

**WELLESLEY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
CALLED MEETING & PUBLIC HEARINGS  
APRIL 7, 2020, 6:45 PM  
ONLINE REMOTE MEETING**

---

**Members Present:** David Smith, Chair; Eric Cohen; Emily Maitin; Thomas Paine.

**Staff:** Dana Marks, Planner.

**Others Present:** Meredith Angjeli; Pluton Angjeli; Beth DeSombre; Jennifer Lee; Mark Lee.

**Call to Order:** David Smith called the meeting to order at 6:50pm.

---

**Public Hearing – HDC 20-01 – 32 Weston Road – Certificate of Appropriateness (Continued).** Mr. Smith invited Beth DeSombre to describe the updated portico design at 32 Weston Road, which was the subject of the continued Public Hearing from the Commission meeting on February 4, 2020.

*All documents from the Commission meeting are on file in the Planning Department.*

Ms. DeSombre described the revised design. The side panels from the original proposal were removed. The stoop will be made of bluestone. No gutter or downspout will be present on the portico, however there will be a zinc-coated copper drip edge to direct water flow away from the front entrance.

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the portico design as shown on the revised plan A8 entitled “Proposed Portico Details,” prepared by Howland Architecture Studio, dated February 18, 2020. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Following a roll-call vote, the Commission unanimously (4-0) approved the portico design, therefore fully granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for HDC 20-01 – 32 Weston Road.

---

**Public Hearing – HDC 20-02 – 10 Waban Street – Certificate of Appropriateness.** Mr. Smith opened the Public Hearing regarding the proposed fence replacement at 10 Waban Street, and invited Jennifer and Mark Lee to describe the scope of the project.

*All documents from the Commission meeting are on file in the Planning Department.*

Mr. and Mrs. Lee explained that they would like to replace their existing fence with a new one. Based on the aesthetic of the house and their past experience with the Commission, they wanted to request to use the “Mt. Vernon” style, which had been discussed at earlier meetings, and they think it is a better fit for the house. A picture and specifications of the proposed new fence were included in the Lee’s application.

Mr. Cohen asked when the existing fence was installed. The Applicants answered that it had been roughly 20 years ago. Mr. Smith also noted by the Commission that a letter of support was independently submitted for this project by a neighbor.

Mr. Cohen made a motion to approve the new “Mt. Vernon” style fence as proposed. Ms. Maitin seconded the motion. Following a roll-call vote, the Commission unanimously (4-0) approved the motion, therefore granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for HDC 20-02 – 10 Waban Street.

---

**Public Hearing – HDC 20-03 – 10 Cottage Street – Certificate of Appropriateness.** Mr. Smith opened the Public Hearing for the proposed chimney removal and window replacements in the rear section of the house at 10 Cottage Street, and invited Meredith and Pluton Angjeli to describe the scope of the project.

*All documents from the Commission meeting are on file in the Planning Department.*

Mr. Smith asked if the rear windows were visible from a public way. Mrs. Angjeli stated that they were partially visible from a public way. Mr. Smith then turned the discussion to the chimney, which the Applicants intend to remove and not replace.

Mr. and Mrs. Angjeli first explained to the Commission the scope of the chimney removal and their reasoning for proposing this portion of the project. The existing chimney in the rear wing of their house is not in use and is in a state of disrepair. There is pervasive water damage which has weakened the integrity of the chimney itself. The Applicants have spoken to a number of masons, whose recommendations were either to completely remove the chimney, or to take down the existing chimney and completely rebuild it. The Angjelis intend to remove the rear chimney and patch the roof to match the rest of the roof because it is the more cost-effective solution and they do not use the chimney.

Mr. Cohen asked if the water leakage is coming from inside of the chimney or from the flashing around the chimney where it hits the roof. The Applicants answered that water damage is coming from both sources. Mr. Angjeli explained that in addition to the water damage, the integrity of the chimney and the bricks themselves is no longer intact.

Ms. Maitin asked if the Applicants knew how old the chimney and the rear portion of the house was, to which the Applicants indicated they were unsure. Ms. Marks indicated there were no building permits on file for such an addition. Mrs. Angjeli shared that there was extensive work done in the 1980s, however it did not include an addition. Mr. Cohen commented that it looks quite old, and his preference would be to leave old chimneys intact even if they are no longer in use or functional. Ms. Maitin agreed.

