



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts
730 Massachusetts Ave., Arlington, MA 02476
Phone: 781-316-3000

webmaster@town.arlington.ma.us

05/27/2010 Minutes

May 27, 2010
 Whittemore Robbins House

Final & Approved Minutes

Commissioners

Present: D. Baldwin, B. Cohen, A. Frisch, M. Kramer,
 D. Levy, M. Logan, S. Makowka,
 T. Smurzynski, J. Worden

Commissioners

Not Present: J. Nyberg, M. Penzenik

Guests: T. Gianotti, T. Khan, J. Davis, B. Labau, A. Thompson, W. Pemsler, C. Chaille, L. Sullivan, M. Chaille, P. Young, T. Tillman, C. Gunning

1. AHDC Meeting Opens 8:00pm

2. Appointment of alternate Commissioners; Mt. Gilboa/Crescent Hill – B. Cohen, T. Smurzynski, A. Frisch; Pleasant -- A. Frisch, D. Levy, T. Smurzynski; Jason/Gray -- B. Cohen, T. Smurzynski, A. Frisch, D. Levy; Commissioners S. Makowka and M. Logan are present and may participate in discussion but will not be voting alternate Commissioners for tonight's hearings.

3. Approval of minutes from April 29, 2010 meeting. S. Makowka proposed various changes, moved by T. Smurzynski with changes, seconded by B. Cohen, approved unanimously.

4. Communications
 - a. 33 Russell Application received – will be on formal hearing
 - b. S. Makowka noted that he spoke with C. Kowalski from Planning Dept. about 6 Jason Street application for formal hearing
 - c. B. Cohen received communication that new owner from 199 Pleasant Street.
 - d. B. Cohen received call from building dept. re: property on 187 Lowell Street and he's applied for permit for renovation for main house but that the size of the addition he's proposing requires special permit from ZBA.
 - e. J. Worden reported that Town Meeting approved our budget for next year.
 - f. S. Makowka reported that 54 Westminster had stop work order posted on house. He will follow up with Building Dept. to see what work is going on and if it involves us.

5. New Business
 - Hearings (typically last around 20 minutes per application) 8:20pm
 - a. Formal Hearing re: 193 Westminster Ave. (Pemsler) re: window removal. W. Pemsler explained that they are remodeling kitchen and rear window on left hand side of house is problematic given interior design. They need to enclose that one window to put in counter space. The enclosed opening would be covered with vinyl siding to match the siding currently on house. J. Worden commented that said that the side wall is a large wall without many windows and he wonders if it would be possible to leave the window but block it from the interior. B. Cohen responded that that might be possible if this location had clapboard, but in this case, she feels because it is vinyl siding and it is already a blank wall now and removing one more window isn't going to make it any less blank. The applicant noted that neighboring houses are similar in design with few side wall windows also and that the existing window is vinyl and

not in good shape. A. Frisch suggested that J. Worden's recommendation doesn't help because there isn't much to protect. S. Makowka said the existing vinyl goes right up to the window sash with no existing wood casing around the window so you would have to recreate something that isn't there right now to preserve some vestige of the window. S. Makowka suggested they explore the possibility of shortening the window, to accommodate a counter, and keeping it in there with shelving on either side which would allow more light. He also stressed that if approved, siding replacement must be done in a way that blends the repair into to existing siding as much possible. The applicant confirmed that they will not be using small sections siding, using instead long strips from back corner to the window so it matches as much as possible. B. Cohen moved the Commission, having reviewed the application, approve the removal of rear side window with the stipulation that the siding be installed to blend as much as possible and that the applicant have the option of retaining the window while moving it closer to rear and reducing its sizes with the final configuration of such approach to be approved by the monitor prior to installation. Seconded by A. Frisch, approved unanimously. Monitor appointed B. Cohen. S. Makowka noted for the record that the subject window is a replacement window and that the trim was previously removed.

b. Formal Hearing re: 54 Academy Street (Davis) re: window replacement. Josh Davis, owner presented plans to replace windows. He stated: general contractor put into writing his advice that windows be replaced – email dated 5/25 enclosed in package given with application. Replacement windows would be identical in appearance, design and material to existing windows. He also included Marvin Windows specifications – the windows being the same quality as the casement windows previously approved by HDC for the enclosure of the porch. The four windows they want to replace are 4 large double hung which are in deteriorated condition. The windows currently have storms in front of them. Want to make front appearance from Academy Street as pleasing as possible. The casement windows approved 18 months ago are shown in the pictures included with the application. Applicant read email from contractor re: replacement of 4 windows. End result is that it will make house more attractive. Windows same as existing and would be congruous and harmonius with windows in District.

