



HISTORIC DISTRICTS COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, January 19, 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 19, 2017 at 7:00 P.M. in the First Floor Conference Room at 141 Keyes Road.

Present:

Full Members

Mark Giddings, Chair
Nea Glenn
Terry Gregory
Justin King

Associate Members

Kate Chartener
Satish Dhingra
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. Giddings, Ms. Glenn, Mr. Gregory, Mr. King and Ms. Chartener, who was appointed in place of Mr. Fiori.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

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

Owner Cheryl Dreyer presented her application for window and fencing changes at this time. Beginning with the windows, she explained that she would like to remove one window on the first floor left side of the house, to the right of the existing side entrance. A second window in this location would also be restored and upgraded with new weather stripping. She explained that she had initially applied to replace the second window if absolutely necessary, but had found that the existing window could be restored instead. Members reviewed the submitted elevations at this time. A Commission Member asked if the same feathered clapboard siding would be installed in place of the missing window and the Owner answered yes. She added that the house had been recently painted and the freshly painted clapboards were expected to blend right in.

Discussion turned to the new fence, which is proposed to be a board fence with an 18" decorative topper which will replace an existing stockade fence facing Main Street on either side of the house. Members reviewed the location and design of the new fence. A Commission Member asked if the new fence would be painted or left natural. The Owner stated that the fence would be painted white to match the trim on the house. She added that there was already another fence running between the house and the garage which matched this design.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Ms. Glenn moved to approve the removal of one existing window on the first floor, left façade as shown on the submitted plans with the understanding that the second window will be restored and to replace the stockade fence facing Main Street on both sides of the house with a new 4.5' Universal board fence topped with an 18" Highland picket topper as submitted. Mr. Gregory seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

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

Architect Elise Stone and Owners Cindy and Tom Jump were present for the discussion. It was noted that the project had been continued from the last meeting to allow time for the site visit earlier in the day. The Architect quickly reviewed the project for those members who had not been present at the last meeting. Members noted that the changes to the windows at the rear of the house were not visible from the public way and that the changes to the windows on the right façade had been tentatively approved at the last meeting. On the front façade, it was noted that one window would be replaced with a door to provide an entrance to the far end of the new wrap around porch. The new door would be a three quarters glass French style solid wood door. The Architect presented an historic photo of the house with its original wrap around porch and explained how the new porch would replicate the original details as closely as possible. The new posts were proposed to have a square base with turned tops and the railings would use square balusters.

Members reviewed the plans for the new additions and noted that the existing bulkhead would be relocated. Members asked if the a/c condenser would be moved and the Architect explained that they hoped to relocate it to the far side of the new bulkhead. A Commission Member asked that it be screened with either vegetation or a small fence.

A Commission Member asked whether there were any concerns with the design or location of the proposed screen porch. The Architect explained how it was designed to tie in to the roof of the house. A second Member noted that the screened porch appeared to be smaller when she had seen it staked out on the site. A second Member stated that he had been concerned with the plan but that these concerns had been resolved once he had seen how far back it would be on the actual site. Other Members agreed and had no further concerns about the screen porch's design or location.

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 porches, the replacement of the four windows on the right façade, the installation of a new door in place of a window on the front façade, and the relocation of the bulkhead and the a/c condenser as shown in the submitted plans with the condition that the a/c unit must be screened from view by either vegetation or fencing and that a manufacturer's cut sheet be submitted for the new door. Mr. Gregory seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

OTHER BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes – Members had received the draft minutes for the January 5 meeting prior to the meeting and one change had been submitted. Mr. King moved to approve the January 5 minutes as revised. Ms. Glenn seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Update on Banners at First Parish Church – Mr. Giddings reported that he had met with the Town Manager and representatives of First Parish Church to discuss the issue of the banners installed in front of the building. First Parish's representatives had stressed that they valued the Historic Districts

Commission and wanted to abide by the Historic Districts Act, but felt that these banners were a First Amendment issue. The banners had been installed to encourage discussion and would be taken down when they no longer felt they were serving this purpose. First Parish felt that if they applied for approval, they would be agreeing that the HDC had authority over this decision and they were not willing to do say that. Mr. Giddings added that he had had a conference call with Town Counsel beforehand to discuss the Commission's jurisdiction and options. Town Counsel had agreed with the HDC's decision to not move forward with violation proceedings on the banners at this time.

Mr. King questioned whether the Commission should pursue this issue, asking whether they would be willing to let things stand if the violation was larger than a banner. Mr. Giddings explained about the recent Supreme Court decision on signage bylaws and how the Historic Districts Act was in violation because it used content to determine how a sign would be reviewed. Members discussed the issues of content vs. the size of a new sign and whether or not the HDC should be taking action in this case. It was noted that the HDC had already gone on record that they did not agree with First Parish's interpretation of the Act.

