



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

webmaster@town.arlington.ma.us

Minutes 01/22/2009

Commissioners Present: J. Worden, A. Frisch, M. Kramer, T. Smurzynski, B. Cohen, D. Levy, S. Makowka, M. Logan, M. Penzenik (arrived 8:20pm)

Commissioners Not Present: M. Hope Berkowitz, M. Potter

Guests: W. Dillon, J. McGough, S. Stafford, J. Salocks, M Dempsey, L. Urgotis, R. Botterio, R. Goldstein, J. Nyberg, A. Sparks, C. Marsh, M. Brooks, C. Lockery, C. Reitzel, N. Svencer, S. Svencer, L. Carlson Hill, G. Hill, J Mackey, W. Rowland

1. **AHDC Meeting Opens** 8:00pm
2. **Appointment of alternate commissioners:** D. Levy, (JG, AP), B. Cohen, (JG, AP, MG), A. Frisch (JG, AP, MG), M. Logan (JG, MG); appoint T. Smurzynski (MG for purpose of 187 Lowell Street hearing, JG for 754 Mass Ave hearing)
3. **Approval of minutes from November 20, 2008.** Motion to approve by B. Cohen, seconded by J. Worden, approved unanimously.
4. **Communications**
 - a. T. Smurzynski attended seminar for Certified Local Governments. Gave brief update on program. Coordinate with AHC for joint meeting and invite Kevin O'Brien from Planning Dept. to discuss program options.
 - b. We received request for a court stenographer to attend 187 Lowell Street hearing and take notes.
 - c. Communication from 82 Westminster for chimney restoration finalization – S. Makowka asked for commission to extend vote for certificate 04-29M for period of 12 months from today's meeting. Seconded by J. Worden voted unanimously
5. **New Business**
 - a. Continuation of Formal Hearing re: 82 Westminster Ave. (Applicant withdrew application)
 - b. Continuation of formal Hearing re: 754 Mass. Ave. (Vorlicek) for installation of signs at two locations. A. Vorlicek present and gave site plan asking permission to erect 2 signs –(1) at location of former sign (only posts remain) on Mass Ave side, and (2) 2nd sign would be on Jason St. side, visible as you go down Jason Street towards Mass. Ave. The second sign would be smaller than first but identical content and colors. Both signs are in excess of 8 sf.

S. Makowka noted for record M. Penzenik will be recusing herself from this hearing -- T. Smurzynski appointed as alternate for this hearing.

Applicant explained that Mass Ave sign would be 48" wide plus posts totals 56". Also he had received feedback from Kevin O'Brien, Planning Director, that he would recommend to Redevelopment Board that the location of 2nd sign should be closer to walkway than portrayed in the application. B. Cohen said she had no problem with Mass. Ave. sign, one was there before, but was concerned that same sign near Jason Street entrance might be confusing to patrons. S. Makowka suggested that Commission focus on question of whether the second sign is overly obtrusive.

S. Makowka said he has no issue with 2nd sign, but stated that Jason Street neighbors might appreciate no light directed on that sign. B. Cohen suggested that there existed sufficient lighting on Mass. Ave. at this location, making lighting on that sign unnecessary. J. Worden asked about status of elevator project [previously approved by Commission] – Applicant explained that he has until May to complete (per AAB-Architectural Access Board) and will contact us once he's ready to start. No comments from audience.

J. Worden moved approval of that the following work: installation of a replacement sign on the Massachusetts Avenue side and a new sign on the Jason Street side subject to the additional conditions that the Jason Street sign be as close a possible to parking area edge and neither sign be illuminated, which has been deemed not to have an incongruous effect on the historic aspects or architectural character of the building or district. Motion seconded by B. Cohen. No discussion. All voted in favor. J. Worden to continue as monitor for this property.

c. Formal hearing re: 25 Avon Place (Smith). S. Makowka read from statute (40c) that Commission required to consider Commonwealth's policy to promote solar energy access as part of their deliberations. Applicant S. Smith gave presentation. Solar panels to be installed on portion of roof not visible from front view of house, but are somewhat visible from Minuteman Trail especially during colder months. Applicant stated that the proposed project does little to affect historic integrity of house and so asks for approval.