J. Worden asked if they looked in to restoration of windows instead of replacement. Applicant said he trusts contractor and believes that contractor's recommendation to replace is what he would be comfortable with doing. J. Worden asked if they talked to window restoration company and indicated that he would like them to do so before he would be willing to approve replacement of windows. The applicant said his contractor does window renovations and the windows proposed are of the quality of the windows approved previously by the HDC. He stated that the windows jam, are deteriorated, and have water damage. J. Worden asked if the proposed replacement windows are true divided light. Answer: Not true divided light and thus, according to Commission guidelines, not replacement with like or "matching" materials which would be excluded from commission review. J. Worden said the porch conditions are not the same as the rest of house. S. Makowka said guidelines say our preference is for restoration, not replacement, and although the proposed windows as described are consistent with guidelines if replacement is allowed, the hurdle is still whether restoration should not be the first avenue of thought. We do not have evidence that restoration is not a viable alternative. B. Cohen pointed out that the products description on page 37.3 Part 2 of the submitted materials indicated aluminum cladding which is inconsistent with the guidelines. To avoid confusion, the Applicant indicated he would be happy to stipulate that they would use a non-clad version of the windows proposed. D. Baldwin commented that the contractor indicated the windows would be 6 over 2 in the email, but wanted to be sure the proposal was to replicate the existing 8 over 2 configuration. The applicant agreed that 8 over 2 is correct. S. Makowka disagreed with statement in the application that this is a non-contributing structure – made it clear that nowhere was that finding in the final Town Meeting Report and he wants the record to be clear. S. Makowka asked if applicant has considered like-with-like replacement, such as the sashes for new true divided light Boston Style window sashes, which has been approved by the Commission under a Certificate of Non-Applicability in the past. D. Levy asked if he doesn't like the storm windows and will he be replacing other windows. Applicant said removing storms felt more compelling tonight because they just finished painting the house. Feel this helps maintain the symmetry of windows and porch. B. Cohen commented that this house originally had storms and that we have no jurisdiction over storms. She also finds it hard to believe windows are so deteriorated that they cannot be rehabilitated. The section in the product description about aluminum cladding bothers her. S. Makowka noted that while storm windows may block view of windows, the replacement windows as proposed have full charcoal gray screens which are going to cover the window and create a visual separation of windows from street. B. Cohen said on pg 37.4 of the specifications (g) choice of half or full screen – charcoal fiberglass but you can put in aluminum wire, bright bronze, aluminum frame which comes in brown, evergreen, pebble gray, stone white, Optional of charcoal high transparency screen mesh. A. Frisch asked what condition are casings – applicant said loose and splintered also locks are broken but that's easy fix.

Comment from audience: B. Labau asked about the design of the proposed windows. Answer, they are replacing the existing window by inserting a new unit with a wooden frame with whole suspension mechanism that fits inside. The commission noted that this approach alters the dimensions of the window since you lose at least " all around. B. Labau commented that there is another type that Marvin makes where you just replace the sash. This "sash pack" or "tilt pack" is what his house has currently.

