kraus, Alan LeBlanc, Brendan Hennessey, Teddy Bascom, Anthony Polednak, Maureen Johnson, Trish Foss, Ben Pignatelli, Lizzie Pignatelli, Amy Roberts, Scott Seiting

Location: online

Recording location: <https://imd0mxanj2.execute-api.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/ssr/watch/6436fa484fec900008a83962>

SW called meeting to order @ 7:07pm and read an open meeting law disclaimer from the Governor regarding open meetings.

**Agenda Item:**

**Public Comments:** No Public Comment

**2. Demolition Delay Dispositions -- For details, see attached Demolition Delay Review Summary on Page 3 - 8:**

- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| A. 109 Lexington St  | Public Hearing – Request to Lift Delay: Continued hearing to 5/2/23     |
| B. 348 BPR           | Public Hearing: Continued hearing to 5/2/23                             |
| C. 510 BPR           | Public Hearing: Proposal Not Detrimental, No Delay                      |
| D. 27 Golden Ball Rd | Public Hearing: Proposal Not Detrimental, No Delay                      |
| E. 3 Applecrest Rd   | Public Hearing: Proposal Not Detrimental, No Delay                      |
| F. 6 Irving Rd       | Initial Determination: Found <i>Significant</i> - Public Hearing 5/2/23 |
| G. 11 Silver Hill Rd | Initial Determination: Found <i>Not Significant</i> - No Delay          |
| H. 270 Glen Rd       | Initial Determination: Found <i>Significant</i> - No Delay              |

**3. Other HC Business:**

- A. Release \$78,390 in CPC funding for 71 Lexington St PDR (2018)- vote anticipated SW raised the CPC's concern about whether the outstanding \$78,390 in funding allocated for a PDR at 71 Lexington St might be returned to the CPC. He suggested that the Commission vote on this. KS said she has been unable to get in touch with the owners and does not think they are interested. The Commission discussed whether they thought the owners were interested and if the property would need to reassessed. JT said he felt money should be returned. KS suggested waiting one more month to see if anyone can speak with the owners.
- B. Celebrate Weston – May 20<sup>th</sup> - 11-3p Adrienne Giske said there was an upcoming planning meeting for the Celebration. JT said that Historical Society will be opening the Josiah Smith Tavern and the exhibits there. Pam Fox said she volunteered the Commission to offer tours of the Fiske Law Office and to distribute cemetery brochures. Pam Fox noted that if the Historical Commission would like its name on the program, they could make a donation to become a sponsor at Celebrate Weston. JT suggested doing a write up on the AIC and the Tavern discussing the work the Commission did restoring the properties. AA made a motion to make a \$250 donation (from the general Commission budget) to Celebrate Weston. JT seconded; all in favor.
- C. Case Estates Preservation Deed Restrictions- Update PH gave an update that draft Preservation Deed Restrictions for all three Case Estate buildings have been completed. She said that the Select Board has chosen to approve and vet the deed restrictions locally, rather than use MHC language and vetting. Hopefully the RFPs would be sent out soon. Pam Fox asked whether such restrictions could last in perpetuity without going through MHC. PH said that Town Counsel has made assurances that their drafted language would allow for the restriction to run in perpetuity.
- D. Preservation Awards Not Discussed.
- E. Historic House marker- sign maker & cost change- vote anticipated PH discussed a new company, The Painted Lady Sign Co, who could make the Historic Marker Signs. The signs will be hand-painted on Azek and have an increased cost from what Ould Colony had been charging. PH suggested raising the application fee from \$180 to \$200. KS made a motion in increase the Historic Marker Application fee as suggested. The motion passed in a unanimous rollcall vote. Pam Fox asked CZ to update the language on the website.
- F. Administrator's concerns No update

**4. Treasurer's Report:**

JT said he will provide an update at the next meeting.

- 5. Administrative Approvals:** **169 Ridgeway Rd- 1934-** Request to modify previously approved application to add living space at location of existing porch area in back.  
**190 North Ave-** 1855- Application for repair/replacement of porch decking & rails in kind.

