



**Arlington Historic District Commissions  
Final and Approved Minutes – October 27, 2022  
Conducted By Remote Participation via ZOOM**

Commissioners Present: D. Baldwin, P. Chaves, A. Johnson, B. LaBau, S. Makowka, B. Melofchik, C. Tee, J. Worden, C. Barry (joined at 9:02pm)

Commissioners Not Present: B. Cohen, S. Savarese

Guests: L. Ginggen, M. Brooks, M. Quadros, M. Scanlon, M. Phillips, N. Urciuoli, M. Urciuoli, N. Abele, R. and B. Holmes-Farley, R. Taketomo, R. Conlon, T. and R. Smurzynski, V. Brown, D. Tee, C. Leich, D. Green, G. Magnusson, G. Slebodnick, J. Becker, John, K. Snowden, K. Lubar, K. Allenblair, A. Vogel, A. Ginggen, B. Hoxie, W. Russell, J. Rogers, J. Zechner, J. Martin

1. **AHDC Meeting Opens 8:00pm. S. Makowka opened the meeting at 803pm. Meeting conducted by remote participation and will be recorded but deleted after minutes approved by Commission**
2. **Approval of draft minutes from July 28, August 25 and September 22, 2022 Regular and Any Outstanding Executive Sessions. D. Baldwin moved to table minutes to next meeting, seconded by J. Worden. Roll call to table: Baldwin – y, B. LaBau – y, C. Tee – y, Worden – y, Chaves – y, Melofchik – y, Makowka – y. Unanimous vote to table until 11/17 meeting.**
3. **Appointment of Alternate Commissioners – Jason Gray – Chaves, Melofchik, Makowka; Mt Gilboa/Crescent Hill – Chaves, Melofchik, Makowka**
  - a. **Communications – J. Worden reported that 6 Jason Court is still for sale.**
  - b. **Lots of communications re: 38 Gray Street, will be discussing tonight**
4. **New Business: S. Makowka announced that we may not get to informal hearings tonight due to the number of formal hearings on agenda.**
  - a. **Formal Hearings re: 38 Gray Street (Urciuoli) for exterior renovations.** S. Makowka noted that there are several applications and to keep everything straight he plans to tackle the two CONAs first, then then the three applications for Certificates of Appropriateness for siding, windows, and railings. M. Urciuoli said he has a presentation on the entire plan that he wants to give. S. Makowka stated that he wanted to give some background to provide context for the hearings. He shared a photo of house provided by Applicant. He noted that there was an application for a CONA back in June for the repair and replacement of the wood shingles, restoration of the existing wood windows, and replacement of the existing asphalt shingle roof. He noted that a number of individuals had reached out to the Commission because of concern about the amount of work seemingly being done. S. Makowka at that time spoke with Applicant about the scope of work including restoring and reinstalling the windows. He also suggested that the window sashes be moved to different location to protect them during the interior demolition. Shortly after, the almost all of the two existing brick chimneys were demolished by the Applicant’s contractor in violation of the Town Bylaw. Since then, the

Applicant withdrew the original CONA application and submitted a number of new applications including some for Certificates of Appropriateness for proposed exterior changes. He noted that the Commission received new materials modifying the applications from the Applicant on 10/25 which were integrated into the previously circulated materials and recirculated to the Commission and posted to the deck available on-line. He noted that the Applicant will need to clarify exactly what is being requested on each application. S. Makowka also noted that the Commission has not previously been provided with new presentation that the Applicant is asking to give tonight.

M. Urciuoli gave presentation – house built 1902, family room addition 1949, sunroom porch enclosed approx. 1960-1970, original main house had cedar roofing; multi-page presentation given (see photos). A. Vogel followed up. He has been consulting with Applicant. He discussed historic properties he has been involved with in the past and that he is locally active in civic causes. He summarized that Applicant after purchasing the house discovered 50 years of neglect and that he feels that the house is in danger of being condemned. The Applicant stated that he intended to restore the windows but then found out the cost is \$2500-3500 per window to fix the existing windows. The replacement Harvey windows are coming in at approximately \$1000 per window.

S. Makowka said that he would like to update certain statements based on information he received from unofficial Town historian Richard Duffy. The so-called ‘family room’ was added by the original owner in 1910 and was used as a smoking room where the men retired to after dinner. He also confirmed with the Applicant that the “sun room” described in presentation is located on the rear of the house and is not visible from the street.