D. Levy said he worries about setting a precedent about approving these windows. Applicant indicated that he would be happy to stipulate no aluminum showing. Applicant is focused on thinking about the replacement of these windows – decision they can make as property owners with respect of house. Based on contractor's suggestions and their sense of things this appears to fall under ordinary maintenance as described in section 9 of the statute. The Commission stressed that the reality is that this is a change of existing conditions and not simply replacement with like materials. For example, the proposed windows are not true divided lights, they are double glazed. Boston true divided light windows would fit within that criteria, but these would not qualify. B. Cohen suggested that the applicant provide evidence to demonstrate that these windows have completely failed noting that, from the pictures provided, these windows don't look terrible. She wants to see more evidence. S. Makowka offered to continue the hearing to allow the applicant to gather more supporting evidence from a source specializing in window restoration regarding the condition of the existing windows. The applicant said from what he has read from section 9 he thinks what is proposed falls in section 9, that he would hope Commission would consider evidence to be put in front of it, and that he brought best he could. J. Worden said the Commission's preference is for restoration for existing windows but if it is demonstrated that restoration can't be done then a replacement as nearly as similar as possible may be considered, however that authority doesn't apply under ordinary replacements. B. Cohen said if replacing with Boston-type sash she would agree with applicant, but in this case the proposal is not to put in an identical sash which is how she's always interpreted that part of the statute and is consistent with the past practice of Commission on other cases. S. Makowka indicated that the choice of an continuation of the hearing or a vote now was up to the applicant. The applicant indicated he preferred a vote. T. Smurzynski moves for approval of the application with stipulation that there be no aluminum clad or framing and that the window have a low transparency screen, seconded by B. Cohen for discussion purposes. D. Levy repeated that's it's an appropriate replacement window but Commission needs to decide whether a functioning window should be replaced so he doesn't see how we would allow this unless this is direction Commission wants to go. B. Cohen reiterated that she doesn't have enough evidence windows are deteriorated and it would not be possible to repair the windows. A roll call vote was taken: J. Worden – no, A. Frisch - no, D. Levy - no, M. Kramer no, T. Smurzynski – yes, B. Cohen - no, D. Baldwin - abstained. The motion was denied. S. Makowka indicated that the denial would be effective on filing with the Town Clerk. Copies of the filing would be mailed at same time to the applicant.

c. Formal Hearing re: 204 Pleasant Street (Sirah) re: Carport and Exterior Renovations. Home owner's architect described second phase of ongoing series of projects to restore structure from 3 family apartment building to single family. This phase involves 2 components: (1) removal of non-original carport structure and (2) removal of staircase to former 2nd floor apartment currently located on front facade. Project would include removal of aluminum siding, extensive repair of trim, etc. hidden behind aluminum. The original structure has a steep access drive with sharp turn into current attached garage. The proposed revision to site plan entails construction of a detached garage which is fully separated from existing house but connected by a breezeway. Allows for easier passage of autos – ice is a problem in winter. There is a shared driveway – the property line bisects right of way in middle. He indicated that there are some elevations of before and after proposal contained in the materials provided to the Commission. There is one original window, but most are replacement windows from various time periods. The proposal to separate garage, making building lower and subservient to primary structure. They are also exploring small section of stone cladding on main structure where stairs are currently located to articulate entrance – the idea is to wrap thru to side breezeway passage. The idea for doors on the back of garage facing toward pond comes from client's desire to recall or replicate a barn door opening. They want to remove siding, rake, plywood, make something nice on front of house. Wants to keep with industrial nature of this property which was for ice harvesting. J. Worden asked for rationale for putting stone on what was an originally wood building. Applicant said lots of granite foundation work, this recalls that work – more rustic and industrial nature. J. Worden says he thinks you're going to have a problem with the stone wall. S. Makowka said what you're hearing is that the original structure adding new elements seems incongruous. The Commission doesn't see the context for that (cladding) – but is okay to bring attention to the fact that it's an entrance way but need to consider a rustic farm/barn vernacular. B. Cohen said stone cladding on the side isn't visible from street but is from Spy Pond and that the applicant might want to explore what else you can do. S. Makowka noted that the proposed cupola on new building seems to be as big as the one on the existing structure. If you're trying to downplay the new structure you're not accomplishing this with this oversized cupola. Need to explore changing scale, the proposed design does way too much and is counter to expressed desire of not drawing away from main house. B. Cohen noted that this is a very contemporary vision, understanding you're trying to work with something that's been muddled with so much. S. Makowka noted from site visits that currently from the street you get peeks down to Spy Pond to right of existing garage structure. It seems that this proposed wider structure built away from the main structure will cut off view down to Pond from Pleasant Street. The architect noted that the separation from the house would create a 5 foot view to water. S. Makowka asked if they would consider 2 bay instead of 3 bay garage to maintain view of water. A. Frisch asked them to rethink the stone work. There was a conceptual discussion with applicant for what kind of material might also work including options such as board and batten, Greek Revival vocabulary with matchboards, etc. B. Cohen stated that what is being proposed is very contemporary and that might be OK but it's really hard for her to envision. S. Makowka said notes on the plans referred to spec sheets but they weren't included in the application packet other than a piece of literature referring to windows. Applicant noted that some windows were replaced by previous owner – S. Makowka said be consistent with design guidelines in specing new windows. J. Worden said re: subsidiary garage building with cupola – it would be more typical for subsidiary building would be set back relative to main building. The architect stated that they can't push garage back because then the driveway slopes down further and would be too low for access way to house. B. Cohen said she doesn't have a problem with proposed configuration which is basically a shed next to a barn. The architect stated that the