New LED Street Lights Discussion – At the last meeting, Members had been asked to check out the new LED street lights on Stow Street in order to provide comments to the Town. Members agreed that the lights were obviously LED and agreed that ideally the light would be warmer in color. Staff was asked to find out more information about the lights installed on Main Street and Stow Street and whether there were options for warmer lights.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

Jennifer Lozada, 24 Lowell Road, North Bridge/Monument Square Historic District, to replace 3 windows and a porch light fixture

Owner Jennifer Lozada presented her application to replace windows and install a new light fixture on the ca. 1880s house. She explained that one of the windows is on the rear façade of the house and is a six over six double hung window, and that the other two are in the rear corner of the left façade. The new windows would be Eagle aluminum clad Simulated Divided Light windows in a two over two pattern to match the majority of the windows in the house.

Commission Members reviewed the photos of the existing windows and the information on the proposed replacement windows. A Commission Member asked if the new windows would have the same mullion size and profile as the other windows on the house. The Owner noted that there were several options and believed that they could get close to the appearance of the existing windows. Another Member asked if the existing windows were original to the house and whether they could be restored. The Owner stated that she was not sure and had not considered that option. A third Member noted that all of the other windows on the house had storm windows and expressed concern that the new windows would stick out as being new. She suggested that the Owner consider restoring the window and asked Staff if it was possible to give suggestions for companies that the Owner could call. Members noted that a previous applicant had used a company called Old Bostonian and Staff stated that the Commission had a list of local companies which did restoration work that she would forward to the Owner.

Members agreed that they would prefer to see the existing windows repaired and suggested that the Application be continued to give the Owner time to look into this question further. Members also agreed that the rear window was not visible from any public way and could be altered without the Commission's review. Further discussion on the windows was then continued to the January 19 meeting.

The Owner explained that the second element of the application was to replace an existing ceiling fixture on the front porch with a new decorative light fixture. A Commission Member stated that this was a wonderful fixture but was concerned that a 100W maximum bulb as allowed in the fixture would be too strong as these fixtures could really throw the light. Members reviewed the information on the fixture and photos of the existing front porch. It was noted that the fixture would be centered on the porch and that the design of the porch would shield it from throwing the light up or too far out.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. A Commission Member asked if there were any concerns that the new light fixture was not a period piece and no concerns were expressed. Ms. Glenn moved to approve the installation of a new Patti Bros. Inc. “Star Fixture: Clear Glass” measuring 18”x 17” with a gunmetal finish to replace the existing front porch ceiling fixture with the condition that it be limited to a 60W maximum bulb. Mr. King seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Jason Parillo, 45 Walden Street, Main Street Historic District, to install new sign

Applicant Jason Parillo presented the application to install a new sign over the rearmost archway on the left side of the Tuttle’s Livery building. He explained that the new business, Blue Hill Bank, wanted to install a wall sign over the entrance. The new sign would be a high density foam sign with carved letters and logo. Only two colors – a blue background and white lettering – would be used. The size of the rectangular sign was in keeping with the other signage on this façade and would be centered over the arched bay. No lighting was proposed as part of this application.

Members reviewed the proposed signage and the other signs on the building. 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 High Density Foam wall sign with white carved letters on a blue background as submitted. Mr. Gregory seconded the motion and ALLVOTED IN FAVOR.

Graham & Graham, PC, 91 Main Street, Main Street Historic District, to replace existing sign

Business Owners Stephen and Laura Graham explained that they wanted to install one blade sign for their business in the colonnade on the right side of the building to help visitors to find their office. The new sign would be installed using the brackets for the former “Blue Butterfly” sign. No new signs were proposed for the street façade of the building and they were not planning to add their name to the existing signboard. Members reviewed the proposed sign and noted that it would have carved lettering on both sides. Members had no questions about the design or location of the new sign.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment and there was none at this time. Ms. Glenn moved to approve the installation of the new 48” x 21” oval blade sign as submitted with carved, not vinyl, gold letters and a faux mahogany finish. Mr. King seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR.

Marcia Rasmussen, 122-277 Main Street, Main Street Historic District, to install parking signage or meters

Dept. of Planning and Land Management Director Marcia Rasmussen presented the Town’s application to install new parking meters and signage along Main Street. She explained that she had initially proposed installing meters only along the frontage of the Concord Free Public Library but that she had since met

with the Library Committee and they had asked for meters to be installed on both sides of Main Street between Sudbury Road and Academy Lane. The meters allowed for the 12 minutes free option which was not available by Pay By Phone, and would have a three hour maximum. 46 meters would be installed in this stretch of Main Street. From Academy Lane to Thoreau Street, the Town would use a Pay By Phone system that would only require occasional signage with approximately 3 signs per block. These new signs would be 24" x 18" rectangular metal signs with a design matching the ones already installed in the West Concord Municipal lot.

