

MINUTES OF WELLESLEY HISTORICAL COMMISSION MEETING OF FEB 12 2018.

Present: Members: Grant Brown (Chair), Lawrence McNally (Vice Chair), Michael Racette (Representing Gleysteen), Vicki Schaufler, Rise Shepsle, Robert Carley (representing Goins) and Jake Lilley

Alternate Members: Peter Fergusson, Vin Loccisano, Emily Maitin

Advisory Member: Joshua Dorin

1. Brown called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Great Hall, Wellesley Town Hall.
2. Citizen Speak: No citizens present chose to speak on matters not on the agenda.
3. Public Hearing – Preservation Determination:
97 Russel Rd (Application DR-2017-41)

The owner's, Michelle and Edward Jacob, provided a brief overview of their intention to remove the current dwelling and replace it with a new home.

Claudia Zarazua, Planner, Town of Wellesley Planning Department provided a brief overview of the present property including a finding by the Planning Department that the property should not be deemed preferably preserved. Zarazua noted that the architecture and scale is representative of original period, but the current neighborhood no longer reflects the scale of the original dwellings.

Fergusson questioned the siting of the proposed home and the owners provided information noting that the home presently straddles the south side of property and the Owners seek to move the footprint of the new building such that the newly proposed home is located on the steeper portion of the property closer to the water. The owners note that they have resided at 97 Russel for in excess of twenty years and have consulted extensively with their neighbors regarding their proposed project. Additionally, the Owners made mention of their desire to include some form of vehicle housing (garage or carport) on aspects of the present footprint. Fergusson questioned the scale of the property in view of the proposed siting downhill of the present footprint. Owners expressed that the present home is 840 square feet and their intention is to build two bedroom of approximately 2,700 square feet which is in keeping with those abutting homes. Brown expressed the need to focus on the current home as opposed to what may come next and asked the same of the Commission. Dorin expressed the need to distinguish this area of Russel road from that of the "core section of Russel Road", as this area has seen significant development and the proposal to demolish the home may make sense.

Shepsle questioned those areas of the present home that encroach on town property and it was expressed that the new development will not encroach on town property post development.

Brown notes to those in attendance that the immediate neighbors are very different in architectural style and scale. Brown further requests that Michael Racette represents Gleysteen's vote and Robert Carley represent Goins. Both Racette and Carley agree.

Motion (McNally) to determine that the structure be deemed Not Preferably Preserved (Carley seconded). Vote: 7 - 0 in favor.

The Public Hearing for Application DR-2017-41 was closed.

4. Public Hearing – Preservation Determination:
8 Sabrina Road, (Application DR-2018-03)

Attorney Larry Shind, representing applicant, states his agreement with the staff report and notes that the original house has seen substantial alteration over time. Shind describes the property as a two acre lot having a small outdated house not suitable for expansion. Shind notes that the Owner has participate in a lengthy permitting process prior to the Demolition Delay Bylaw enactment. Said permitting process included both Planning Commission and Large House Review. Shind further recites that delays in selecting a construction firm resulted in the home not being removed prior to the Demolition Delay Bylaw. Shind requests that the home deemed not preferentially preserved.

Brown opens to meeting to neighbors, none of which are present to speak.

Claudia Zarazua, Planner, Town of Wellesley Planning Department provided a brief overview and background of the present property and recites that it is the finding of the Planning Department that the present property should be needed not preferentially preserved. Brown opens to Dorin, who has no pertinent historic background information on the property at 8 Sabrina Road. Dorin notes that this is likely due to the present property being an outlier that was built later in the Sabrina road development. Dorin notes that Sabrina Lake (circa 1870) was a manmade lake and the site of a prior amusement park location. Dorin does not believe this home was part of that development. Shepsle questions those homes surrounding lake and public access to the lake, which resulted in a brief conversation among those members of the Commission.

Brown opens to the Commission, requesting if there are any pertinent questions. There were none.

Brown further notes the interesting collection or architecture of the area, and agrees that the particular property has seen significant development over time thereby making it difficult in determining the originality of the structure in view of the haphazard development over time.

Motion (Shepsle) to determine that the structure be deemed Not Preferably Preserved (McNally seconded). Vote: 7 - 0 in favor.

The Public Hearing for Application DR-2018-03 was closed.

5. Public Hearing – Preservation Determination:
48 Cedar Street (Application DR-2018-04)

Owner Tom Zou provided background of the property as well as his intention to partially demolish aspects of the property such that a two story addition could be added to the existing structure.

Brown opens to floors to any neighbors who may wish to comment. None were present.

Claudia Zarazua, Planner, Town of Wellesley Planning Department provided a summary detailing the proposed partial demolition of present property. Zarazua notes that the originally proposed demolition represent a demolition of 67% of the present home. Applicant is therefore in front of the Commission to request a determination in view of language in the bylaw. Zarazua, and the Planning Department Staff, have determined that the building should not be deemed preferably preserved especially in view of the scope presented in the originally provided plans of demolition.