**6. Historic Marker**

**Applications:** **31 Silver Hill Rd- 1910** – The Commission reviewed the application and photo. JT made a motion to approve the Historic Marker Application. AA seconded; all in favor.

**7. Approval of minutes:** N/A

**8. Calendar** Next meetings: 5/2/2023, 5/30/2023

**9. Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned 9:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted: Christine Zale

**Demolition Delay Review Summary:**

A	Location and Documentation	Process	Applicant(s) Present	Building Data	Proposed Demolition	Notes
	<a href="#">109 Lexington St.</a> MHC Form B	Public Hearing Request to Lift 12-Month Demo Delay	Michael Wolfson, Ar; Tom Galvin, OR	1750-1795, Colonial Revival 2 ½ story	Total	Public Hearing Continued to 5/2/23.
<p><b>Discussion:</b> [Note: JT was not present for this discussion.]</p> <p>SW recapped that the Commission had previously determined that the main original block of the house is significant and is preferably preserved. The Commission imposed the delay to give all parties time to mitigate the loss of the property. The owners are now requesting the Commission consider lifting the 12-month delay. At an earlier Public Hearing on 2/7/2023 the owner, had shown the Commission proposed plans for a new building by Meander Studios. At that meeting the Commission commented that the proposed building was larger in scale than the existing building and that if the original building could not be preserved, the preference would be to replicate the size and detailing of the existing main block of the house.</p> <p>The Commission clarified that this was not a continued hearing but a new hearing to consider the lifting of the demolition delay.</p> <p>Michael Wolfson of Meander Studios presented a revised plan that shows the new proposed building replicating the location and size of the original house’s main front façade. The architect communicated that the details of the original building would be exactly replicated on the front façade including the trim, casings, corner boards, facia, gable ends, soffit and water table. The materials would not necessarily be wood, but rather composite materials. The rear of the proposed building showed a large wing off the back that is bigger in scale and taller than the existing building.</p> <p>Members expressed appreciation for revising the plans for the main front façade to replicate the existing one. They asked about the details of the rear wing and if these could match those planned for the proposed front façade. For example, the large window in the center of the main block facing Lexington Street eliminates the authentic feel of the original old house and make it appear out of place. Additionally, trim, casings, corner boards, frieze boards and facias, etc. that match would make the building appear as one. The Commission also asked if the rear wing addition could be set back further from Lexington Street, advising that doing so would soften the impact to the main block and to the neighborhood. Finally, members asked if the roof of the rear wing could be lowered to a point below the ridge of the main block to keep the wing from appearing dominant.</p>						