A Commission Member asked why two different methods were proposed. The Applicant explained that the Library wanted people dropping off materials to have the option of the 12 free minutes and a more limited maximum time of 3 hours. She noted that the Library had plans to redevelop 151 Main Street for Library programs and expected to need more space for Library users. The Member asked if the new regulations were intended to dissuade commuter parking. The Applicant explained that much of the area was being used by Concord Academy and that the regulations had been recommended in the Town's 2013 Parking Management Plan.

Another Commission Member asked if the meters would be installed on both sides of Main Street to Academy Lane and the Applicant answered yes. A question was raised about the issue with the new meters installed on Hubbard Street and Walden Street. The Applicant explained that those meters were experiencing signal problems due to the loss of wireless coverage in the area and would be meeting with representatives to discuss these issues. She explained how the meters worked and why a signal was necessary for the credit card feature.

A Commission Member reviewing the proposed new signage stated that it was a very contemporary color scheme. He asked if there were options available for other color schemes which might blend in better with the Historic Districts. The Representative agreed to look into that option. Another Member asked if the Pay By Phone option was being presented to eliminate the use of meters in those areas. The Representative answered yes, that she had heard strong opposition from Commission Members to installing meters all the way to Thoreau Street and that the Town had developed this compromise proposal to address those concerns. A third Member asked how residents of the area felt about the meters. The Representative stated that she had not spoken with area residents. A fourth Member asked how Concord Academy felt about the project and the Representative answered she had spoken with Don Kingman at Concord Academy and he understood the need for parking management in the area. She added that many Concord Academy workers have been using Main Street for parking while there is construction underway on the campus. She explained that the Pay By Phone option allowed the Town to install 12 signs in place of 53 meters on 30 posts and noted that the signs would be installed on existing poles where possible.

A Commission Member noted that parking meters could be looked as the modern equivalent of a hitching post. Another Member pointed out that these meters would also become bike stands. Members discussed how parking meters have been dealt with in other locations and communities. The second Member expressed concerns with the density that so many parking meters would create in the area and it was noted that the current application would install 46 new meters on 26 posts. The Representative stated that the Town would consider an alternative option which would eliminate 14 meters by stopping short of Academy Lane at 166 Main Street and the small Concord Academy Parking lot. She explained that Engineering preferred the meters to be on both sides and starting/stopping at the same place for both enforcement and management of the meters. A question was raised about the ownership of the Stow Street parking lot used by the Library. The Representative explained that this is a shared municipal lot that was typically full. It was noted that there were currently long term parking spaces available in Concord Center in the Keyes Road lot.

The Chair opened the discussion to Public Comment at this time. Belinda Davis, 169 Main Street, thought that it was horrendous that the Town wanted to install parking meters on Main Street. She agreed that Concord Academy currently used 85% to 90% of the available spaces and noted that this had not always been an issue. She expressed concern that adding meters would just push the parking problem over to Middle Street and Sudbury Road. She noted that Academy Lane was already full of cars and stated that there were still hitching posts on Main Street which were not the same as the meters. She stated that the Parking By Phone option would be available in front of her property and that she would resent it if she could not park in front of her own house without paying.

Kathy Angel, 267 Main Street, shared Ms. Davis' concerns. She agreed that the parking would only be pushed to other streets and thought that parking on Main Street had only become an issue after the permit program was established for Crosby's parking lot. She felt that the Town was not fixing the issue but just pushing the parking around. She agreed that parking meters were not hitching posts and noted that this was a residential neighborhood where property owners spent a considerable amount of time and expense maintaining the historic look of their properties. She agreed with the comments to change the color scheme of the signs. She saw this area as a gateway to Concord and did not believe that the meters or signs would solve the problem. She did think that the new striping on the street had improved the situation, though. She asked about the times and cost of the new parking system. The Representative noted that it would be in use from 8AM to 6PM and would cost .50/hour. She was also concerned that there be some exemption for residents or visitors of residents to not have to pay to park there.

Amanda Patrick, 21 Thoreau Street, stated that meters had been recently installed in front of her home and that she found to be ugly and a problem for visitors. She also questioned whether they would really be used as she thought many would be discouraged from stopping if they were required to pay, and that it would needlessly restrict area residents.

Mr. Giddings also read a letter from Mr. Fiori, who was not able to be present for the meeting. Mr. Fiori's letter expressed concern for the installation of meters in the Historic Districts as he felt it would encourage "meter creep" down Main Street and would be a visual intrusion for the Historic District. He urged against the approval of this application. The Representative stated that she could guarantee that where the Town was installing the Pay by Phone signs, they had no plans to install additional meters.