Brown opens to Michael Zehner of the Town of Wellesley Planning Department, questioning if a determination by the Commission would be certifying that the presented demolition plans are acceptable so long as not substantially altered. Zehner noted that the Commission should make any action contingent on the plans presented thereby allowing the building department to bind plans in view of any minor alterations so long as these alternations are not material.

Lilley questions what is existing vs new as related to the present property. Zarazua provides insight into the proposed addition in view of the presented architectural drawings. Zarazua further provided insight into the size of the original home (as evidenced on the original floorplan) as well as the size and shape of the proposed addition. Zarazua notes that the proposed addition is primarily located toward the rear of the lot and when viewed from Cedar Street, is not particularly visible from the street. A brief discussion on the siting and visibility of the proposed addition ensued.

Zarazua further mentions that the original home was fire damaged and during the restoration process that roofline was repaired and altered. Zarazua confirms that the present home, including the roofline, is not representative of the original as built structure. Racette questions the historic aspects of the present home and neighborhood, after which a brief conversation by the Commission ensued. Carley noted the need to questions what comes next as related to the present property, as the Commission is asked to evaluate a proposed demolition of more than 50% which in turn opens the discussion to what comes next for the property.

Zou notes that the requirement to lower the roof originated with the ZBA. It was these requirements that pushed the proposed demolition beyond 50%.

Brown request additional information relating to the area from Dorin. Dorin provides background on the neighborhood, noting that the area was closely linked to the industrial aspects of Wellesley, circa 1880's. Dorin questions if the home itself was historically significant enough to warrant the question of historic preservation, with the statement that if the home itself is not historically significant the question of preservation in view of partial demolition is moot.

Catherine Johnson shared comments from the ZBA meeting, reciting that the height of the roof of the addition needed to decrease to keep massing relevant to neighborhood and the original structure. Applicant then took this further to reduce the pitch of the original roof as well, thereby prompting the present discussion.

Applicant notes that the ZBA requested the pitch reduction of existing roof, thereby pushing the property teardown percentage to 67% and thereby opening the present discussion with this Commission.

Browns asks Lilley to comment on the original pitch of the roof and if it is historically significant and in keeping with the period. Lilley notes that present pitch, as built, actually serves to make the home visually more pleasing. Lilley notes dropping the eve height actually makes the home appear more 'squat' and notes a drop in the ridge height is detrimental to the presented mass of the structure.

Brown notes that if original pitch and façade of home is left intact, the resulting project will maintain the historic aspects of the home. Zehner notes that keeping the roof pitch would likely reopen the ZBA public hearing as it would not be considered a de-minimis change.

Brown questions why the roof was reduced on the main house and Zehner noted that prior conversations with senior planner Victor Lack resulted in the reduction of the ridge

height of the addition but had little clarity as to why the main home roof pitch was reduced.

Brown then questioned the applicant as to why the main roof pitch was reduced. Applicant states that it was at the request of the ZBA as well as the existing 3rd floor structure is weak given the previous fire damage thereby required a total roof replacement.

Brown questioned the planning board, inquiring if the pitch of the original roof was left the same would this application go back to ZBA. Johnson notes that the ZBA found main house would have been fine if pitch stayed the same and garage wing height was reduced.

Brown describes the current home as architecturally pleasing as it presently stands, and notes that by changing the pitch of the main roof the history of the original building is lost. Brown notes that the current home is historic in nature, and questions Applicant if he is willing to keep the current roof pitch. Brown further notes that if the original home roofline can remain this would in turn make the addition appear smaller in scale.

A brief discussion ensues between McNally and Zehner regarding the timing of the building permit in view of a potential WHC determination to impose 1-year delay.

Carley questions procedural posture and timing, noting that the project came to ZBA on November 2, 2017 as it was preexisting nonconforming lot. At the time the original plan was to keep structure intact and then add. Carley notes that the present property now comes before the WHC based on applicant doing what ZBA suggested, or maybe even over and above what ZBA had requested. Johnson provided insight into the ZBA's request to reduce mass in the garage addition prompting a request for redesign.

Carley expresses concern over the troubling aspects of the present application as it has only come before the present Commission in view of a ZBA meeting.

Brown notes that if the present property is deemed preferably preserved a waiver process could rapidly happen, thereby allowing feedback from the Commission relating to the desire to retain the original roofline. Zehner notes that the applicant could then potentially address the ZBA at a business meeting as opposed to a public hearing.

Motion (Racette) to determine that the structure be deemed Preferably Preserved (McNally seconded). Opposed (Carley) Vote: 6 - 1 in favor of a preferably preserved determination.

The Public Hearing for Application DR-2018-04 was closed

6. Public Hearings- Waiver Review
16 Bay View Rd (DR-2017-31)

The owner's Manager, Mark Heavner, addressed the Commission. The applicant has submitted plans for review incorporating the proposed changes of the Commission from prior meetings. Applicant noted several additional changes beyond this Commission's prior requests. In addition to the comments of Heavner, a set of detailed elevation, site and landscape plans are provided and discussed.

Brown invited comments from any neighbors, none of which were present.

Dorin notes that the staff report for the present application fails to address all prior discussions from prior meetings, including the request from the Commission to review the neighborhood and incorporate changes based on discovery.

