

**WELLESLEY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
CALLED MEETING & PUBLIC HEARINGS
SEPTEMBER 1, 2020, 6:45 PM
ONLINE REMOTE MEETING**

Members Present: David Smith, Chair; Pluton Angjeli; Meredith Angjeli; Eric Cohen; Emily Maitin; Thomas Paine; BB Wood.

Staff: Dana Marks, Planner.

Others Present: Duane D. Houghton; Barry Friedman; Valerie Gates; Bethany Smith; Christopher Dallmus; Brian Menna

Call to Order: David Smith called the meeting to order at 6:46pm.

Public Hearing: HDC 20-05 – 57 Cottage Street – Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Smith opened the public hearing for 57 Cottage Street and invited the Applicants to present the proposed project. The homeowners Barry Friedman & Valerie Gates were present, along with Duane D. Houghton of Duane D. Houghton LLC. Mr. Houghton submitted this application on the owners' behalf.

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

Mr. Houghton presented the proposed project to construct a three season porch to the rear of the existing house and match existing materials and finishes. The three season porch would be one story tall and be approximately 18' x 36' coming off of an existing small rear addition. A new patio space would also be created. The roof line would match what currently exists at the rear of the house.

The windows along the walls of the porch would be double-hung Marvin wood windows. A new set of Pella doors would be installed on the porch to match the existing set and lead onto the new patio space. Similar siding and rafter tails present on the rest of the house would also be incorporated into the new porch. Mr. Houghton pointed out that the only "modern" elements of this project would be the three skylights and the windows beneath the rear gable. An existing HVAC unit would be moved to accommodate for the three season porch.

Mr. Cohen asked about the detached garage, and if there were any materials demonstrating how the three season porch would interact with the existing garage. Mr. Houghton pointed to the plot plan, and explained how far out the porch would extend towards the garage – about 25' or 30'. There would be a walkway that connects the two elements.

Within the scope of the project, the applicants are also intending to replace the garage door. Mr. Houghton stated that a wood door is proposed, and the specifications for that door was included in their application package. It is a wood door to match the time period of the garage structure.

Mr. Houghton indicated that they are going with JB Sash & Door to use ultimate double hung Marvin 6-over-1 side by side windows. They are made with pre-primed wood on the interior and exterior, and are about the same size and shape as what is on the front of the existing house. Mr. Cohen noted that these windows are different than what is drawn on the rendering, and would be located on the west, south, and east sides of the porch. Mr. Houghton confirmed this observation, indicating that the rendering does not reflect the specific window to be used, but they want to match windows as closely as possible. Mrs. Angjeli stated that the 6-over-1 window configuration keeps the overall look and feel consistent, and asked about what type of sill would be used. Mr. Houghton stated that it would be an extended sill on both sides to match the exterior trim. Mrs. Angjeli asked about specifications for the gable end windows, which Mr. Houghton indicated would also be manufactured by Marvin with wood and matching exterior trim.

There was some debate among the Commission members as to whether this project read as a three season porch or an addition. Mr. Smith commented that it looked like an addition to the house, and asked to confirm why it was called a three season porch – he pointed to the fact that instead of a foundation it is framed on pilings and that it is not heated. Mr. Houghton explained that it is designed to be a three season room. It will be insulated but will not contain heating. Curtain walls are brought all the way to the ground to keep with the existing look and feel of the house instead of having a large open porch.

Mr. Smith asked about the proposed skylights. Mr. Cohen asked about their specifications, and whether they were “aluminum v-lux.” Mr. Houghton confirmed so however did not have specifications for the skylights. Mr. Cohen asked if it was possible to place the skylights on the other side of the roof pitch. Mr. Houghton stated that the skylight placement was intentional to bring light into the entrances to the interior spaces, which could not get light in through regular windows. Mr. Paine asked about the stretch of wall along the east façade of the proposed porch that does not have any windows beneath two of the proposed skylights. Mr. Houghton explained that the corresponding interior spaces will have built-in cabinets and traditional windows would not be possible.

There was further discussion about the difference between a three season porch and an addition. Mr. Smith stated it seemed more like an addition based on the massing and scale, and it could be more successful if foundation was carried through rather than having siding going all the way down. Mr. Houghton stated that it was designed in this way to mimic the front porch, which also has siding going all the way down. Mr. Cohen stated it is a good idea to capture the character of the front porch in this proposed back porch. Mr. Cohen further stated that from a design point of view there are some elements that have yet to be resolved.

