



**Arlington Historic District Commissions
Final & Approved Minutes**

August 27, 2020 8:00 PM
Conducted by Remote Participation

Commissioners Present: D. Baldwin, M. Bush, C. Barry, B. Cohen, A. Frank Johnson, S. Makowka, B. Melofchik, C Tee, J. Worden

Commissioners Not Present: M. Audin, N. Aikenhead,

Guests: R. Le, E. Segal, C. Grinnell, M. Doyle, A. Lynch

1. **AHDC Meeting Opens 8:00pm**
2. **Appointment of alternate Commissioners; Pleasant St – 4 at large (C.Barry, J. Worden, B. D. Baldwin, C. Tee), B Cohen plus M. Bush, B. Melofchik; Mt Gilboa , B. Melofchik, A. Frank Johnson, B. Cohen plus M Bush and at large (C. Barry, C. Tee, D. Balwin).**
3. **Approval of draft minutes from July 23, 2020. D. Baldwin moved to accept minutes as revised, seconded by B. Cohen, roll call unanimous approval except for J. Worden who couldn't answer to accept revised minutes. J. Worden abstained**

4. **Communications**

S. Makowka received an email stating that the proposed solar roof tiles may not be compatible with copper and he indicated that the copper ridge at 87 Pleasant Street may not be approved for removal. S. Makowka did indicate that the HDC would prefer they keep copper ridge and they can ask for removal. M. Bush gave update on drive by on house in Dorchester that has installed solar roof tiles – characterizes as different but in no way offensive. 12 pitch roof with shed dormer – much less complex than what was proposed on Pleasant Street and it differs in a variety of ways but the fact that the flashing is a bit more pronounced but much better than panels slapped on the top in his opinion.

M. Bush indicated that he spoke with resident of 25 Elder Terrace and they will be submitting an application.

5. **New Business**

- a. **Informal Hearing for 51 Academy Street (Rem Le) for renovation plans. New owner wants to introduce himself to HDC. House on hill above David Baldwin's house on Academy Street. A. Lynch his realtor joined the call as well. A CONA for roof repairs**

has been submitted and already underway for approval. Discussion about gutters and windows on the rear of the house. Fiberglass gutters were mentioned and discussed as well. Two firms products are approved for use including The Fiber Gutter Co and The Fiberglass Gutter Company in Pembroke MA. Applications will be necessary.

- b. **Continuation of Formal Hearing for 244 Pleasant Street (Segal) for window replacements and porch railing replacement.** S. Makowka summarize that some of the windows were already replaced so this is an ex-post application. M. Doyle, contractor Alpine, explained that Meredith (applicant) purchased home recently and discovered home was full of lead which was a concern. They worked with Alpine to do lead remediation and they apologize that they went ahead not knowing they bought a home in a historic district. Regarding the railings, their priority is to create a safe environment on the porch and they were concerned that the low railings would allow a child to fall of the porch. S. Makowka asked if railings were changed yet and the Applicant confirmed they have not been changed. The railings do not look to be original per B. Cohen. Proposing on front and rear of house, which are both viewable, that they will bring railings up to code height but keep architectural details. On the side railings, they are not planning to have the intricate railing designs – want simple vertical balusters like at side of existing front panels. 36” is code for the railings. Part of dynamic is also lead compliance. Upper handrail needs to be fully replaced or hand-stripped. Applicant would prefer to get rid of the old handrail and replace entire thing with similar design but 6” taller up to 36”. The front of the porch doesn’t need the higher height but along the side and back (14’ height in the back). M. Bush said decorative elements of railing don’t come close to passing 4” ball test and if you put a second rail above it you need something between the rails to pass the 4” ball test. He feels that the proposed design will not meet the 4” code test. The applicant would be great with a more standard type vertical baluster railing throughout. Based on historical photo, the decorative railing is not original to the house. A. Johnson showed a photo before there was even a porch and there was a vertical railing around the house. C. Barry is fine with pure vertical railing and would rather see a 36” rail than the lower rail with a “bandaid” on top. All commissioners agreed. The Commissioners would prefer a 36” vertical and the monitor can work with them if the building dept. has any issues.