introduction of copper roof and farmers porch designed to add depth back to it while maintaining 5'8" space between two structures. A. Frisch asked if we should be concerned about loss of view of lake. D. Levy concerned and more in favor of 2 car garage with maybe a open carport on end so it's not as heavy. A lot of places to park cars. He thinks cupola is also too big – needs to be lower. B. Cohen concerned with metal roof – maybe way it shows up on drawing makes it look as big long fat strip but looking at it from the higher elevation of Pleasant street might be worse.

Architect suggested that they could superimpose computer models to show that. D. Levy said visual representation would be important. J. Worden said what if you had 2 bay garage and carport he might be happier also. Continuation until next month approved by applicant.

d. Formal Hearing re: 6 Jason Street (Clearwire Wireless Broadband) re: antenna installation The applicant explained that Clear Wireless is proposing new plans that differ significantly from the original submitted to the MHC. In particular, there are no faux chimneys on new plans. In the alternate design now contained in the application the proposed telecommunication devices will be attached to existing elevator penthouse and chimney on top of building. Two panel antennas will be attached to the existing chimney which will be flush mounted and painted to match the chimney (either brick pattern or solid color per Commission preference). Another antenna will be attached to the elevator penthouse as well as two dishes, these would be painted to match existing colors on elevator penthouse. Antenna panels are 42" tall, close mounted to actual chimney and painted to match where mounted. Panel is 4" deep and 6" from chimney to allow for mounting. Top is 69"3" tall. Applicant would agree to install antennas so that they did not extend above existing structures. Also, 1 equipment cabinet will need to go on roof top. This will be mounted to existing stairwell penthouse and that will screen it from Mass. Ave., corner of Jason and east on Mass Ave towards downtown Arlington. Cabinet measures 54" in height and installed 6" give or take from existing roof to allow for maintenance.

S. Makowka asked for audience questions: Is anything taller than what's already there? Answer is no – nothing will be extended above what's there. Also the proposed dishes are 2' in diameter. An abutter noted that they are enraged that this kind of installation is even being considered. Especially located across the street from the Jason Russell House, this is especially inappropriate in her opinion. It was noted that people will be able to see it when trees are bare.

S. Makowka agreed that the original design with proposed new "faux" chimneys was totally out of context with site but noted that the revised plans are a huge move in right direction. In response to an abutter's question, applicant explained that Clearwire provides highband internet services and this is not Verizon or AT&T and that Clearwire currently has no coverage in the Town of Arlington. He noted that the 1 antenna on the penthouse would be most visible because it protrudes out somewhat. S. Makowka asked about dotted lines shown on side of building in plans but applicant clarified that they were internal conduits – there would not be any external conduits. S. Makowka asked for clarification of who is the applicant here noting that the application signed by Clearwire LLC. He noted that the Commission issues certificates to property owners or parties authorized to work on behalf of property owners. He indicated that Clearwire will need to provide letter from the owner of building indicating their authorization of Clearwire.