A Commission member asked if it was possible to address the Library's concerns with "One Hour Parking" or "Thirty Minutes Parking" signs in place of the proposed meters. The Representative explained that the Select Board had already approved paid parking in this location. She did not think that such signs would address the current parking situation or the Town's decision to have paid parking in this area. She explained that the Town was trying to gain revenue to maintain the parking spaces and for management and enforcement efforts. The Commission Member questioned whether the parking meters were needed primarily to address parking issues or as revenue.

The Representative stated that the Town was willing to consider the Pay By Phone option where it would work well and could address the Commission's concerns. She stressed that there is a parking problem in this area and that the Town should not be faulted for working to address it. She understood that the Commission would prefer no meters to be installed but that this was not an option.

Dutch Leonard, 267 Main Street, thought that the Pay By Phone option was a much less intrusive alternative to the meters and would help to protect the character of the District. He wondered if Pay By Phone could have a code available for a two hour option for Library patrons which could eliminate the

need for those meters as well. A Commission Member thought that additional signage rather than meters was the best solution for the Library. The Representative explained that a half hour or one hour limit would not address the Library's concerns for those who attend programs at the Library. A second Member wondered if the Town had considered installing meters along Stow Street or in its parking lot, as she did not think that those would be as intrusive there as on Main Street. Ms. Angel suggested that the Town try installing fewer Pay By Phone signs and see if more were needed. She expressed concern with having new signs every 10 feet.

The Chair stated his appreciation for the Representative's work to find other options and asked that she look further into the wider use of Pay By Phone in this area. Another Member asked if the Town knew where the parking problem might go if meters were installed and the Representative stated that they were currently looking at that issue. The Representative also noted that they had found that 70% of drivers in the West Concord Municipal Lot used the Pay By Phone option. A third Commission Member asked if residents of the area had been consulted during the parking study. The Representative stated that there had been public hearings and forums at that time but that they had not reached out to individual homeowners. She explained that as part of that process, they had met with different neighborhood groups and had discussed different solutions for the problem.

The Representative was asked to take the Commission's concerns back to the Library and Town to see if there was any way to avoid installing meters on Main Street. Staff asked if the Commission would have the same objections if the meters were only installed along the Library's frontage on Main Street and stopped before the residential section of Main Street. Several Members thought that this might be a possible solution. Ms. Angel objected to this solution as well. Further discussion was continued to the February 2 meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS (Continued)

585 Lexington Road Discussion – Mr. King recused himself from this discussion and left the meeting at this time.

Contractor Christopher Park was present with Architect Elise Stone to explain his potential plans for the site. He explained that he was very interested in the property as a long time Concord resident who had known the Flannery family when they lived here. He felt a connection to the site and loved the design and history of the house. He wanted to purchase and install a new house on the property, but was asking that the Commission relax some of the parameters that they had set for the site. He wanted to do a great project here that benefited the Town and the streetscape, but also wanted it to be suitable for today's families. He noted that nothing was salvageable in the existing house and explained how the new house would be an expanded example of the existing style.

A Commission Member asked about the size of the existing house. It was noted to be just under 2,000 sf. The Architect explained that the economics of construction did not allow them to build anything here that was less than 3,500 sf., with four bedrooms and a two car garage. She explained that the existing house was non-conforming with the existing zoning of the area and needed to be pushed back 6' on the site. To construct a new house in the same style, they also needed to increase the proportions of the building slightly to meet current building code, insulation needs, etc. The Contractor stated that he wanted to build the new house to have the same design, but to scale it up by about 6'.

Members reviewed the photos of the existing property. It was noted that a stone wall to one side of the house was believed to be the foundation wall for a former carriage house and the Contractor explained his

thoughts on how it could be incorporated into a new structure. His idea was to make the house about 9% larger in front and to blow the back out to accommodate the additional space needs of the building. The Architect explained that this could be done without increasing the height of any new additions beyond the existing building and that there was a great deal of room behind the house that they could work with.

Members agreed that they were very sensitive to preserving the details and proportions of the existing house. Members discussed possible ways that the Contractor could proceed but felt that they would need to see a design before making any decisions on the Contractor's proposal for the site. They recommended that the Contractor talk with the Owner of the property and see if they could reach an agreement based on a realistic sense of what could be done on this site. Members agreed that they wanted to see this property brought back into use but needed to review carefully how that work was done. The Architect stated that they would begin by measuring the house so that they could have a better gauge for comparing the new designs to the existing structure.

Mr. Nobile moved to adjourn. Mr. Gregory seconded the motion and ALL VOTED IN FAVOR. The Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Kritzer
Senior Planner

Minutes Approved on: _____

Justin King, Secretary