		<p><b>Public Comment:</b> Alicia Primer, 179 Church St, said she hoped the Commission would review dimensional drawings of the proposal. She also said that the demolition of the building would increase the existing non-conformity of the building and that the Cambridge school would still need to go through both the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals. She said the additions need to be subordinate to the original building.</p> <p>Adrinne Giske, asked if this was going to be a prefab modular construction. Michael Wolfsan said it would be stick built.</p> <p><b>Continued Discussion:</b> Michael Wolfson said that dimensional drawings could be provided to the Commission. PH reiterated that the newer construction should be subordinate to the original building. The Commission discussed the level of detail they would like to see on the drawings. Michael Wolfson said the school was committed to replicating the front façade. The Commission appreciates the school’s willingness to continue the dialog and the changes that they have made to their plans to date. The Commission understands the urgency of the school and also understands the multiple issues they are dealing with including safety, housing needs and fiscal constraints.</p>				
		<p><b>Disposition:</b> KS made a motion to continue the hearing to 5/2/23. MB seconded, all in favor.</p>				
<b>B</b>	<b>Location and Documentation</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Applicant(s) Present</b>	<b>Building Data</b>	<b>Proposed Demolition</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	<p><a href="#">348 BPR</a></p> <p>MHC Form B MHC Form A</p>	Public Hearing	Amy Baxter & Paul Galbraith, O	1888, 2 ½ story Queen Anne	45 window replacements	Previously determined <i>Significant</i> . Public Hearing continued to 5/2/2023.
(Boston Post Road National Register Historic District)		<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW recapped the previous meeting where the house was found significant and noted that a site walk was conducted at the property. The proposal is to replace forty-five windows all around the main house as well as in parts of the carriage house.</p> <p>PH discussed the site walk with AA, HS and the owners. AA said the windows are in remarkably good shape, though many need cord repairs, weather-stripping and tightening. The owners have not yet found a vendor able to restore these windows for a cost competitive with the new vinyl windows that they have considered. They are looking to keep their house warmer and less drafty. The owners said they had concerns that restoring the windows would not fix the draft coming from the windows and that they were looking for more energy efficient windows.</p> <p>The owners said they were open to storing the original windows in their barn if the replacements were approved.</p> <p>The Commission asked if the owners had flexibility to continue the hearing to allow more time to find someone to help them properly restore the windows in a way that will keep them warm, will last indefinitely, will keep the house’s integrity, but will hopefully be less costly. The owners were ok with continuing.</p>				
		<p><b>Disposition:</b> AA made a motion to continue the hearing to 5/2/23. PH seconded; all in favor.</p>				

C	Location and Documentation	Process	Applicant(s) Present	Building Data	Proposed Demolition	Notes
	<a href="#">510 BPR</a> MHC Form B MHC Form A	Initial Determination	Christy Lincoln, O; Steve Bradley, O	1765, 1824; 2 - story Federal Style house converted to office building	Replace 6 windows	Previously Found <i>Significant</i> . No Delay
	(Boston Post Road National Register Historic District)	<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW recapped the data and application. The building, known as the Abraham Hews/Marshall Jones House, is a two-story Federal style structure located in Weston Center. It was remodeled in 1824 from an earlier 1765 Colonial house which was previously found significant as an important contributor to the Boston Post Road National Register Historic District. The application is for the replacement of 8 windows on the first floor at 510 Boston Post Road.</p> <p>Steve Bradley said they did look into restoring the existing windows but they are currently beyond repair and would still require storm windows. He said that the current windows are not original and were likely replaced in the late 1940s.</p> <p>The owners wish to install double hung Andersen 400 Series replacement sash, each with 6/6 grill configuration to match the existing windows.</p> <p>PH discussed the site visit of the property and asked if Pella replacements were considered. Steve Bradley said that they prefer Anderson and they could use fully divided lite Anderson window. There was a discussion of the window pane and muntin sizes.</p>				
		<p><b>Disposition:</b> MB made a motion that the proposal as presented is not detrimental and to not impose a delay. KS seconded; all in favor.</p>				
D	Location and Documentation	Process	Applicant(s) Present	Building Data	Proposed Demolition	Notes
	<a href="#">27 Golden Ball Rd</a>	Public Hearing	Alan LeBlanc, O	1911, 2 Story Colonial Revival house and detached garage	Re-side House and replace 3 windows	Previously Found <i>Significant</i> . No delay.
		<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW recapped the initial determination meeting where the 1911 house was found significant to the neighborhood character and context.</p> <p>The owner proposes to replace the shingle siding and to install three new basement hopper-type windows. Since the previous meeting, he has proposed to install a third dormer at the front of the house, with a matching window.</p> <p>The owner provided a sample of the siding to the Commission ahead of the meeting. PH said that the sample siding appeared very plastic – looking. AA noted that the proposed material did not have the appearance of shingles. After discussion, the owner agreed to install hardie-plank shingle siding, rather than a vinyl siding product. With the Hardie Board Shingle it is possible to lace/weave the shingles at both outside and inside corners. Shingles with staggered edged panels are also available, so it may be possible to replicate the existing shingle texture.</p> <p>Alan Leblanc explained the dormer addition he is proposing on the front façade, which will allow light into the hallway and will match other dormers. He said he felt it would be possible to maintain the existing flare at the base of the walls, as that will also help to maintain the house’s character.</p>				