Abutter asked why we allow these antennas in a district. D. Levy feels personally that this is a very modern structure and what is proposed is ok, if they were asking to do it on top of the Jason Russell House he would object. This proposal is as sensitive as it could be an still achieving the goals of the petitioner. To be clear, the decision would be different if it were a historically significant structure. The abutters noted that this decreases the view from the road. S. Makowka says there are non-contributing structures in the Districts and this is one of them – we try to accommodate the needs of property owners within the context of meeting our preservation obligations under the law. B. Cohen added that she wrote the property descriptions for the Jason/Gray district and that this is a non-contributing structure. Further, this won't adversely change the appearance of the building. D. Levy said he does understand the abutter's perspective, but he doesn't agree. There were probably television antennas covering building when it was built – it has plumbing vents, elevator tower, bunch of things on roof already, this is a small thing, back from parapet to minimize view. You really won't see this from down below. S. Makowka asked what happens if Clearwire goes out of business? Applicant stated that it is typical that a removal bond would be posted with Town for amount cost to remove equipment from roof. B. Cohen moved approval of application as submitted in application with accompanying documentation presented at 5/27/10 meeting with contingency that removal bond be held by the Town, that the devices be painted a solid color to match area of installation with color approval by monitor prior to installation, seconded by D. Levy. Approved by a vote of 5-2 with negative votes by J. Worden and D. Baldwin. Monitor appointed B. Cohen.

e. Informal Hearing re: 20 Jason Street (Khan and Gianotti). Presenters are new owners of property on Jason Street and have several questions about possible work on their house. First, can we install window guards? Answer, we typically have no jurisdiction over interior installation and window guards would be considered temporary in any case. Next, re: concrete driveway, can we possible to expand in back? Answer: if you don't change grade we have no jurisdiction. J. Worden said to look into town bylaws about increasing impervious material in a lot. Next, how about repair of cracks in foundation? Answer: this is repair and replacement only don't need hearing. Next, re: backyard fence – can we enclose the back yard? Answer: a fence behind the front façade of the house is not under our jurisdiction. For these items just file an application for a CONA with us, there is no need for a formal hearing.

What about a small retaining wall in the front yard along the sidewalk? The Commission expressed some concern about this proposal and suggested the applicant rethink the need for this. Finally, re: kitchen windows on rear?
Answer: if not visible from public way then not under our jurisdiction.

5. Other Business

a. M. Kramer notified the Commission that she is in the process of selling her home and moving outside of Arlington and will thus be resigning. S. Makowka expressed the Commission's appreciation of Ms. Kramer's contributions and wished her well in her future historic preservation activities in her new home over the border in Cambridge. S. Makowka also recognized audience member Brian Labau who has previously expressed interest in joining the Commission.

b. S. Makowka noted that he had circulated a draft fee schedule for discussion purposes. Several Commissioners noted that it appeared to be too complex and others suggested that nothing be implemented that would discourage timely submission of applications especially for smaller projects. B. Cohen agreed to revise draft schedule and re-circulate for discussion at a later meeting.

c. D. Baldwin agreed to review current window guidelines and propose what revisions, if any, might further clarify the Commission's standards for evaluation of proposed replacements.

d. S. Makowka noted that he was passing on a lengthy list of completed projects to C. Greeley.

7. Old Business

- a. Preservation Loan Program Update – J. Worden reported APF has received an application
- b. Outreach to Neighborhoods & Realtors -
- c. Status of New Commissioners – S. Makowka

