



HISTORIC DISTRICTS COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Pursuant to notice duly filed with the Town Clerk's office, the Town of Concord Historic Districts Commission held a public meeting on Thursday, January 5, 2017 at 7:00 P.M. in the First Floor Conference Room at 141 Keyes Road.

Present:

Full Members

Mark Giddings, Chair
Dennis Fiori
Nea Glenn
Justin King

Associate Members

Peter Nobile
Melinda Shumway

Lara Kritzer, Senior Planner

Chair Mark Giddings called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. Voting Members for the meeting were Mr. Fiori, Ms. Glenn, Mr. Giddings, Mr. King and Mr. Nobile, who was appointed in place of Mr. Gregory.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Daryl and Andrew Peddar, 252 Main Street, Main Street Historic District, to remove enclosed stairway and 3rd floor shed dormer. Proposed additions include side entry, rear first floor bay, rear deck, and small storage structure

Owners Daryl and Andrew Peddar and Nashawtuc Architects' Lisa Adamiak and Holly Cratsley were present for the discussion. The Architects explained that the new owners wanted to clean up the rear façade, including the former third floor apartment areas, and to add a side entrance on the left façade near the new parking area. They explained that the majority of the work was on the rear façade and how they were working with the new owners to reorganize the interior of the house. They reviewed the footprint and layout of the building and explained how things had accrued on the rear façade over time. Their current plan was to give the rear façade the look of a proper addition. It was noted that there was currently an entrance on the right side of the house but no entrance on the left side near the new driveway. They planned to remove the right façade entrance and create a new mudroom entry on the rear left corner of the building. The Architect explained how the new mudroom had been designed to have the entry at grade so that the living room space could still take advantage of the view through the rear windows to the river. They planned to take the existing side entry hood from the right façade and reuse or replicate it at the new entrance. The project includes a 75 sf. addition at the center of the rear façade and new storage containers along the rear façade for bicycles and outdoor equipment. The Architect noted that they were also proposing a new deck for the rear façade to provide a slightly raised and separate outdoor space for the house. This deck would have a bench style railing across the rear to preserve its view to the river and would include steps down to the yard.

Using a three dimensional computer model, the Architects explained how the new side entry and open porch would be placed in the corners of the house. She noted that the design was intended to provide a little more privacy from the new house and that the new mudroom addition would create a better connection for the pergola to the house. The central “river room” addition would provide a 14’ x 15’ family room space overlooking the river. She explained that their goal with the exterior of the rear façade was to make it cohesive and to simplify its design. This included removing the existing basement access on the rear façade and relocating a bulkhead on the right façade. She also noted that two new a/c condensers were also proposed to be installed on the right façade between the existing bay bumpout and storage containers.

The Architects explained that the new side entry would also need a new walkway as the existing stepping stones were not adequate. Site improvements would include a new, wider bluestone walkway to the side entrance from the parking area. New lighting fixtures would include a ceiling mounted fixture at the side entry and sconce style fixtures using frosted glass and LED lights at the new deck. A Commission Member asked if these new fixtures were considered to be Dark Sky Compliant. The Architect explained that they were not termed as Dark Sky but that the light source was in the top of the fixture and would be fully shielded from view. She thought that the glow of light would be visible but not the bulb itself. No uplighting was proposed. Another Member asked why the Architects were not considering a recessed light at the side entry. The Architects explained that a recessed light would not fit into the roof as proposed.

Members reviewed the computer model of the building from various viewpoints. A Commission Member asked about the history of the changes to the rear façade of the house. The Architects explained that the prior owner had been an architect and had added elements found at other sites, such as the arched window, into the rear façade. Other changes had been made to provide access to the third floor apartment. It was noted that this was the first house in Concord with plate glass windows and that the original building’s windows had few divisions. The original building had primarily large, one over one double hung windows but later additions, including the dormers on the third floor, had used smaller, generally six over six light windows. The Architects explained that their proposal was to return to one over one plate glass windows on the first and second stories, but to leave the six over six windows in the third floor at this time. A second Commission Member asked if the dormer windows had been plate glass as well. The Architects stated that they believed the dormers were not original to the building and that they may have been built with the six over six windows now in place.