Applicant further explained that the proposed panels would be installed flush to roof face, only raised 3-4", and set back about a foot from edges of roof. Will look similar to picture shown of other installation with the difference here being that the design covers roof face from top to bottom, but only covers only half from front to back. He presented a rough plot plan from installer showing shape and orientation of house, explaining that site has to be evaluated for participation in incentive program based on orientation and shading and this qualifies. S. Makowka asked about existing shingle material – Answer: shingles are asphalt. Also, the edges of the panels are black and panels are glass with black silicone, and no changes are needed to roof structure (dormers etc.) because this is simple flat plane.

M. Penzenik asked about effectiveness of system with panels being flush to roof and not elevated at all. Answer: – given orientation on globe, the latitude of Boston, the ideal orientation is something like 37 degrees; this is 33 or very close to that. S. Makowka commented that our jurisdiction doesn't have any concern over effectiveness of the panels. M. Penzenik asked if the applicant had considered alternate solar roofing membrane that is very thin. Her position is that the choice of technologies needs to be looked in to a bit further since she feels that this house is very prominent on Bike Path and solar cells should be as discreet as possible. The applicant responded that this is the technology approved under the MTC (Mass. Technology Collaborative) program being used. B. Cohen asked about how it is fastened to roof. Answer: Low profile racking system that goes into the rafters. Panels would be on front edge of roof. S. Makowka suggested setting panels back from the front edge to limit visibility.

Comments from audience – R. Botterio asked if this is 1st time house in a district has asked for solar panels. S. Makowka responded that yes it is the first such application in recent years and he cautioned Commissioners that this will set a precedent for future applications. B. Cohen said like storm windows and storm doors, which are specifically excluded, this installation is relatively reversible. M. Penzenik said storm windows and doors don't have same type of presence, but feels we should look at another product that might be less intrusive. S. Makowka noted that he did research; both Cambridge and Brookline have allowed solar panels in historic districts, subject to a number of criteria including whether features were being altered, visibility, etc. B. Cohen said New England did not have a lot of solar, but there is some precedent for 19th century solar systems. A. Frisch feels that as long as it's not hitting you in the face, we ought to give some slack to solar panels. J. Worden asked if this is clear of chimney. Answer: The chimney is not affected.

R. Botterio asked about satellite dishes on buildings in districts. Point is all kinds of technical changes coming in to our lives.

J. Worden moved that the installation per the application of solar panels subject to the condition that the array be placed at least 6 feet back from front edge of roof on Avon Place, would be sufficiently unobtrusive such as to be deemed not to have an incongruous effect on the historic aspects or architectural character of the building. Seconded by B. Cohen for discussion purposes. M. Penzenik said that you don't want the array pushed so far back it moves in to the shade – it's located where it needs to be for maximum sun exposure. S. Makowka suggested that the setback could be determined by the monitor instead of specifying fixed setback. J. Worden said proposed change would be acceptable, S. Makowka suggested that the Commission consider adding a clarifying comment and amendment to the effect that as a first of its kind approval of solar panels, that this approval be considered a test to allow better understanding of impact and should not be considered precedent for all future applications. B. Cohen moved that the motion be amended to allow setback distance to be determined by monitor in concert with applicant and to include S. Makowka's language. Seconded by A. Frisch. All voted favor of amendment. Vote on amended motion: M. Penzenik voted against, all others voted in favor. Monitor appointed: B. Cohen.

d. Formal hearing re: 187 Lowell Street (JK Construction) for construction of 2 new houses. S. Makowka opened hearing with statement that there were a lot of issues to consider and rather than doing it piecemeal and moving all over the board, he would like to start with overall presentation of what's being proposed by applicants and a brief description of materials received in relation to proposal. Then he would like the first part of the discussion to address the question: Is it appropriate to build any structure at all on this site? He suggested that the Commission needed to

hear the justification for building on this site from applicant. Then as a second order of business, he would like to move to a discussion of the proposed massing, etc. of the proposed houses in the context of the site – that is, is the proposal appropriate or inappropriate given the design and the characteristics of the site. He suggested that the Commission might have to adjourn this hearing at that point and consider additional aspects such as the design details of the structures at our next hearing due to time limits and the number of items on our agenda.