6. REVIEW OF PROJECTS

1. 11 Westmoreland Avenue (Caruso 01-12M) 6/02 – Cohen-COA
2. 79 Crescent Hill (Moore, 04-5G) – Cohen-CONA
3. 19 Westmoreland Ave. (Munro, 04-23M) – Potter-CONA
4. 75 Westminster Ave. (Dressler, 05-06M) – Makowka – COA
5. 175 Lowell Street (Erickson for Hill, 05-07M) – Cohen – COA
6. 15 Montague Street (Barkans, 05-08M) – Cohen – CONA
7. 105 Westminster Ave. (Origo – 05-27M) – Cohen – COA
8. 118 Westminster Ave. (Stansbury – 06-02M) – Frisch – COA
9. 197 Lowell Street (Svencer – 06-13M) – Makowka – COA - REMOVE
10. 203 Lowell Street (Salocks & Stafford – 06-20M) – Potter – COA
11. 123 Westminster Ave. (Urgotis – 06-26M) – Makowka – CONA (Front Steps)
12. 99 Westminster Ave. (Doctrow – 06-43M) – Cohen - COA (Porch) - REMOVE
13. 12 Russell Terrace (Caritas – 07-09R) – Makowka – CONA (Temporary Fence)
14. 16 Maple St. (Rogers – 07-11P) – Makowka – CONA (Deck)
15. 24 Irving St. (Kelly – 07-14P) – Makowka – CONA (Windows, Sills, Porch & Balcony)
16. 46 Westminster Ave. (Surratt – 07-15M) – Makowka – CONA (Porch Repair) - REMOVE
17. 152b Pleasant St. (Cury – 07-16P) – Worden – COA (Fence)
18. 72 Westminster Ave. (Coleman – 07-19M) – Makowka – COA (Windows) - REMOVE
19. 10 Montague St. (Jirak – 07-20M) – Makowka – CONA (Fence Replacement)
20. 157 Lowell St. (Stevens – 07-21M) – Makowka – CONA (Porch) - REMOVE
21. 3 Westmoreland Ave. (Canty – 07-23M) – Makowka – CONA (Roof & Light)
22. 182 Westminster Ave. (Meikle – 07-24M) – Makowka – CONA (Roof, Doors, Windows) - REMOVE
23. 72 Crescent Hill Ave. (Lamont – 07-30M) – Cohen – COA (Window, Structure Removals) - REMOVE
24. 50 Pleasant St. (Town of Arl – 07-32P) – Makowka – COA (Wood Gutters & Fascia)
25. 20 3 Westmoreland Ave. (Canty & Eng – 07-35M) – Makowka - COA (Fence) - REMOVE
26. 36 Jason Street (Smith – 07-37P) – Makowka – CONA (Wood Fascia & Shingles)
27. 151 Lowell Street (Wyman – 07-40M) – Logan – COA (Garage)
28. 246 Pleasant St. (Eykamp – 07-48P) – Makowka – CONA (Windows)
29. 40 Westminster Ave. (Fairfield – 07-49M) – Makowka – CONA (Siding, Door, Windows, Trim and Chimney – matching materials) - REMOVE
30. 149 Pleasant St. (Alberto – 07-53P) – Penzenik – COA (Porch Windows)
31. 26-28 Jason St. (Angelakis – 07-54J) – Cohen – COA (Garage, Wall)
32. 23 Maple St. (Town of Arl. – 07-55P) – Makowka – COA (Trim, Siding, Vestibule, Windows)
33. 170 Pleasant St. (Gillis/Kelly – 07-56P) – Cohen – COA (Basement Windows)
34. 188 Pleasant St. (Snyder – 07-58P) – Frisch – COA (Fence & Porch Gate)
35. 754 Mass. Ave. (Vorlicek – 07-59J) – Makowka – 10 Day COA (Windows)
36. 72 Westminster Ave. (Colman – 08-01M) – Cohen – COA (Front Porch)