Members reviewed the visibility of the property. The Architects noted that the new windows would all be Marvin Wood Architect series windows. A Commission Member asked for a copy of the specifications for these windows for the building file. Another Member suggested that the first floor of the rear façade be painted white and treated as a later addition to the house. The Architects explained that they were proposing to treat the center section as another bay of the house, similar to those found on the side facades. She explained how the finish was proposed for that area, and that it would be harder to carry that treatment through the area at either corner. A third Member asked if they were limited in terms of additional square footage because of the other changes to the property. The Architects explained that the small house was limited by the size of the main building, but that there were no limitations on the main structure. A fourth Member asked for more information on the benches proposed for the rear deck. The Architects explained that the new deck was within 30 inches of the grade and would not require railings, but that they wanted to have something at either corner of the deck to frame the area. They had proposed the benches as a way to provide that definition and retain the view to the river. The benches would be wood and painted to match the trim on the house. It was noted that the new deck would be mahogany and would not be painted.

A Commission Member asked if they proposed to keep the existing storage containers on the right façade. The Architect answered yes, explaining that there was little outdoor storage on the site. Another Member thought that the proposed alterations simplified the design and restored the original rear façade. A third Member agreed and noted that the existing rear façade was a hodge-podge of elements. A fourth Member agreed that the proposal was a big improvement over the existing rear façade.

The Architects answered the Commission's questions about the foundation of the new addition, explaining that it would have a stone veneer and project 5' from the existing rear façade. A Commission Member asked if there were any concerns with the proposed light fixtures and there were none. Members discussed whether a site visit was necessary and agreed that they were already very familiar with the site. Members agreed that the proposed a/c condensers on the right façade should have additional screening but left it to the owners to decide if vegetation or fencing would be installed. A second Member suggested that the storage area could be extended to screen the units as well.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Ms. Glenn moved to approve the plans to relocate the side entrance to the left facade, install a new rear deck and addition, and make window and door changes at the rear of the building as submitted with the condition that screening in the form of fencing or landscaping is required for the two a/c condensers on the right façade and that the specifications and detail information on the new windows must be submitted for the file. Mr. King seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The Chair then signed and dated the approved plans.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Cindy and Tom Jump, 181 Lexington Road, American Mile Historic District, to replace windows and doors, add new screen porch & wrap around porch

Owners Cindy and Tom Jump and Contractor Liam Coleran presented the plans to replace windows and install new porches on the ca. 1840s farm house. The Contractor explained that the new owners wanted to restore the wrap around porch to the front and left facades of the building and showed an old photo of the property with the porch still in place. A Commission member noted that the Queen Anne style porch would not have been original to an 1840s farmhouse and asked when it might have been added. The Owner was not sure but noted that there was evidence on the existing building of where the porch had been removed. In addition to the new front porch, the Contractor explained that they also wanted to add a new screened porch to the rear left corner of the house and to replace a number of windows. Many of the replacement windows were on the rear façade but there were changes to the kitchen windows on the right façade of the house that would be visible from Lexington Road.

The Contractor explained that they had assumed that the Commission would want to do a site visit to the property but were hoping to get approval at this time for the new window in the kitchen on the right façade. He explained that the existing window was a 1970s casement style window that they would like to replace with a new triple casement window that would be better centered under the existing window on the second floor. He added that they planned to install new trim around the window to match the existing windows on the rest of the house.

A Commission Member stated that the proposed new window would be a big improvement. A second Member agreed and suggested that the wrap around porch was probably added along with the two story bay in the 1880s. He agreed that the house looked naked without the porch. The Contractor explained

where shadows of the former porch could be seen in the existing trim and siding and that they planned to replicate the original details in the new porch.