William Dillon, attorney from Goulston & Storrs, representing developer. Robert Botterio, designer, Will Rowland, architect, and J. Mackey, owner also present. Atty. Dillon summarized that Applicant has first appeared before the Commission in June and again in August on informal basis. Prior to filing the application in mid- December, Applicant had reached out to neighbors and has not received any interest in meeting independently but is happy to meet with them. They are here tonight requesting a certificate of appropriateness. In terms of background, Atty. Dillon stated that the question has come up in past about density of site. In past, the developer had proposed a denser site consisting of a five lot subdivision. They met informally with the Commission in June to get a sense of whether 3 lots was a viable alternative and they have been working on that. He continued that the concept behind the design of three houses was inspired by the idea that the existing house should remain the focal point of site and the houses were designed in all those respects. The new houses were designed to be as subsidiary as possible with minimum floor area consistent with conditions that made development of the site feasible. The design element on the building to right of the existing house is intended to be reminiscent of a barnlike structure – they used the Arlington Coal & Lumber building to influence design. The distance of the new structure to the existing house would be something that might be typical of the relative location of barn building and main house if originally constructed. House on left is plainer and meant to be the sort of house that reflects a house that other members of family would have lived in – less ornate, lower in profile, set back, and the lot lines provide for that.

S. Makowka asked if any of neighbors in attendance have seen copies of plans. Answer: no they had not. S. Makowka asked that a copy of the plans be circulated to those in attendance and offered to let audience members stand behind Commission to get a better view of presentation.

R. Botterio began a description of the proposal. He presented a model showing proposed houses and existing structures. Mr. Makowka asked that he provide an overview and then answer the first question about why the project at this site -- given the past discussions we have had about this point -- why it might be appropriate in a District to have additional structures built with the predicate that in other examples of new constructions there has typically existed a separate buildable lot that was noted at the time of development or on a site of a previous structure.

R. Botterio answered -- This is different than all others since this the first time that it is a being proposed to build two new houses on large piece of land that has not already been developed. The history of Town is the Town came from 1700s to 1800s to the 1900s and continues to grow and this is a property that is available to expand additional buildings. The only way other buildings should be built is if they look like they belong or might have belonged. It's hard to convince someone who goes by there and sees more structures that they have been there for years past.

Said he had been involved in 4 structures put in Historic Districts – one on Lowell street and another that is going to be built on Lowell Street where, as said, conditions and circumstances were different; a Russell Street carriage house that was not there prior [an antique building moved from area of St. Agnes rectory]; and a brand new house on Pleasant street put on a lot where there was no building – one was moved as to that the property and an addition was put on..

B. Cohen corrected that statement with regard to Pleasant St., an existing ranch house was demolished on that lot and an historic house was moved from Broadway to its current location on Pleasant Street. R. Botterio suggested that he turn to a discussion of why the proposed design works for of this property. S. Makowka noted for the record receipt of communications from the Arlington Land Trust which stated that 187 is one of few remaining large historic residential properties and they ask the HDC to fully protect the site's integrity – it's a prominent house and the surrounding landscape offer an especially valuable legacy of Arlington's agricultural past. S. Makowka stated that this and other communications would be put in the record in their entirety and made available to anyone who wanted a copy. He continued that there was also a letter also from Jeff Salocks and Sharon Stafford as representatives of the neighbors which attached a 2004 letter highlighting the significance of the large lot as noted in numerous historical surveys of this site as well as final report of the Mt. Gilboa Historic District.

Attorney Dillon responded -- We are very cognizant of that and have tried to keep the distinction between open space -- as good in itself -- and layout of this site in terms of the lot. Open space, in his view, is not subject to HDC protection but the relationship of the house to the lot is very much within the Commission's jurisdiction. The design is intended to be something that would have been consistent with the original construction for extended family and ancillary buildings. Goal is to build two buildings while maintaining the relationship of the houses and the way the lot works in context with the District.

S. Makowka asked Commissioners for questions related to "siting" which is specifically in the bylaw and relates to the structures and their surroundings. A. Frisch asked about how land has been preserved all these years and why it hasn't been developed. Lisa Carlson Hill, neighbor 175 Lowell St., responded that the it was owned by the original family for about a hundred years and maybe more but never up for sale until recently. She continued in response to A. Frisch's question that this was a farm that was broken up. The Commissioners noted that according to one source, the house was built in 1884 so there was a lot there at the time and a number of other existing houses. B. Cohen said that the age of the house is pertinent to questions about the history of property and how it came to be. She noted that the District Report book says built in 1884 around the same time as other houses built in the area.