37. 106 Westminster Ave. (Bergeron – 08-03M) – Makowka – CONA (Windows) - REMOVE
38. 54 Jason Street (Zaphiris – 08-7P) – Makowka – CONA (Front Stairs, Step & Landing)
39. 34 Jason Street (Szymanski – 08-09P) – Makowka – CONA (Deck on Rear)
40. 160 Westminster Ave. (Jackson – 08-11M) – Hindmarsh - COA (Rear Addition on House) - REMOVE
41. 26 Academy Street (Wright – 08-19P) – Cohen - COA (Deck, Landscaping)
42. 274-276 Broadway (Galvin -08-20B) – Makowka - CONA (Gutters, Roof)
43. 9 Westminster Ave. (Covenant Church – 08-21M) – Makowka - CONA (Roof) - REMOVE
44. 75 Pleasant Street (Congregational Church – 08-30P) – Makowka – COA (Stairway, Deck, Door)
45. 754 Mass. Ave. (Vorlicek – 08-31J) – Worden – COA (Handicap Lift, Stairs, Entry, Door)
46. 193 Westminster Ave. (Pemsler – 08-33M) – Cohen – COA (porch, siding removal, stairs)
47. 175 Pleasant Street (Lucchese – 08-34P) – Penzenik – COA (fence)
48. 204-206 Pleasant St. (English – 08-35P) – Penzenik – COA (windows, doorway, siding removal)
49. 14-16 Prescott St. (Bouboulis – 08-36P) – Frisch – COA (siding removal, clapboard repair)
50. 3 Westmoreland Ave. (Canty/Eng – 08-39M) – Logan – COA (ac vent, screening)
51. 87 Pleasant St. (Calvert - 08-40P) – Makowka – CONA (porch deck & railings)
52. 21-23 Central St. (Mitchell/Dyer – 08-44C) – Frisch - COA (rear addition, stair, landing, roof)
53. 393-395 Mass. Ave. (Barkan – 08-45B) – Frisch - 10 Day COA (Shutters)
54. 81 Westminster Ave. (Lemire – 08-46M) – Penzenik – COA (Porch & Railings)
55. 147 Lowell Street (Nyberg – 08-47M) – Smurzynski – COA (Siding Removal & Repair)
56. 14 Westmoreland Ave. (Leveille – 08-48M) – Makowka – CONA (Retaining Wall)
57. 25 Avon Place (Smith – 09-02A) – Cohen – COA (Solar Panels)
58. 187 Pleasant Street (Fox – 09-03P) – Levy – COA (Window Removal, Rear Addition)
59. 30 Jason Street (Mallio – 09-04J) – Makowka – CONA (Window Replacement)
60. 28 Academy Street (Rehrig – 09-05P) – Makowka – COA (Chimney, Porch, AC Units, Door)
61. 81 Westminster Ave. (Lemire – 09-06M) – Makowka – CONA (Windows)
62. 187 Lowell Street (JK Construction – 09-07) – Cohen/Makowka – COA (New House, Old House)
63. 184 Westminster Ave. (Kahn – 09-10M) – Makowka – COA (Roof)
64. 215 Pleasant Street (Gruber – 09-11P – Levy – COA (Shed)
65. 160 Westminster Ave. (Jackson – 09-12M) – Hindmarsh – COA (Addition Revision)
66. 156 Westminster Ave. (LaFleur/Ehlert – 09-13M) – Makowka – CONA (Driveway, Steps, Landing)
67. 7 Westmoreland Ave. (Levy – 09-16M) – Makowka – COA (Wall, Driveway, Fence) - REMOVE
68. 3 Westmoreland Ave. (Canty/Eng – 09-17M) – Makowka – CONA (Driveway)
69. 179 Westminster (Cerundolo – 09-20M) – Cohen – COA (Porch, Trim, Siding Removal)
70. 187 Lowell (JK Construction – 09-21M) – Cohen/Makowka - COA (New House)
71. 203 Lowell Street (Salocks/Stafford – 09-22M) – Makowka – COA (Addition)
72. 37 Jason Street (Lees – 09-24J) – Cohen – COA (Deck)
73. 74 Pleasant Street (St Johns – 09-25P) – Worden – COA (Sign & lighting)
74. 86 Pleasant Street (Coyner – 09-26P) – Makowka – 10 Day COA (shutters)
75. 22 Montague Street (Sparks – 09-27M) – Makowka – 10 Day COA (Porch Repairs) - REMOVE
76. 16 Central Street (Piechota -09-28C) – Makowka – CONA (Roof)
77. 3 Westmoreland Ave. (Eng/Canty – 09-30M) – Makowka – CONA (fence)
78. 79 Crescent Hill Ave. (Diaz – 09-31M) – Makowka – COA (door removal, stoop, window)
79. 79 Crescent Hill Ave. (Diaz – 09-32M) – Makowka – CONA (Rear Window) - REMOVE
80. 135 Pleasant Street (Doona & Irvington Trustees – 09-34P) – Makowka – 10 Day COA (Door)
81. 54 Westminster Ave. (Selig – 09-35M) – Makowka – 10 Day COA (Roof Overhang) - REMOVE
82. 35 Central Street (Budne – 09-38C) – Makowka – CONA (Porch-Chimney-Cap)
83. 204 Pleasant Street (Sirah RT – 09-39P) – Penzenik – COA (Rear Façade Changes)
84. 82 Westminster Ave. (Ivers – 09-40M) – Makowka & Cohen – COA (New House Construction)
85. 147 Lowell Street (Nyberg – 09-41M) – Smurzynski – COA (Deck)
86. 23 Jason Street (Leary – 09-42J) – Makowka – CONA (Roof)
87. 50 Academy Street (Barrett – 09-43C) – Makowka – CONA (Chimney, Shutters, Gutters, Facia)
88. 148-152 Pleasant Street (White – 09-44P) – Makowka – CONA (Clapboard Siding Repair)
89. 14 Avon Place (Harding – 09-45A) – Makowka – CONA (Back Door, Stairs, Bulkhead)
90. 10 Montague Street (Jirak – 09-46M) – Makowka – CONA (Garage Deck Demolition)
91. 18 Central Street (Berlinski – 09-47C) – Makowka – CONA (Roof)
92. 17 Russell Street (Makowka – 09-48R) – Cohen – COA (Front Door Window)
93. 14 Avon Place (Harding – 09-49A) – Cohen – CONA (Windows)
94. 14 Avon Place (Harding – 09-50A) – Cohen – COA (Deck, Stairs, Railings, Doors)
95. 15A Avon Place (Burke – 10-01A) – Makowka – CONA (Gutters, Downspouts, Soffits, Porch, Facias, Windows)
96. 14 Avon Place (Harding – 10-02A) – Cohen – COA (Windows)
97. 109 Westminster Ave. (Rines/Pascale – 10-03M) – Kramer – COA (Porch)
98. 15A Avon Place (Burke – 10-04A) – Frisch – COA (Windows)
99. 88 Westminster Ave. (Ryan – 10-05M) – Makowka – CONA (Windows on Rear of House)
100. 174 Westminster Ave. (Landwehr/Szaraz – 10-06M) – Makowka – CONA (Wood Window Repair)
101. 10 Montague Street (Jirak – 10-07M) – Frisch – COA (Railings)
102. 7 Central Street (7 Central Rlty Tr – 10-08C) – Cohen – COA (Sign)