Lilley notes his absence at WHC prior meeting, but notes applicant appears to have made all of the proposed changes previously suggested. Lilley briefly discusses the visor above the garage door which results in unresolved view of the front and further speaks to several potential changes. These changes included removing the visor from over the garage doors, pushing the gable to the far edge of the house, and allow hip roof to become the edge of the gable, as opposed to another layer. Lilley further notes two different roof eave types, namely a hip roof and gable roof with rake board condition, and suggests that the applicant simply pick one roof profile for the project. Applicant briefly discussed these changes and appeared willing to incorporate these into the final product. Lilley provided hand drawings to applicant reciting the discussed changes.

Motion (McNally) to issue a waiver in the present application subject to confirmation by the Planning Board that the proposed project in in agreement with the hand drawings provided by Lilley. (Lilley seconded). Opposed (Carley and Schauffler) Vote: 5 - 2 in favor of waiving of the demolition delay subject to final edits to the drawings in keeping with the above as approved by the planning department.

The Public Hearing for Application DR-2017-31 was closed

7. Public Hearings- Waiver Review
11 Pleasant Road (Application DR-2017-11)

Attorney Stanley Brooks, and owner representatives David Brossi and Joseph Brossi addressed the Commission. The Parties made reference to the updated plans submitted to the Commission and attorney Brooks discussed the manner in which the owners had

addressed each of the points of feedback given by the Commission at its January 2018 meeting. Brooks asserts that the changes achieve a design that is a better fit with the other houses at the lower end of Pleasant Street and is hopefully in keeping with prior feedback from the Commissions.

The Commission complimented the applicants for their robust design and detailed plan and noted that the final work product is in keeping with the prior structure and the general area of Pleasant Street.

Brown questioned if changes were made to the eaves, and Applicant noted that eaves are now 12 inches. Dorin questioned if the roof height had been decreased and Applicant confirmed that it has not in view of the pitch changes made to the roof. Brooks confirmed that the height of the proposed design is well below the maximum allowable height.

Lilley states that the present home, as presented, is an asset to the neighborhood and was further complimentary to the design.

Motion (Carley) to issue a waiver in the present application. (Lilley seconded). Vote: 7 - 0 in favor.

The Public Hearing for Application DR-2017-11 was closed

8. Municipal Light Plant: Brown made mention of his prior discussion with the municipal light plant in view of their plans to redevelop the property. Brown notes their eagerness to refurbish the property and their recognition of the need to renovate. The proposed Phase 1 projects relate to window and door replacements. Brown notes that these aspects are in the current fiscal budget. Brown further mentions that phase 2 of this project relates to the repointing of the brickwork. Brown volunteers to act as a conduit between this Commission and the WMLP and further expresses that the WMLP will present plans for review by this Commission.
9. After discussion and review of the draft minutes of the WHC meeting of January 12, 2018, it was moved by McNally, seconded by Shepsle, and passed unanimously (6 - 0), to approve the minutes as amended of the WHC meeting of January 12, 2017. Brown further requested a four month rotation for minute taking, with Carley approving.
10. House Plaque Approvals / House Plaque Research Contract: Dorin commented on the work product of the present team preparing historical research. Dorin notes precision, accuracy and formatting concerns in the presented work product. Dorin expressed that 1,200 structures are presently eligible, with some being more difficult to research than

others. In his opinion, the remaining properties represent more difficult examples in town.

In view of Dorin's comments, Brown suggests requesting an additional 5 properties to confirm precision and accuracy of the provided work product. The WHC will in turn review these next five properties and provide additional feedback, if needed.

11. Update-Town Hall Exterior Project and HHU

Catherine Johnson provided an update on proposed upgrades to the town hall building envelope. Johnson noted the likely requirement for ADA compliance for exterior areas of the town hall.

Johnson additionally discussed Honeywell, Hardy and Upham projects and notes that the projects will likely be divided into two projects. Johnson further mentioned the proposed renovation or enlargement of the bathhouse at Morses Pond especially in view of the prior 2010/2011 renovated. Johnson noted that the recreation department are presently exploring the option to renovate or enlarge the structure and Brown volunteered to find the appropriate contacts such that the involvement of the present Commission is considered.

12. Project Updates:

Beebe Plaque:

McNally expressed that he recently obtained the last draft for the Beebe plaque and upon review by Goins will approach the developer.

Historical Articles and or Awards (e.g. Historic renovation, Historically-Accurate New Construction)

Brown noted that Goins and Gleysteen have been actively working toward various articles suitable for publication in the Townsman. Additionally, Brown noted that he has received nominations for several homes and will circulate a final list soon.

New business

McNally notes the May 20th Veterans Day Parade, and expressed that the parade committee has been advised of the planned attendance of this Commission.

Fergusson noted approval by Wellesley College to allow for a science center replacement in which Skidmore, Owings & Merrill seek to eliminate some features of the 1977 science center including the original entry/exit and associated stairway. Fergusson requests that

the WHC present a letter to Wellesley College stating the architectural significance of the stairway and requesting that it be preserved. Brown agrees.

Motion (McNally) to adjourn. (Carley seconded). Vote: 7 - 0 in favor.

The WHC adjourned at 11:03