Application for roof and gutter CONAs. This request is typically approved as a CONA – like with like materials. Wood gutters along bottom part of the roof plane that appear to be copper lined across the front shown by S. Makowka. The wood gutters extend wherever the gambrel roof ends – 2 in front, 2 in back, 2 inside. J. Worden asked if retaining wood gutters with copper linings. They are retaining them but they are redundant. A. Vogel gave discussion about gutters and feels they are not a decorative feature. K style aluminum gutters in same location and with same style. Downspouts will be replaced as well. Hearing no objection from Commissioners to issue the CONA there will be a CONA for the gutters issued.

Application for chimney COA. S. Makowka explained that an application was originally submitted as CONA which he rejected since it included jurisdictional exterior changes and that the Applicant had submitted a new application for a COA for a minor project with the intent to replace older front chimney, remove ‘family room’ chimney and create veneer extension above the roof for the front chimney.

The Commissioners noted that the above the roof request for thin veneer is very concerning and will make chimney seem incongruous with the existing style. Veneer is very thin and so are concerned that it will not replicate look if applied. In the past we have asked for a wooden box with a full brick veneer around the exterior. Another concern is the removal of the ‘family room’ chimney which matches the one on the main roof. Applicant’s architect A. Vogel said there are many historical products that will match. They have special pieces at the corners that will look like a full brick. B. LaBau asked if chimney continues down through house now. In proposed restoration it will be removed inside the house but on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor, it will show on the outside. The Applicant proposed that the original bricks will be used to in the rebuild as much as possible. A. Johnson asked if the issue is that you are looking for something to weigh less on the house? Applicant said yes. [C. Barry joined meeting at 9:02 pm.] She continued that external view needs to be the same so wooden box with full brick façade and the smoke room chimney needs to be replaced in her opinion. The Applicant stated that he believes that

the 'smoker' chimney is not original to the house. He shows pictures where the seams at the foundation on both sides have caused problems.

S. Makowka asked for public participation. K. Lubar asked A. Vogel his qualifications as an architect. He's not a registered architect, but has been a project manager doing this type of work for many years. K. Lubar said that he feels that the chimney needs to be recreated as it was before. D. Greene (40 Irving Street) said the little chimney on the side isn't as important to him. T. Taketomo (48 Irving St) asked if there is a historical reference where a smoker has a significant relevancy.

J. Worden felt that the external appearance on the smoker should be reconstructed so it looks the same. The chimney on that very early addition is a very integral part of the house. B. LaBau said it is unfortunate that the chimney on the smoker was taken down. That chimney was an important part of that room and of that house. It's a nice element architecturally since it takes the low pitch box and adds a lot of visual interest to the house.

B. La Bau made a motion that the smoker chimney be reconstructed and the 1<sup>st</sup> floor with full brick and not a veneer. It will match the original bricks being used. Design and bricks to be approved by monitor prior to installation. Seconded by J. Worden for discussion. C. Barry suggested adding that all flashing details, brick jointing and mortar should match original chimney. B. LaBau made new motion that both chimneys on house to be reconstructed, chimney above main roof with full dimension brick either salvaged or new to match and to be constructed on wood frame box to allow full dimension brick to be used and on smoker reconstruct chimney using salvaged or new to match old brick as close as possible. Design, flashings, mortar, spacing of mortar joints, etc. with details to be approved by monitor prior to installation. Seconded by J. Worden. Roll Call – C. Tee – y, J. Worden – y, P. Chaves – y, A. Johnson – y, B. Melofchik – y, S. Makowka – y, Baldwin – y.

Application (pg 70 in packet) for railings discussed. Replace modern front porch railings with ones similar to match rear porch railings. 10/25 amendment asked for additional updated porch. Baluster on rear of house in original application. S. Makowka noted that the application does not include any details so he feels he doesn't have enough details to approve the porch changes. He noted that replacing wood with wood on deck and stairs would qualify for a CONA application. He also noted that the existing stone elements on either side of front stairs were damaged during the recent construction activities and will need to be restored like with like. Replacement of railing system to match existing rear porch railing system.

J. Worden moved that applicant be allowed to replace the existing railing system on front porch to match existing back porch system. Seconded by D. Baldwin. D. Baldwin – y, C. Tee – y, J. Worden – y, P. Chaves – y, A. Johnson – y, B. Melofchik – y, S. Makowka – y. Unanimous approval.

