

Members present: Henry Stone (HS), Kathryn Scadden (KS), John Thompson (JT), Alan Fobes (AF), Steve Wagner (SW), Phyllis Halpern (PH), Al Aydelott (AA - Present only for Agenda Item #3)

Staff present: John Field (JF)

300 Meadowbrook Rd Owners' representative present: Daniel Quaile (Lincoln Architects)

Others present: Leslie Glynn, Jim Polando, Adrienne Giske (AG - Present only for Agenda Item #3)

Location: online

Link to Recording: <https://weston.vod.castus.tv/vod/?video=20db6a62-9190-428a-b750-013a25ee0dad&nav=programs%2FHistorical%20Commission%20-%20Weston%20MA>

SW called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm and read an open meeting law disclaimer from the Governor regarding remote meetings.

Agenda Item:

1. Public Comments: None

2. 300 Meadowbrook Rd – 1922 – Continuation of review of revisions to approved plans

Note: AA and AG were not present for this agenda item.

SW noted that the last meeting was a joint meeting with the ZBA on 4/12/21. At the working meeting previous to that, the H C worked with the applicant, took several votes and made recommendations to the ZBA for modifications to the as-built conditions at 300 Meadowbrook. At the meeting with the ZBA, the applicants had presented the back elevation with a gable roof and with a higher eave line, which the H C had not endorsed. Other discrepancies included retention of a Palladian window at the rear gambrel and concerns with wooden shutters. The ZBA asked for the applicant to return to the H C to propose a solution that would be acceptable. SW emphasized that is the purpose of the current meeting.

Architect Dan Quaile showed several drawings. He pointed out that the original proposed and approved fascia at the family room did not align with the adjacent eaves. He also shared his 3-D model of the originally approved drawings to illustrate what he believed would be issues that would make it difficult to build/maintain. He discussed possible options for the egress bedroom windows on the 2nd floor assuming that the owners are allowed to keep the gable roof:

- a.) keep the same size windows and push them up to the underside of the eave, or
- b.) use a slightly shorter window with a higher sill.

Quaile stated that the owners realized that they made mistakes, but that they felt that their proposal is de minimus compared to the approved drawings. He said that if the owners are required to pull down the as-built gable, there will be less money available for proposed screening. The owners are now willing to remove the Palladian window in the back and to add louvered wood shutters to the two street facades.

SW stated that he expected to see more significant changes to the owners' proposal and that what Quaile presented today does not follow the ZBA's instructions. In the discussions that followed, Quaile suggested that there is no perfect solution at this point. He said if the family room eaves are lowered, as the H C recommended, then the window headers can no longer align. SW asked whether the Murphys would accept a solution with a lower hip roof that has a higher eave line. Quaile answered he would need to consult with them.

PH prefers that as much of the original 2nd floor fabric as possible remain visible and that the lower eave line be as consistent as possible. SW noted that although there were no hips in the original house, a hip over the family room minimizes the impact of that addition, whereas the gable end emphasizes the height and changes the look of the house. He believes the hip roof visually softens the appearance, while the higher fascia, as discussed, will not be as noticeable. JT said that he prefers the lower eave line. AF said that he is willing to accept the existing height of the family room eave line, but he also prefers the hip roof. HS said that he is inclined to accept the higher eave and hip (keeping the first third of the existing ridge) in order to move along. AF asked about an alternative, maintaining the higher as-built eave line around the family room, but with a lower slope hip (say 4:12

instead of 6:12). Materials could be reused, though this would require more labor. This lower slope doesn't crowd the existing 2nd floor windows. The mudroom roof could match this hipped roof. Other H C members agree that the lower pitched roof over the family room addition is an improvement. Members agreed that the window heads should align across the back. Quaile showed a photo from inside the existing as-built construction, suggesting that the H C's recommendation would allow the existing family room construction to remain from the wall top plate down.

The H C requested that Quaile provide a drawing for approval to reflect the current discussion. Quaile said that he would update the owners and the drawings. SW reiterated that the H C cannot have another conversation about this, as enough hard work and enough compromises have been made. This is a reasonable compromise for all.

JT motioned to approve a new drawing that will show:

- a. Removal of the Palladian window on the back gambrel façade
- b. Install louvered wood shutters on keepers throughout on all facades
- c. Rebuilding of the family room roof as a hip with a 4:12 pitch that will keep the as-built eave height and will allow the 1st floor windows to maintain matching head heights across the back.
- d. Rebuild the mud room entry roof as a hip.
- e. Retain the configuration, size and locations of the existing 2nd floor bedroom egress windows. Maintain more visibility of the original 2nd floor fabric.
- f. Install wood decking (instead of Trex material)

HS seconded. JT, HS, AF, KS, SW voted to approve motion. PH voted no. Motion passed, but not unanimously.

3. 261 Merriam Street Preservation Restriction

AA and AG joined the meeting for this agenda item.

PH introduced the topic, saying that owners of this house are a group of 30 people wishing to sell it encumbered by a donated preservation restriction held by the town. The owners' attorney and Town Counsel, advising the H C, have begun working on the restriction. The format is one familiar to the town, with a narrative description of the existing property written by Leslie Glynn (in conference with HS.) All this was passed along for review to H C members recently.

Leslie Glynn stated that the owners have accepted the narrative and also the preservation agreement as written to date. This will not cost the town any funds, assuming it will be accepted by a purchaser. She believes that it covers what the current owners and the HC hope for.

HS raised the possibility that the existing shingles with woven corners may cover original clapboard siding. If the clapboards are ever revealed underneath, they should be allowed to be repaired and refurbished. This point will be clarified, so that the H C may approve a change to clapboard in the future.

PH pointed out that the current wording for how the restriction runs with the land is for a period of 99 years and then it may be renewed. This condition was a request from the owners' attorney. AA asked why does this matter; why not set it up to be a permanent deed restriction instead? HS questioned who will be there to renew it. Glynn agrees and will raise the question again with other owners and their attorney. Other HC members agree.

AA questioned whether Mass Historical Commission is on the signature page, as Town Counsel has stated that they will not be involved. PH will confirm that there is no signature page for Mass Historical Commission. AA also asked whether it is explicitly stated that succeeding owners automatically are bound by the deed restriction, which would be standard boiler plate deed restriction language. AA wants to make sure there is a continuing process for review so that future owners will be bound by the H C's decisions (approval or denial.)

Al also asked about extinguishment. If the house ever suffers a total loss, the restriction would be void, but does the H C want to have input on a replacement structure? Such involvement is in typical restriction language. That would be very important to the neighborhood and for the Silver Hill Historic District. It would also discourage any future bad decision by an owner. AA suggests giving review authority of a replacement structure to the H C, for example placing a standard on what that future construction must conform to, i.e. being consistent with

the character of the original house and neighborhood, massing, scale, location on the site and details – all to be reviewed by the H C. PH and Glynn will ask for this to be included.

AG suggested that Glynn check the standards for Middlesex County Registry of Deeds' scanning requirements to ensure that the beautiful graphics of the narrative remain visible.

JT motioned to approve the preservation restriction with modifications as discussed. AA seconded. All approved.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 pm

Respectfully submitted: Phyllis Halpern