103. 174 Westminster Ave. (Bush/Sheldon – 10-09M) – Makowka – CONA (Gutters)
104. 100 Pleasant Street (Shiffman – 10-10P) – Makowka - CONA (Roof)
105. 45 Jason Street (Hamilton – 10-10J) – Makowka – CONA (Roof)
106. 187 Pleasant Street (Fox – 10-11P) – Makowka – CONA (Gutters, Siding, Woodwork, Trim)
107. 38 Russell Street (Mishkin – 10-12R) – Kramer – COA (AC Compressor)
108. 23 Maple Street (Town of Arl. – 10-13P) – Makowka – CONA (Door)
109. 17 Russell Street (Makowka/Spring – 10-14R) – Frisch – COA (Railing)
110. 215 Pleasant Street (Gruber – 10-15P) – Penzenik – COA (Garage Door)
111. 187 Lowell Street (J&K Construction – 10-16M) – Makowka-Cohen – COA (Ext. of Old Certif)
112. 38 Russell St. (Mishkin – 10-17R) – Kramer – COA (Windows)
113. 159 Pleasant Street (Krepelka – 10-18P) – Makowka – CONA (Gutters)
114. 15 Russell St (Wang - 10-19R) – Cohen – CONA (Roof)

Meeting Adjourned 11:03pm

Carol Greeley

Executive Secretary

cc: HDC Commissioners

Arlington Historical Commission, JoAnn Robinson and Richard Duffy, Co-Chairs

Building Inspector, Mr. Michael Byrne

Building Dept., Richard Vallarelli

Planning Dept. and Redevelopment Board, Ms. Carol Kowalski

Massachusetts Historical Commission

Town Clerk

Robbins Library

MIS Department