Mrs. Angjeli commented that the massing and use of the space successful, as well as the intention to match existing details and roof pitch. She agreed the project has more of the look and feel of an addition, but that does not affect its ability to connect with the look and feel of the neighborhood. Mrs. Angjeli suggested that the Applicants explore foundation options for the project that would fit it more with other houses within the neighborhood. Mrs. Angjeli further added that including a landscaping plan would be helpful for the Commission to understand context although landscaping is outside of their purview.

Mr. Smith suggested that the Applicants rethink what they really want for the space – either an addition or a three season porch – and delay taking a vote on the application as it was presented this evening. Mr. Cohen stated that the east elevation appeared unresolved due to the large blank void without windows, and suggested it be broken up in some way. Mr. Angjeli agreed about the east elevation, and specifications about the proposed new garage door should be specified. Mr. Cohen added that the concept and massing were going in the right direction, but the design details needed to be further resolved. Mr. Paine added that more contextual site information would be helpful to further understand the project.

The homeowner Ms. Gates explained that the presence of a large existing tree will affect how the project is actually seen, and is different than how it appears in the proposed drawings. Ms. Gates added that their intention for this project is to have a large three season porch that will also create a usable outdoor space with a patio that is not out in the open, and to create a more private outdoor area because their house is located on a corner lot. This project would create a private terrace or alcove that they have not yet had for as long as they have lived in the house.

Mr. Houghton shared that they have an architect on board, but wanted to share the concept drawings with the Commission first to get their comments and feedback, which is what was shared with them prior to this meeting. Mr. Cohen asked for clarification. Mr. Houghton explained that their architect has the concept drawings, and they wanted to get feedback from the Commission first before going back and making any changes and moving forward with the design drawings. Mr. Cohen asked and Mr. Houghton confirmed that these drawings that were presented are the architect's design concept.

Mr. Smith reiterated his suggestion that the Applicants come back with a refined design. Mr. Cohen agreed that the concept and massing are on the right track, and the design just needs to be refined. Ms. Maitin added that when the Applicants come back, they should include plans with dimensions and layouts of what is existing and what is proposed, and that also include the location of the garage.

Ms. Maitin moved to continue the public hearing to the next Commission meeting on October 6, 2020. Mr. Paine seconded the motion. After a roll-call vote, the motion unanimously passed (7-0). The Applicants confirmed that they agree to the continuation.

Public Hearing: HDC 20-06 – 23 Cottage Street – Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Smith opened the public hearing for 23 Cottage Street and invited the Applicants to present the proposed project for an addition to the east with a street-facing shed dormer. Homeowner Bethany Smith and the project architect, Christopher Dallmus of Design Associates, were present.

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

The architect, Mr. Dallmus, presented the proposed addition to the Commission. The project includes extruding the second floor to the east through the soffit of the first floor to create a full 1.5-story gable end. There is an odd window on the second story that does not appear on the interior, and they will also be eliminating that window.

Mr. Dallmus explained the scope of the addition by going through the building elevations, showing the existing and proposed conditions side by side. The east-facing gable end will be extended to meet the soffit of the first-story porch. The proposed shed dormer is sized to match the existing windows on the north elevation and will be an aluminum window from the Pella Architect Series.

Mr. Smith asked about the windows on the wall of the addition that will be extended. Mr. Dallmus explained that they intend to install the existing windows onto the new exterior wall once it is extended, as noted on the plans. Mr. Cohen clarified that the existing windows will be relocated to new surfaces. Mr. Cohen then asked if the first and second story windows will be aligned. Mr. Dallmus answered that they are just pulling them out, and the second story window is certainly aligned and centered. Mr. Dallmus stated that as a condition he is not opposed to making them centered along the ridge. Ms. Smith stated that is what she intended. Ms. Maitin asked about the existing window on the first story and whether it matched any other windows in the house. Mr. Dallmus answered that the sizing is different, and that they intend to reuse it. The Commission asked whether it was possible to make it match the rest of the windows. The Applicant indicated they were open to replacing the window instead of reusing the existing window.