Turning to the screen porch, the contractor explained that the new porch would be centered on the existing sliding door on the left façade which had been installed in the 1970s. He explained that they planned to construct the new porch with period appropriate details. He went on to explain that the existing shed roof in this section of the house would remain and that the ridge of the new screened porch would come out of its center. The Owners explained that this shed roof had been damaged and would need to be repaired as part of this project. A Commission Member encouraged the Applicants to consider detailing the new screen porch to match the front porch on the building. A second Member agreed and thought that a site visit would be helpful in better understanding the project. He had no objections, though, to the Applicants moving forward on the window replacement. A third Member asked if the front door would be changed with the wrap around porch was installed. The Contractor explained how the gable over the entrance would be centered over the door and that the door itself would not need to change. Members agreed that the kitchen window could be considered tentatively approved and that there were no concerns with the Applicants moving forward with its replacement.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment. Jennifer Hart, 72 Annursnac Hill Road, stated that it was a wonderful house and expressed concern with the scale and shape of the proposed screened porch. She suggested that a simpler, Federal style porch might work better and wondered if the dimensions and scale were right for the house. The Contractor explained that the new porch would be 14' wide and project 16' from the side of the house.

A site visit was scheduled for Thursday, January 19, at 8:30 A.M. The Contractor was asked to stake out the locations of the two new porches for the site visit, including the proposed height. Further discussion was continued to the next meeting on January 19.

Mark Vella and Antonia Vincente, 462 Lexington Road, American Mile Historic District, to replace windows and paint colors

Owner Toni Vincente and Contractor Chris Park presented the application for new windows and paint colors on the building. They explained that they would like to use Anderson Fibrex (Fiberglass) clad wood windows for both the new construction and to replace the existing windows on the existing building. A Commission Member asked if the existing wood windows were beyond repair. The Contractor answered no, but that they all needed to be repaired. It was suggested that the original wood windows in the original front portion of the house be restored but that the windows in the rest of the house could be replaced. The Contractor explained that the later additions to the building had a variety of different windows installed, some of which were in bad shape. He presented an example of the Anderson window which the Applicants wanted to use and explained that it was a solid wood window with fiberglass cladding on the exterior. He stated that he preferred this material over aluminum as he had found that the powder coat finish on aluminum often failed within a few years.

A Commission Member asked how the new windows would change the dimensions of the window openings. The Contractor stated that there would be no change in the size of the windows and explained that they would be installed from the inside of the building and use the existing wood trim. It was noted that the existing windows were two over two double hung windows and that the new replacement windows would match the size and grill pattern of the existing windows. A second Member asked if the exterior cladding would have a shine. The Contractor stated that it would have a low luster finish and noted that it could also be painted. It was also noted that this would allow for the removal of the storm

windows on most of the house. It was noted that the new windows would be Simulated Divided Light windows and would not require storm windows. Members preferred to see the original windows in the front gable end portion of the building restored and those storm windows replaced if necessary. A Commission Member noted that there were better storm windows available now than the aluminum ones shown in the photos.

The Applicants next explained that they had removed the stucco from the building and had found that the wood clapboard siding was still in place underneath. The Contractor stated that it was still in good condition and that only a few repairs had been required. The Owners proposed to match the color scheme of the Haines House at Concord Academy with dark gray siding, white trim, and black shutters. A Commission Member asked if the shutters would be reinstalled on the building and the Contractor stated that they had been removed for the stucco work and would be repaired and reinstalled in their original locations. He noted that most of the shutters were on the front of the house but that a few were proposed for the new addition. The Owner explained that the dark gray was a color created by Philips Paint in West Concord and simply called “Haines House – CA”. The trim was proposed to be painted “Brilliant White” (BM PM-4) and the shutters and doors to be “Black” (BM PM-9).

Members reviewed photos of the existing building with the Contractor, who explained how they had discovered rot in the front porch and had had to rebuild portions of it. Members agreed that the windows on the front façade, in the bays on both sides of the house, and gable ends must be restored. Members asked whether the areas below the windows on the bays would be painted to match the trim or the body color. The Applicants agreed that all of the existing pink trim elements on the building would be painted white. The Contractor explained that they were not sure what had originally been installed on the bays between the windows – whether it was paneling or clapboards – but that they felt that panels painted to match the trim color would work best in those locations. Commission Members agreed that panels would be a better fit for the bays.