		<b>Disposition:</b> AA made a motion to approve the proposal with the condition that there is a preference for Hardie-plank shingles. HS seconded, all in favor.				
<b>E</b>	<b>Location and Documentation</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Applicant(s) Present</b>	<b>Building Data</b>	<b>Proposed Demolition</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	<a href="#">3 Applecrest Rd</a>  MHC Form B	Public Hearing	Brendan Hennessey, O; Teddy Bascom, C	1811, Federal style one-story structure	Repairs and window replacement	Previously Found <i>Significant</i> . No delay.
	MHC Form A  (Boston Post Road National Register Historic District)	<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW discussed the initial determination meeting for this <i>significant</i> building, dating from 1811, and marking the western entrance to the Boston Post Road National Register Historic District. It is a simple Federal style structure with a granite foundation, clapboard siding, a cedar shingled hip-shaped roof and a single center chimney. Alpheus Bigelow Jr, Esquire practiced law in the office and lived across the street.</p> <p>The proposal includes exterior restoration work. The sill plate on the BPR side will be secured and leveled. Damaged siding and trim, none of which appear to be original material, will be replaced in kind. The door facing toward the yard will be replaced with a wood Simpson replacement door (<i>Simpson 3744 Thermal Sash Door</i>). The door facing the street will be restored as necessary. The chimney will be repointed as needed.</p> <p>AA discussed the site visit of the property. There appears to be only one complete original window in the building. Except for half of another window, all the others appear to have been previously replaced. The original sash will be saved for future use. All six windows will be replaced with custom wood 8/12 windows.</p> <p>Brendan Hennessey said they would be ok with storing the original windows for future use. He said he is currently evaluating whether to use Harvey Majesty wood windows with aluminum cladding, Marvin wood windows with aluminum cladding, or painted Marvin wood window replacements. The Commission recommends against the use of aluminum cladding as it does not last and it is not historically appropriate. Brendan Hennessey discussed the proposed door replacements.</p> <p>Commission members expressed their appreciation that the Law Office will be restored and re-used.</p>				
		<b>Disposition:</b> JT made a motion that the proposal as presented is not detrimental and to not impose a delay. MB seconded, all in favor.				
<b>F</b>	<b>Location and Documentation</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Applicant(s) Present</b>	<b>Building Data</b>	<b>Proposed Demolition</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	<a href="#">6 Irving Rd</a>  MHC Form A  (Irving Road Historic Area)	Initial Determination	Anthony Polednak, Or	1930-1942, 2 ½ story saltbox style colonial revival	Total Demolition of house and garage	Found <i>Significant</i> . Public Hearing Scheduled 5/2/2023.
		<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW opened up the discussion and read the MACRIS <b>area form</b>. The house, known as The Frank and Mary Duffy House is a 2-1/2 story saltbox style Colonial Revival with a center chimney and 12/12 window sash. It has a one-car detached garage. The property sits prominently in the center of the Irving Road Historic Area and contributes to it. The house, built c 1930, is significant, as part of an intact unified neighborhood built by John Irving Connolly between 1930 and 1942.</p> <p>Anthony Polednak, the appointed representative discussed the history of the property. The owner of the property had passed away and the structure has been neglected for</p>				