S. Makowka noted for the record that he was distributing a document that was not part of the earlier record regarding this property. The Arlington Reconnaissance Report is a landscape inventory run by the Massachusetts Heritage Landscape Inventory program and was published in 2007. This document contains a special note regarding 187 Lowell street (W.C. Taylor house) noting the spaciousness of lot, the mature plantings, and notes that the large size makes this property vulnerable to subdivision and that adjacent property has similar setbacks. Basically, the inventory identifies that this property is worthy of preservation and recommends that the HDC take the lead and work with the Redevelopment Board to monitor this property and explore preservation opportunities.

S. Makowka asked for any additional questions from Commissioners. B. Cohen noted that related there were never any other structures such as barn, etc. on this property. M. Kramer said there are other Districts such as Russell Street where houses were moved from other locations in town creating some very strange lots with regard to shape – so we're not setting precedent. It was done a long time ago.

S. Makowka asked for questions from the audience on the question of open space and whether a new building would be appropriate here. J. Dempsey, Westminster Ave. asked if the proposed lots were conforming. R. Botterio replied that the lots had been split and that they are conforming per the bylaws. J. Demsey asked if there was a common driveway. R. Botterio replied yes for 2 of the houses and also a separate driveway. He commented that there have been many different versions but this is an attempt to recognize some trees that are pointed out on the original plot plan in an effort to preserve some larger trees. Attorney Dillon also commented that one of the changes from the former plan is they have eliminated 1 driveway to preserve the open space in the front yard.

C. Reitzel, Westminster Ave., asked how many trees have to come down. He was referred to the model which shows most of the significant existing trees and R. Botterio commented that the trees are plotted on drawing. He continued that they have saved every one in front of house, including several in back, but will be pulling out "weed trees". He added that there will be plantings to create a buffer between the properties.

S. Makowka asked about any other questions on appropriateness of building on site before we move on to massing. R. Goldstein, Westminster Ave., stated that in an historic district, the context of the house in an open space sets the tone and the history of the house. If you eliminate that context, you take away the historical importance. Here is a remnant site that is what it once was and there should be some sensitivity to that because once it's gone, it's gone. Attorney Dillon reiterated that the general theme or goal was to do something which might have been done in the historical setting. He understands that it didn't happen because of family relationship but the effort here is to come up with a proposal that is reminiscent of something that might have been done.

Lisa Carlson Hill, 175 Lowell St., asked whether, when the purpose of development was for the properties to be single family residences or similar to the current program because there is a difference between commercial and single-family use in her mind. Attorney Dillon responded that the proposal was definitely for single family homes and that they planed to sell as single family homes. J. Worden noted that the Commission had no jurisdiction over whether the house could be later converted to another purpose. J. Salocks, Lowell St., read his letter submitted on behalf of the neighbors:

"Dear Commissioners:

In light of the renewed proposal for "houses" to be developed on the property of 187 Lowell Street, in the Mount Gilboa/Crescent Hill Historic District we are once again advocating for your support in protecting this significant house and its surrounding landscape.

Nowhere else in the Mount Gilboa Historic District does a property like this exist. Subdividing and building on this site does not enhance in any way its historic character, but rather obscures at best, or more likely obliterates, a most critical aspect of this landmark: the spatial quality of the historic lot which surrounds the house. Five years ago the residents of the Mount Gilboa Historic District petitioned the commission to reject the proposal then, as well as "all subsequent proposals" to build on this site.

The passage of time has not diminished our reasons in any way. For the record then, we have attached a copy of that letter dated 17 January 2004 and respectfully remind the commission that it was endorsed with more than one hundred signatures from the residents of this neighborhood and district.

The 187 Lowell Street property truly is, as noted in the AHDC Design Guidelines, one of the certain properties, which has "greater than usual architectural or historic significance". We feel it is imperative to reiterate that the Bylaws of the Historic Districts state that "In passing upon matters before it the Commission shall consider among other things, the historic and architectural value and significance of the site,...". Historic districts are created with the intention to preserve the character of buildings, neighborhoods and special landmarks. Development of, and on, the 187 Lowell Street site is not the right thing for this property, for the Mount Gilboa Historic District, or for the Town of Arlington. This property should be preserved now and for all the future generations of residents and visitors to benefit from.