Pg. 19 has list of all windows on the house. Proposing to change a number of 6 over 2 windows to 1 over 1 windows. 22 Windows on the rear of the house already are vinyl – 13 original windows around the house are proposed to be replace with replacement windows. Many first floor windows to be rehabilitated. The Commission noted that we have only approved wood replacement windows without cladding on the exterior. The packet contains pictures labelled the sides of the house. The A side is the front, the B side is the left side from the street, the C side (were windows were already replaced prior to this owner) is the back, the D side is the right side – visible from Pleasant. On the D side, all 1st floor have been rehabilitated. All windows on A side (on Pleasant Street) and windows prominent on the D side are to be restored (windows numbered 36 and 37 were restored) so windows numbered 38 and 39 are the ones they want to replace (they are visible from Pleasant Street). These windows should be rehabilitated per C. Barry and B. Cohen. Applicant confirmed that original windows still available, they just inserted new windows to make house livable. Window numbered 40 is 1 over 1 and is original. S. Makowka suggested strawman of restoring windows on front A side and 2 windows on 2nd floor on D side while replacing the

vinyl windows on back C Side which are not original and on the B side (some of which are not original and aren't really visible from Pleasant Street) would be acceptable. J. Worden said what S. Makowka suggested would be acceptable to him under the circumstances. C. Barry said if B side toward Arlington Center is sort of not visible we need to be careful to not set a precedent. Applicant clarified that windows on rear are a replacement for vinyl windows not original windows. B side also has a few replacement windows prior to their arrival that were not original. Window 9, 10 are existing vinyl and 11 and 12 are existing wood and all but 12 were already changed to vinyl. The Palladium window on B side was kept and restored. The two front facing windows on the B side "L" are visible -- one is a vinyl sliding door (no change) but the existing original one should be refurbished and kept wood. The Commission agreed with rehabilitation or replace 2nd floor windows on A, B and D sides with wood. The B side window on the bump out to be replaced. The contractor said he may not have that one but the Commission stated it can be replaced with a wood window. Brosco sells all wood windows.

A proposal was floated: Railing would go to vertical balusters at 36" height, replacement of mish mashed vinyl windows on back ok, 2nd floor windows on A, B and D sides be refurbished or kept all wood. B. Cohen moved proposal as formal motion with the following modifications: 1) railings allowed to be replaced with railings to match existing vertical balustrade in place up to 36" height (with a 1 to 1 baluster spacing ratio and same dimensions for top and bottom rails); 2) replacement of non-original windows on back (C side) with vinyl to be allowed as proposed and 3) original wood windows on A, D side on 2nd floor to be all wood or refurbished and bump out on the B side to be all wood or refurbished. Seconded by J. Worden for discussion. S. Makowka clarified that there is no vinyl – the proposal is for fibrex clad windows and this does not set a precedent since the original windows have already been removed and replaced throughout much of the house by prior owners. The Commission also clarified with Applicant that the proposed porch railing is all wood materials and that the existing dimensions of handrail will be maintained to match the side rail proportions and profiles. M. Bush said he has a problem on the C side because we denied vinyl windows for a non-historic windows on the pond side and forced to put wood less than 3 months ago. S. Makowka argued that was different because the original wood windows were in place. We are not approving vinyl windows – we are approving clad windows. Discussion about the difference between the two properties and the windows that were already in place. B. Melofchik said she appreciates M. Bush's perspective. Beth Cohen modified motion to include requirement final approval by monitor on railing prior to installation. Seconded.

M. Bush asked to divide pending motion into 2 different votes: railing and windows. Seconded by D. Baldwin. On motion to divide: C Barry – no, D. Baldwin – yes. B. Cohen – no, M. Bush – yes, C. Tee – no, J. Worden – yes, B. Melofchik – yes. Will divide motion into 2 parts.

Motion to approve railings only – 36" vertical balusters with existing spacing as on side – C. Barry – yes, D. Baldwin – yes, B. Cohen – y, M. Bush – yes, B. Melofchik – yes, C. Tee – yes, J. Worden – yes.

2nd motion for approval of windows only: C. Barry – y, D. Baldwin – n, B Cohen – y, M. Bush – n, C. Tee – yes, B. Melofchik – yes, J. Worden – n. Motion to approve passes with a 4 to 3 vote. C. Barry is monitor.