The Contractor also raised a question on the roof color. The new roof had been assumed to match the color of the existing roof, but they had learned that there were three different roof colors on the building – a dark gray shingle on the original house that was covered in moss, a charcoal gray shingle in the center section of the building, and a weathered wood shingle in the rear section of the building. The Owners wanted to install one shingle color throughout and proposed “Pewter Gray” GAF Architectural Grade asphalt shingles. Members had no objections to unifying the roof color in this manner.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Ms. Glenn moved to approve the use of “Haines House – CA” Gray (Philips Paint) for the body of the house, “Brilliant White” (BM PM-4) for the trim and “Black” (BM PM-9) for the shutters and doors; to restore the existing wood windows on the front façade, side bays and gable ends with the allowance that new storm windows may be installed on these windows; to use Anderson A Series Fibrex (Fiberglass) clad Simulated Divided Light wood windows to replace the rest of the windows on the building and in the new additions; and to install “Pewter Gray” GAF architectural grade asphalt shingles on the entire roof of the building. Mr. Nobile seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Scott & Cheryl Dreyor, 349 Main Street, Main Street Historic District, to replace fencing and remove/replace windows

The Applicants had requested a continuance to the January 19 meeting prior to this meeting. There was no discussion of this project at this time.

Jennifer Hart, 344 Barretts Mill Road, Barrett Farm Historical District, to replace windows

Architect Jennifer Hart was present to explain the proposed window changes on the right side of the building. She explained that a current kitchen renovation called for changing two windows and a door in a 1981 addition to the rear of the existing house. The addition was finished in aluminum siding and the new windows were proposed to be Marvin Aluminum clad wood windows. She presented photos of the existing windows and door and the proposed new configuration. She explained that new Azek material casings would be installed around the windows as they had very little trim at this time. She planned to add slightly more detail and trim, but would be restricted by the aluminum siding as to how much could be added.

Members reviewed the changes and the Architect noted that the long, rectangular window to the right of the door would be replaced with a more typical four panel window. A Commission Member asked why the windows in the addition were not scaled to match those in the rest of the house. The Architect explained that the windows would be installed in the kitchen and that she had had to work with the counters and ceiling heights of the existing space.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Ms. Glenn moved to approve the installation of two new Marvin Ultimate Aluminum Clad Wood awning windows in the 1981 addition at the rear of the house as submitted. Mr. Fiori seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

OTHER BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes – Members had received draft copies of the minutes prior to the meeting and Ms. Glenn submitted revisions at this time. Mr. King moved to approve the October 20, November 17, and December 1 minutes as revised. Mr. Nobile seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

USS Concord Bell Memorial Violation – Members asked the status of this project, which had been discovered in December to have not been built according to the approved plans. Staff stated that she had notified the Concord Rotary but had not received an application for the changes yet. Members agreed that this was a very visible problem which needed to be addressed immediately.

New Town Lighting – A Commission Member raised a question about the new LED streetlights currently being tested out on Stow Street. She felt that they were too bright and white and asked if other Members agreed. Members discussed whether LED lights should be allowed and if the temperature could be adjusted to produce a warmer light. Members agreed to go by Stow Street before the next meeting so that the Commission could send a response to the Town on the use of these lights within the Historic Districts.

Commission Photo – Members agreed to postpone the photo for the Town Report to the January 19 meeting.

New Trees at MBTA Crossing on Main Street – A Commission Member noted that the trees had been removed surrounding the MBTA commuter rail tracks for the bridge work at Main Street and wondered if they would be replaced now that the work was complete. Staff was asked to look into this question for the next meeting.

Mr. King moved to adjourn. Mr. Fiori seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The Meeting was adjourned at 8:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Kritzer
Senior Planner

Minutes Approved on: January 19, 2017

Justin King, Secretary