"17 January 2004

Arlington Historic Districts Commission

53 Brattle Street

Arlington, MA 02474

Re: Mt. Gilboa Historic District / 187 Lowell St. - Proposed development of 2 new single family houses

Dear Commissioners:

We, the abutters, neighbors and residents of the Mt. Gilboa Historic District, are opposed to the construction of new houses on the historic property of 187 Lowell Street. We urge the commission to reject the current and all subsequent proposals for such development.

The 187 Lowell St. property is a true showpiece within the Mt. Gilboa Historic District and in Arlington. No other property in the district is as prominent or as appreciated by so many travelers passing by on foot or by automobile. The Queen Anne style home, ca. 1884, is distinctively sited on a noble, sloping lot. The majestic landscape of lawn and trees surrounding the Victorian architecture make it a notable link to the past. Every sight line in the landscape leads up to the lovely house on the knoll. It is amazing that this grand property is still intact today – providing a strong visual reference to 19th century Arlington and the early development of Crescent Hill. The openness of the existing site is integral to the historic essence of the property. The existing house is a fine example of Queen Anne architecture. The well designed siting of the house on the knoll, centered on the grounds with open space on all four sides, conveys a sense of grandness reminiscent of the 19th century. The significance of the siting of the house on this large lot is emphasized in 2 surveys published by the Arlington Historical Commission, as well as in the final report on the proposed Mt. Gilboa Historic District to Town Meeting by the Historic District Commissions. The subdivision and addition of more houses on this lot will destroy the prominence and historical significance of the property. The "grandness" will be lost forever. The 187 Lowell St. house will become just another nice old house in the district, instead of the historic showpiece it is today. The sight lines and open space, that are integral to the notability of the house, will be interrupted by any new development. The density created by the new houses will destroy the sense of grandeur. The historic structure will no longer be the focal point of the site. This wonderful visual reference into the history of this neighborhood will be gone. There is no other property like this in the neighborhood, and there are not many left in the town. This type of alteration is irreversible. The house and spacious grounds remained in the ownership of one family for over 100 years. But now, with new ownership, they are at risk. The Historic District Commission is the only authority that can protect this asset. The Bylaws of the Historic Districts state that "In passing upon matters before it the commission shall consider among other things, the historic and architectural value and significance of the site,..." and "The commission shall not make any recommendation or requirement except for the purpose of preventing developments incongruous to the historic aspects or the architectural characteristics of the surroundings..." This is our last chance to preserve this site, this piece of our history. Please do the right thing and preserve this entire property. Reject any development on this historic site. Respectfully Submitted by: Concerned Abutters, Neighbors and Residents of the Mt. Gilboa Historic District"

S. Stafford, Lowell Street, showed a picture of house and the lot. She commented that it looks very beautiful. As you can see on the photo, it's wonderful but if two houses were built on the lot, they would be seen in this photograph. Part of why this house looks beautiful is the way it is sited on the land. The site lines lead you right up to house, making the house look bigger than it is. This is reinforced in three publications consisting of 4 descriptions which all link the significance of the architecture of the building directly to the site that it sits within.

First, the Millbrook Valley book, published in 1976 by the AHC. The description of 187 Lowell includes: "Its situation on this lot contributes to its image as a substantial, comfortable old-fashioned home." S. Stafford read that as saying without the lot it wouldn't be as substantial a home. The next book is Northwest Arlington, a survey published in 1987 by the AHC containing two description of 187 Lowell St and both refer to the lot. "W.C. Taylor house set on a large lot with elegant setback retains the Queen Ann detailing which made it an extremely fashionable house when it was constructed in the 1880's." The 2nd description is "The W. C. Taylor, built by J.H. Baxter. This is one of the best sited Queen Anne style houses on Crescent Hill." The last description is from the Final Report to Town Meeting in 1981 which was submitted by the Historic District Commission, "W.C. Taylor house is considered to be perhaps the most beautiful and best example of a Queen Anne home in the neighborhood. This house is located on grand, well terraced lot with mature landscaping and old-fashioned trees and shrubs."

S. Stafford continued—yes it can be subdivided, but once you do that we lose this. This lot was designed in the 19th century and the house was designed to fit perfectly within the lot. For some bizarre reason the lot has been saved all these years but its still there. We rarely get an opportunity to see a piece of our past and this is a visual piece of our past. So, yes things may have been built here, but they were not, so it's an opportunity to save this little piece of the past.