Application for Siding. replace existing siding with composite material and composite trim. Original application was for a CONA, changed to a COA with composite materials. S. Makowka asked if they reviewed the HDC guidelines which provides guidance to applicants that artificial siding should not be used and original details need to be maintained? We have consistently required wood trim and materials in all cases, including new construction. He feels that consistency with our guidelines needs to be maintained with all wood materials. Applicant said guidelines can change. Applicant also stated that similar changes at 65 Beacon Street were approved by the Historical Commission. J. Worden reminded him that that property is not in a District. B. LaBau said he's really concerned about Hardie shingle siding, looking at house how it was originally installed, it's all about the details. For example, there are shingle sweeps (not only at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor line, but at water table also on 1<sup>st</sup> floor line) and he feels the Hardie shingles – which are made in a 3-tab configuration in a sheet of material with

spaces between shingles cut in – are very uniform and same size and a whole house done that way does not give the same impression as historical materials. Shingles are available in single shingles according to A. Vogel. He also stated that they come in different configurations to make them randomized. In his opinion, you can build exactly the same way as with traditional shingles, so the skirts at the water table and at the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor can be built exactly like original materials. The Applicant believes that materials have changed and from 27 feet away it will be very satisfactory and convincing in his opinion. C. Barry said he is opposed to any composite materials in the District. We must uphold the guidelines which ask for authentic materials, D. Baldwin, B. Labau, J. Worden and A. Johnson all agree with upholding the tradition of maintaining authentic materials. T. Takaetomo asked if composite materials of the same dimension of wood materials was acceptable. C. Barry said only time was substitution of fiberglass gutter for wood gutters. He added composite materials in no way express the texture of wood and are also problematic because they have different expansion properties that don't behave like wood. The Commission mentioned that basement windows located at or below grade have been other exception. Composite decking has also not been allowed in a District historically. Application asking for replacement of original wood materials with composite siding and trim.

J. Worden moved to deny the application that it is inconsistent with the architectural values of the district and is specifically called out as inappropriate in our guidelines. D. Baldwin seconded. Baldwin – y, Tee – y, Worden – y, Chaves – y, Johnson – y, Melofchik – y, Makowka – y. Unanimous vote to deny application.

**Application for window changes** (pg 84 of package) S. Makowka summarized the application. He stated that the Applicant original submitted a CONA application to restore the existing windows but that was withdrawn and the new one is to replace the existing windows with Harvey Majesty windows with aluminum cladding with all windows to have a 2 over 1 grid pattern for other than the leaded decorative windows on 1<sup>st</sup> floor (the two full bay windows to right and left of front door as well as surrounds at front door). He summarized that leaves the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows on the front of the house and the windows on sides since we have no jurisdiction over the rear windows.

A. Vogel stated that that they have many examples of houses where they have restored windows and storm windows need to be added. He feels that storm windows detract from the look of the house and the good quality windows they are proposing are very comparable to best made by Marvin and Pella. S. Makowka stated that the Commission, per the guidelines, requests that restoration be investigated before replacement is considered but that none of that requested information had been provided by the Applicant. He asked if the original window sashes are still being stored at another location and the Applicant confirmed that existing original fabric of the house is available. D. Baldwin said looking at some of the photos, the 2 over 1 would not work if used throughout the house. That is part of the charm of the windows – they are all varied. Going 2 over 1 would be a problem for the exterior view of the house. B. LaBau agreed with D. Baldwin and added that the house being built in 1902 or 1903 is a mix of shingle style and colonial period and the 8 over 1 is more appropriate and windows as they are should be replaced with same muntin layouts as they were before removed. It was confirmed that the proposed Harvey windows are aluminum clad. J. Worden said our guidelines are very specific – we don't do clad windows. Also agrees with others that windows should be whatever they were prior to being ripped out. B. Melofchik concurs with B. LaBau about the number of lites. C. Barry agrees with J. Worden that guidelines are clear and we should stick with them and we should encourage if not demand that windows be restored.

K. Lubar gave his opinion on windows. N. Urcioli said she appreciates efforts to preserve the house and until a few months ago the house was not even visible. They spent their savings on

stabilizing the house and funds are not unlimited. They cannot afford to restore the house with every little detail. J. Worden stated that he is concerned that costs were being offered with no supporting documentation. He also noted that Arlington has a Preservation Fund that offers low interest loans for restoration work. Finally he stated that the Applicant can bring an application for hardship but that requires proof of the actual hardship.

A. Johnson move to deny application based on the request for a change to 2 over 1 configuration. Seconded by J. Worden for discussion. S. Makowka suggested a modification to the motion to include that the preference is to restore per our guidelines and that such information has not been provided here. A. Johnson amended her motion to deny the application based the request for a change to 2 over 1 configuration and also noting our strong preference for restoration if possible which requires written information that has not been provided. Modified motion seconded by J. Worden. Roll call vote: D. Baldwin – y, C. Tee – y, J. Worden – y, P. Chaves – y, A. Johnson – y, B. Melofchik – y, S. Makowka – y. Unanimous vote to deny application.