		<p>many years. After an inspection on 9/3/2021, the Public Health Director issued an “Emergency condemnation and Order to vacate the property.” On 11/21/2021, the Health Director noted a concern with the structural integrity of the floors due to leaks in the roof.</p> <p>Pam Fox said this house was important to the street given the size and style of homes in the neighborhood.</p> <p>The Commission said they would want to see what is replacing the house and asked if there was potential for a buyer to restore the property. Anthony Polednak stated that he has no plans to develop the property or to live there, but he would like to leave all options available as to whether to sell it “as is,” or to first remove some safety hazards. SW noted that demolition delay, whether imposed or waived, will not transfer to a new owner (if the house is still standing).</p> <p><b>Public Comment:</b> Maureen Johnson, neighbor, said that the house and property has not been kept up for approximately 30 years. She said the roof has been leaking for a number of years and she does not think that this house could be restored. Trish Foss, 4 Irving, said this property is a hazard and there is a very serious concern of potential fire or trees falling.</p> <p>Anthony Polednak said that tree work will start soon to clear up the lot and address some of the hazardous trees on the lot.</p>				
		<p><b>Disposition:</b> KS made a motion to find the house <i>significant</i> due to its age, and location in the Historic Area. PH seconded, all in favor. KS made a motion to bring the project to a public hearing on 5/2/23. PH seconded, all in favor.</p>				
<b>G</b>	<b>Location and Documentation</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Applicant(s) Present</b>	<b>Building Data</b>	<b>Proposed Demolition</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	<a href="#">11 Silver Hill Rd</a>	Initial Determination	Ben & Lizzie Pignatelli, O	1925, 1 ½ story	Application for additions	Found <i>Not Significant</i> . No Delay.
	MHC Form A (Silver Hill Area)	<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW read the application for additions and described the data in the MACRIS area form. Built circa 1925, the house is a one-and-a-half story structure with a wide wrap-around deck. It sits within the Silver Hill National Register Historic District, but is set back far from the street up a hill.</p> <p>The Commission reviewed photos of the house and noted it appears to have been modified over the years. AA questioned if there was anything left of the original structure. KS and SW agreed that the house did not appear significant. Pam Fox said the house was not significant and it is difficult to see what it originally looked like.</p> <p>The Commission members commented that the proposed work, as shown on drawings submitted by Krause Architects and dated 3/16/2023, looks appropriate.</p>				
		<p><b>Disposition:</b> JT made a motion to find the house <i>not significant</i>. MB seconded; PH voted no; all others in favor. The motion passed, there is no delay.</p>				
<b>H</b>	<b>Location and Documentation</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Applicant(s) Present</b>	<b>Building Data</b>	<b>Proposed Demolition</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	<a href="#">270 Glen Rd</a>	Initial Determination	Amy Roberts & Scott Sieting, O	1924, Colonial Revival	Application for additions	Found <i>Significant</i> . Not Detrimental, No Delay.
	MHC Form A					

<p>(Glen Road Historic Area, Glen Road National Register Historic District)</p>	<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW read the MACRIS area form noting the house, built c. 1924, has a hipped roof with overhanging eaves, exposed rafter tails and a Colonial Revival entrance portico. The house is part of a very cohesive Colonial Revival neighborhood built by Warren Jennings on subdivided farmland. It contributes to the Glen Road Historic Area and the Glen Road National Register Historic District.</p> <p>Amy Roberts presented plans, by Poravas Design &amp; Consulting dated 3/27/2023, which include replacement of the existing deck at the right rear of the house with an addition at the first floor and basement levels. There is also a second-floor addition above the existing family room on the left side of the house, and an addition of an attic-level dormer at the rear. Additionally, the proposal involves demolition of the existing garage roof to build a deck at the rear of the house.</p> <p>Proposed materials include wood shingles that match the existing exposure; wood windows with muntin-patterns to match existing windows; wood trim details at doors, windows, fascias and soffits to match the existing trim; and asphalt roof shingles to match the existing.</p> <p>Five neighbors submitted letters of support for the project.</p> <p>Commission members agreed that the proposed modifications are in keeping with the original historical character and style of the house.</p>
	<p><b>Disposition:</b> JT made a motion to find the house significant due to its architecture and contribution to the Historic Area. KS seconded; all in favor.</p> <p>JT made a motion that the proposal was not detrimental and approve the proposal as presented. MB seconded; all in favor.</p>
<p><b>Abbreviations</b></p>	<p>O = Owner; OR = Owner’s Representative; D = Designer; Ar = Architect; Att = Attorney, C = Contractor</p>