Attorney Dillon asked if they could move to show some of perspectives & elevations. S. Makowka asked for any other comments pertaining to open space.

J. Salocks read from HDC ruling 5 years ago on a proposal substantially similar to this one: "To build 2 new houses not in harmony and incongruous with the site and the District." Also, "The motion was amended to reflect that expansive lawns and open spaces around the Taylor house are important aspects of the site itself and of Lowell Street and the entire Mount Gilboa Historic District."

Attorney Dillon commented that the Applicant has studied those transcripts very carefully and would like to show design concepts they have tried to incorporate regarding site grading, vegetation, and maintaining the prominence of the existing house.

S. Makowka asked that the Applicant move on to a description of massing of proposed structures in relationship to other structures in District.

R. Botterio presented the topographical model of the site and confirmed that the scale is accurate both horizontally and vertically. He continued to summarize the project description: Regarding the massing height issue, they wanted to keep building at the center of the property so they lowered other buildings. When you look at a picture of the existing house you feel the sense of open space in the front so are trying to keep front open as it is currently but it will not be open on the sides. He continued to describe that the buildings on sides are set back from the existing house. S. Makowka asked for the setbacks of the three structures for the record. After some discussion, W. Rowland stated that existing house is setback on pedestal approximately 90' to porch and the new houses are set back (and set lower) approximately 100 and 120 feet back.

S. Makowka asked that the applicant comments on the massing & size of houses with relation to other houses in area.

R. Botterio replied that the plans show a rendering of the house on right which might have been built as a carriage house or barn and then converted in to a house at some point in time with barn doors and windows reworked.

S. Makowka asked that we focus on the question of massing as asked for the square footage of the existing and proposed houses. R. Botterio replied that the square footage is on the plans. Lot 3 (house on right) is 3,070 sf; the footprint is 1552 1st floor. Lot 1 is 3,493 sf, (footprint would be 1,936 on 1st floor as read off plan by B. Cohen).

Attorney Dillon spoke to the concepts: given the lot constraints and view corridor from Lowell St., the idea was to achieve a minimum square footage in terms of marketability and feasibility but to orient the houses in a way that presented a smaller façade that is compatible with height and with of the existing house and to get the needed square footage from the depth while still wanting to give some architectural interest.

S. Makowka noted for record that according to town property records, the existing structure is total 1,866 sf (first and second floors combined) and the proposed addition would be an additional 1,072 sf on the back of that house. He continued, according to Town records, 175 Lowell is total of 2,010 sf, 197 Lowell is 1,408 sf, and 203 is 1,378 sf, on Elder Terrace 2 structures of 1,296 sf and 1,336 sf at end of street. S. Makowka stated for the record that the size of the two structures being proposed are significantly larger than the existing structures in area with the smallest being 50% larger. Given this, he asked the Applicant to explain why the massing is appropriate.

B. Botterio suggested that the Commissioners look at the topographical model. Because the proposed houses are larger than the houses in the neighborhood, they tried to minimize the look of the mass by the design of the house, especially the front view from Lowell Street by making the length longer. The buildings are bigger and the reason is they become more marketable.

Attorney Dillon stated that marketability was a concern so square footage was a critical matter. That being said, the lot being divided, but the resulting lots are still significantly larger than neighboring lots.

J. Worden questioned why the new houses appeared to be situated at an odd angle in relation to street and other houses. Various Commissioners noted that the plans as shown do not have the house on left lined up with either the other structures or with the curve of the street. W. Rowland suggested that the intent was to have the house key off the curve of the street as shown in the model and suggested that the drawings needed to be reoriented. S. Makowka

also requested that it would be helpful to the Commission to have some annotation put on the plans that show the setback dimensions from the front planes of each house. J. Worden commented that if the intent was to place two ancillary structures behind the main house, anyone looking at the model would say the two new houses were basically in the same plane with the existing house despite the appearance of some setback in the plans.

S. Makowka asked for any additional questions from the Commission and then moved to audience comments. J. Salocks commented that the distance between house on lot 3 and lot 2 looks to be less than width of house which seems very incongruous for houses of this nature. He asked for the actual separation distance. W. Rowland stated that the distance is approximately 20 feet at the closest point. S. Salocks commented that both new houses are larger than houses proposed 5 years ago. From Elder Terrace that house is a virtual wall. R. Botterio noted that the house to the left is the same size as the other house, but that the design has been changed to make it not a 2-story wall.