- b. **Formal Hearing re: 109 Crescent Hill Ave (Ginggen) for exterior renovations.** A. and L. Ginggen gave presentation. Proposed addition is narrower than the building, and the ridge is slightly lower. Original building has shed dormers on both sides. There are to be three alterations within main fabric of existing building – 1) duplication of a second 6 over 6 window in the kitchen. May use an existing window from the back reinserted but can't guarantee. 2) On 2<sup>nd</sup> floor would like to close existing bathroom window – propose to install permanently closed shutters on exterior based on existing shutter hardware on the building. 3) Install Velux low profile skylight on existing dormer noting that roof is not visible from the street so it would not be conspicuous at all. Regarding the 12-foot addition on the back, there will be steps up to french doors with railings to match original railings. Everything is an exact duplication of details on the original structure. All materials specified are all wood (no composite materials shown except where garden steps meet the ground at grade. Window – probably Anderson 400 series Woodrite window which does have exterior cladding. architect noted he understood that windows were to be wood and Applicant agreed that wood windows would be used.

S. Makowka asked about other changes noted on the plan and it was confirmed that the existing shed dormer is getting 2 feet longer towards the rear of the house but will still be stepped back from the roof edge as shown in the plans. A. Johnson wanted to confirm that the skylight was not visible from the street. S. Makowka noted that he observed (on location) that it is not visible from in front of the house, but will be slightly visible when viewed further up the street but minimally due to the relatively flat roof. Anderson windows are either vinyl or aluminum clad. After discussion, Applicants indicated they are willing to commit to finding all wood windows. A. Johnson would accept proposal with proviso that all materials match the original and be wood. The Applicant noted that the bottom skirt boards and risers on the rear deck do contact the ground and these are requested to be not wood.

A. Johnson moved approval subject to the condition that all wood exterior materials to be used and the monitor to approve materials prior to installation. Seconded by J. Worden. Roll Call Vote – D. Baldwin – y, C. Tee – y, J. Worden – y, P. Chaves – y, A. Johnson – y, B. Melofchik – y, S. Makowka – y. A. Johnson appointed monitor.

- c. **Formal Hearing re: 50 Academy Street re: chimney and window changes.** B. Hoxie presented. D. Baldwin recused himself as an abutter. C. Barry appointed in his absence. The Applicant stated that the existing bathroom window on the side is problematic for interior renovation plans and needs to be replaced if they can remove the chimney that rises through the interior of the house and extends above the roof line on the left.

The Commissioners noted that the existing visible portion of the chimney at top left creates a symmetry to the house. They are okay with remove the portion of the chimney inside the inside house (not subject to our jurisdiction) as long as the Applicant provides a facsimile of the chimney on the roof that replicates the look from exterior. S. Makowka noted that the proposed window to be changed is on the side and is already a different size than other windows on the same façade so he does not have problem with a change but unit should be all wood per the guidelines. B. LaBau said the head height should be the same as the other windows and replicate the top half of the 6 over 2 2<sup>nd</sup> floor window muntin profile.

C. Barry moved approval of application as submitted with the exception that the left-hand chimney be retained above the roofline either as existing or a reproduction using full size brick veneer duplicating profiles flashing brick mortar, etc. to match adjacent chimney, that replacement window be all wood, and that monitor to approve prior to installation. J. Worden seconded. Roll Call – C. Tee – y, C. Barry – y, J. Worden – y, P. Chaves – y, A. Johnson – y, B. Melofchik – y, S. Makowka – y. B. Labau appointed monitor.

- d. **Formal Hearing re: 65 Westminster Ave. (Quadros) for window replacements.** The Applicant stated that all windows are existing vinyl windows and they want to replace these failing non-original windows with Marvin Elevate 4 over 1 wooden windows with aluminum clad exteriors. They will all be exactly the same size. The Commission asked about the existing wood trim and the Applicant stated that they will be repaired where needed and will remain wood casings. Applicant noted that the existing siding is aluminum.

A. Johnson moved to accept application as submitted because the existing windows are vinyl, seconded by D. Baldwin. Roll Call Vote – D. Baldwin – y, C. Tee – y, J. Worden – y, P. Chaves – y, A. Johnson – y, B. Melofchik – y, S. Makowka – y. B. LaBau appointed monitor

- e. **Informal Hearing re: 33 Westminster Ave. (Phillips) for exterior renovations – NOT ABLE TO BE HEARD**
- f. Informal Hearing re: 75 Pleasant St (Boston Church of Christ) for landscape changes – **NOT ABLE TO BE HEARD**

**5. Old Business**

- a. Report from Streetscape sub-committee - **No Report**
- b. Modification of Design Guidelines (Little Libraries, Below Grade Windows) – **No Report**
- c. Joint AHDC/AHC Meeting – **No Report**

**6. Meeting Adjourns at approximately 10:45pm**