Mr. and Mrs. Angjeli reiterated that they had consulted with a number of roofers and masons who indicated that the structural integrity of the chimney is compromised and is now a hazard. As homeowners they want to mitigate the water damage, which is now starting to have an impact on more of the structure of the house. They added that they will still have one chimney on the main front portion of their house, and believed that it would still fit in with the surrounding district. They are proposing to remove the chimney completely because it is the most cost-effective solution to mitigate the situation, they also intend to do so in a way that the house will stay consistent with the rest of the Cottage Street Historic District.

Mr. Smith commented that since the rear chimney is deteriorating and there is a more prominent chimney on the main house, he has no issue with removing the rear chimney, especially because it is also a safety hazard. Mr. Paine agreed.

The Commission then moved on to discuss the window replacement portion of the proposed project. The Applicants provided specifications for the Marvin Architecture Series wood windows they intend to use. Mrs. Angjeli explained that the existing aluminum windows are also leaking and damaged. They are not original to the house and most likely installed during an extensive renovation in the 1980s. The Applicants intend to replace the existing aluminum windows in their entirety with wood windows to be consistent with the rest of the house. All of the Marvin replacement windows would have a 2-over-1 sash configuration to emphasize that consistency. The Commission was comfortable with the window replacements as proposed.

The Commission returned to the subject of the chimney. Ms. Maitin asked the Applicants if they believed that they had consulted enough people to try to resolve the issue by preserving the exterior of the structure. The Applicants answered that this was their first idea, but the advice of professionals indicated that the weight of the chimney is too much to be supported by the existing structure and preservation would be a big undertaking. The current state of the chimney would mean the only feasible option would be a complete rebuild, and the brick condition is too far gone to be re-used in such a rebuild.

Based on the information that the Applicants shared, Ms. Maitin stated that she would reluctantly approve the chimney removal. Mr. Cohen also reluctantly agreed; chimneys in old houses are hard to treat and mitigate issues. Mr. Smith was not opposed to a chimney removal because it serves no utility purpose and is located on the rear addition of the house.

Mr. Cohen made a motion to approve the replacement windows as proposed with the condition that they match the rest of the house with a 2-over-1 sash configuration, and are wood Marvin Architect Series Windows, and that the Applicants can remove the rear chimney and patch the roof with a suggestion that if they can do something to mitigate the water or other damage in the chimney in a reasonable way, then that would be appreciated. Mr. Paine seconded the motion. After a roll-call vote, the Commission unanimously (4-0) approved the motion, therefore granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for HDC 20-03 – 10 Cottage Street.

---

**Approval of Minutes.** Prior to the meeting, Ms. Marks circulated drafts of minutes from past Commission meetings on February 4, 2020, and February 26, 2020. Ms. Maitin made a motion to approve the February 4 and February 26 minutes. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. After a roll-call vote, the Commission unanimously (4-0) approved the two sets of minutes.

---

**Review and Approval of Proposed FY2021 Submittal & Meeting Calendar.** Mr. Smith moved to approve the FY2021 schedule as prepared by Ms. Marks. Mr. Paine seconded the motion. After a roll-call vote, the Commission unanimously (4-0) approved the calendar for the upcoming fiscal year.

---

**HDC Vacancies.** The Historic District Commission currently has three vacancies. Three individuals submitted applications to join the Commission. Two applicants, Mr. and Mrs. Angjeli, were present to meet with the Commission.

Mr. Smith thanked the applicants for their interest in joining the Commission. Mr. Smith explained the composition and purpose of the Commission in order to maintain the character of the Town's historic districts.

Mr. Cohen asked why the both wanted to join the Commission. Mr. Angjeli answered that when they heard that the Commission currently had only four members, they were aware and experienced the effect of a meeting needing to be pushed back due to a lack of a quorum. They wanted to do their part to try to have as many seats as possible on the Commission filled, and also to share their different perspectives in reviewing proposals and projects in the future. Mr. Cohen then asked if they would be okay serving for a three-year term. The Angjelis answered affirmatively.

Ms. Maitin asked if two people from the same household had ever been on the same board or committee at the same time in the past. Ms. Marks replied that she would investigate whether or not this was allowed would let the Commission know. Any new members appointed to the Commission would be required to review and comply with the Open Meeting Law and the Conflict of Interest Law.

---

**Citizen Speak.** No one was present for Citizen Speak.

---

**Adjourn.** Mr. Smith adjourned the meeting at 8:02pm.

---

**Next Meeting:** May 5, 2020

**Minutes Approved:** May 5, 2020

**Minutes Compiled by:** Dana Marks, Planner