- c. **Continuation of Formal Hearing for 187 Lowell Street (Grinnell) for new construction.** C. Grinnell gave presentation. A lot of material is same from prior weeks. Table of Contents pg 4 shows things modified since last meeting 2 weeks ago. Renderings, elevations, trim details and then large section of supporting details that relate to his understanding of what step 3 of process was intended to be. Pg. 13 has changed the entry porch details. He is happy where they ended up. Extended closer to Lowell Street. Siting of home on lot is exactly same. The front porch has been extended significantly from where it was cut off before. Significant change – corbels and gable bracket – lots of detail later in presentation. Input was positive to porch change. 2 houses away (191 Lowell) does not have a front door and was a good example of why this works. Pg. 15 was same. Pg. 16 had lots of changes in the elevation. Back in love with brick foundation which matches materials of both neighbors at 175 and 187 Lowell. Simplified carriage doors since last time. Cottage red painted will be close to the brick and garage doors will virtually disappear with the choice of the brick. Entry porch enlarged shown on images as well. Roof ornamentation shown. Brackets on side porch match the house next door. The vents for the fireplaces are shown (gas FP). Applicant noted that the transition from crown on fascia isn't depicted correctly – will be corrected. The intended transition piece (As used at his existing house) wraps around corner and transitions into profile of fiberglass gutter which mimic wood gutters.

Pg. 23 – Marvin seems to be only viable solution for windows to be authentic wood exterior. Divided lights – questions about difference from any angle to see metal grid in between window muntins. What is not shown in elevations is a window next to entry, instead would like to find some historic feature window like the small window at 191 Lowell. Main entry door – architect showed him the one drawn but hasn't been able to find something. Brosco door catalogue suggested by B. Cohen. M. Bush sent Simpson catalogue picture to applicant. Garage doors – Clopay, all wood, painted, no casing around it just minimal interface to brick foundation on sides. Garage entry door – Simpson out of Brosco book to mimic 2 over 2 to match garage doors. Oak sill. Porch railings – nice wood profiles top and bottom. Go heavier with 2.5 wood spindles on porch although since submitted found another supplier and now sort of reconsidering. Porch brackets like what's on 187 Lowell. Solid wood cedar decking. Extension of brick foundation under porch is 1 option or have it standard wood framed with square cedar lattice below painted trim color. Storm retention and driveway – everyone else classic asphalt in neighborhood. Grate up driveway will be required. Solar panels mentioned but not planning to install or get approval for at this time. Vents for utilities shown (remember fireplace vents will be seen). Commission thought they looked overly large and to check on requirements. Steps at street will be retained at original wall. Want to keep open space so not thinking of any walkway up along lawn.

Exterior siding – cedar clapboards, rough side out – B. Cohen said she prefers smooth side out. C. Barry said rough side out is rustic but that seems to be inconsistent with this project. M. Bush said 1 x 10 seems big for the water table. C. Barry said proportions have to work – there is no absolute. Corbels on front of the house shown.

Same height and width as ones on his house. Liked curved element in gable bracket. It was noted that both Fiberglass Gutter Company and Fibergutter.com are approved and Arlington Coal and Lumber carries the latter product. Retaining wall will match the existing stone wall along Lowell Street as much as possible. Discussion about walls – gravity walls are permeable and a good stone mason can help make a good one. Foundation plan to replicate brick that he did on his garage. Chimney – no plan with dormers and other stuff going on.

The Commission thanked the Applicant for his very thorough material packet. C. Barry questions transition from stone to brick and worries about integrating all the stone walls with the brick. He could be convinced but needs to think about it. M. Bush said the historic detail which existing house has as well – classic detail is stone to ground level and brick above. 2’ or so of brick is exposed. D. Baldwin likes the brick and the way it sets off against the stone. The Commission asked about the height of the garage doors below the water table. Answer: doors 8’ tall and 9’ wide. C. Barry suggested a header detail to look like the bricks are supported.

Continued to 9/10.

d. 87 Pleasant Street for solar tile conduit continued to 9/10 meeting

6. Meeting Adjourns. B. Cohen moved to adjourn, seconded by M. Bush. Motion to adjourn – roll call, all in favor. Meeting adjourned 10:41pm.

Next Meeting 9/10/2020 – Monitor B. Cohen
9/24/2020 – Monitor B. Cohen