N. Svencer, 197 Lowell Street, commented on the overall change of scale going from houses on Elder Terrace to these three houses -- there is a monumental jump. He also questioned the market requirements that say you need 3,000 sf to sell a house in this neighborhood.

C. Reitzel, Westminster Ave., commented that while he felt there were really nice elements of design in the proposal, which is almost irrelevant. If walking by, it wouldn't matter if done 100 years ago, because lumping of two houses so close together just doesn't work. From an aesthetic viewpoint, says developer is shooting himself in the foot economically and that it would be better to have smaller more proportional house. He continued that he did not have the same reaction to the proposed house on the left but had not really visualized it from the Elder Terrace side. J. Nyberg, 147 Lowell Street, had two comments. He is thankful that neighbors are here. This is a complex issue and its indicative of each generation in Arlington has had some of these issues and we have worked as community to talk and discuss ideas. With regard to massing, unless it is a mill workers village, most districts do have different masses so we don't need to make every house exactly the same which itself may diminish the intrigue of the District. If we wake up 100 years from now what would be discussion be? So it is interesting to think forward.

S. Makowka noted that we had gone over the time originally allocated and that we need to move on to other matters. He suggested that the Commission adjourn this hearing and get into specific design elements at next meeting. R. Botterio commented that he would like to avoid rehashing what we've gone over tonight. A. Frisch said he's big on campus. Now the proposal has 3 houses on land and he could envision the current house larger with 2 units around it smaller. It was suggested that such a use is problematic due to single family zoning.

Attorney Dillon asked if it were possible to move at next meeting towards completion of deliberations, the Applicant would appreciate a chance to get to completion. S. Makowka commented that we would work diligently but something as large and complex as this needs a lot of work.

Applicant agreed to continue until 2/26/09.

e. Formal Hearing re: 81 Westminster Ave. (Lemire) for replacement of windows. – Applicant not present at hearing. Motion to continue hearing until to February meeting made by J. Worden. Seconded by B. Cohen. All voted in favor.

f. Formal hearing re: 187 Pleasant Street (Fox) for renovations including removal of one existing window and construction of small addition at rear of house (partially visible). Carol Marsh, architect, presented proposal. The existing house is on the corner of Pleasant St. and Kensington Park. It is a Victorian house, with plaster detail on gables and mostly shingles siding. She presented photos of existing house including shots from up Kensington Park.

The proposal is for a tiny addition on back of house which is tucked around behind existing ell on Kensington Park. The addition would be 2'8 x 10'6 approximately. S. Makowka asked about the drawings which seem to show the new roof being stepped up from existing roof. C. Marsh clarified that that was just a rendering issue; the new roof will be in same plane with existing roof and will not be stepped up. C. Marsh added that plan called for removal of one existing window on Kensington Park side to accommodate interior arrangements. She explained that all materials to match existing conditions like with like. They would use wood gutters to match existing gutters, and would need to add new downspout to be tucked in corner. New windows on rear will be 1 over 1 but are not visible. C. Marsh confirmed that the roofline of new addition and removal of window are only (slightly) visible changes but were also replacing two windows and adding a door on the rear. Door to be wood with trim to match existing conditions.

B. Cohen moved approval of the application as submitted which is deemed not to have an incongruous effect on the historic aspects or architectural character of the building or district. S. Makowka suggested that motion be amended to

specify that specific doors and windows be approved by monitor prior to installation; B. Cohen modified motion to include such language. Seconded by M. Logan, approved unanimously. D. Levy monitor.

g. Executive Session (if necessitated, not required, put on agenda for next month)

6. Other Business

a. Request for comment re: Cellular Tower Proposal on triangle at Pleasant Street, Belmont – S. Makowka will send same letter as was sent 2 years ago with regard to another such tower not in a district.

b. S. Makowka asked for election of officers for 2009 – J. Worden moved same officers as 2008, seconded by A. Frisch, all voted in favor – S. Makowka Chair, B. Cohen vice Chair, J. Worden Secretary.

7. Old Business - none

Meeting adjourned – 10:45pm