Mr. Dallmus indicated that on the rear elevation there is an existing skylight that will be retained, however it was not denoted on the drawings. Ms. Marks noted that it was unlikely that it is visible from a public view, and Mr. Cohen added that it already exists and won't be changing.

Mr. Cohen further asked for clarification on what type of window is proposed for the shed dormer. Mr. Dallmus answered that it will be a double-hung aluminum Pella Architect Series simulated divided light window. Mr. Cohen confirmed with Ms. Marks to note that the Applicant is matching existing window conditions, and reusing existing windows. Mr. Dallmus confirmed this was the case, however stated that they essentially agreed to replace the existing first floor window with a new 2-over-2 window – if this were the case they would replace the shutters in kind.

Mr. Dallmus stated that all side wall material of the proposed addition will be wood clapboard siding to match the aluminum siding on the rest of the house.

Mr. Smith asked if it was possible for the proposed shed dormer to be bigger to accommodate shutters. Mr. Dallmus answered that it was possible, however it could start to affect the interior floor plan. Mr. Dallmus added that traditionally these types of shed dormers that break through eaves do not have shutters.

Mr. Cohen stated that the new north elevation will look closer to what the house may have looked like in the first place. Mr. Cohen asked if there are any other building elements that aren't included in the application, such as gutters. Mr. Dallmus indicated that there are existing aluminum gutters that will just be continued, and Ms. Smith added that the idea was to just match the existing conditions. Mrs. Angjeli commented that the massing is consistent with the neighborhood and that the windows on the addition to the east should be aligned under the gable end rather than being offset.

Ms. Wood asked for clarification of the siding materials on the front façade. Mr. Dallmus clarified that the existing material is aluminum, and the siding material on the second floor where the addition is to be built will be replaced with wood clapboard. The rest of the existing aluminum siding will remain.

Mr. Cohen moved to approve the design as presented with the following conditions:

- On the east elevation, the second and first floor windows will be centered on the center line of the gable
- The first floor window on the east elevation will be replaced with a 2-over-2 window
- Any replacement shutters will match the material and design of existing shutters, including new shutters on the new first floor window that will match the other existing shutters
- Any new window trim will match existing window trim
- Any new trim will be wood to match existing trim
- Windows to be Pella to match existing Pella windows
- Any new gutters to match existing
- New clapboard on the new addition will be wood

Mr. Paine seconded the motion. After a roll-call vote, the motion unanimously passed (7-0), thus granting Bethany Smith a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed addition and new shed dormer at 23 Cottage Street.

Preliminary Project Review – 30 Cottage Street – Proposed change in condenser location on previously approved plot plan. Ms. Marks gave a brief summary about the project at 30 Cottage Street that previously was approved by the Commission. The approved plot plan did not have the location of an HVAC condenser unit, and an updated plot plan now indicates where the condenser will be located. The homeowner Mr. Menna was present to further explain that the omission of the condenser location in the approved plan was an oversight, that they intend to place the condenser on the side of the house near the bulkhead, and that he respected the review process of the Commission. Ms. Marks indicated that the Commission should determine whether or not this would require a new application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Cohen stated that if it is a structure above the ground that is visible from a public way, then they should go through the process as outlined in the Bylaw. Mrs. Angjeli agreed with Mr. Cohen and commented that the Commission should be consistent with going through the process for all appropriate projects.

The Commission indicated that Mr. Menna should submit a new application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to get formal approval for the location of the condenser.

Approval of Minutes. Prior to the meeting, Ms. Marks circulated a draft of minutes from the previous Commission meeting on July 7, 2020. Ms. Maitin made a motion to accept the July 7 minutes as presented. Ms. Wood seconded the motion. After a roll-call vote, the Commission unanimously (6-0) approved the July 7 minutes. Mr. Smith abstained from voting due to his absence on July 7.

Looking Ahead: Historic Preservation Design Guidelines Draft & Fall Public Hearing. Mr. Smith asked for an update on the Design Guidelines Draft and where it was posted and available online. Ms. Marks shared with the Commission where it was posted on the Town website within the Historic District

Commission pages, and elaborated that this could be a space to continually update with more information about the document and its eventual public hearing.

The Commission decided to set a date for the public hearing to approve the guidelines as a reference and guiding document on December 1, 2020. Ms. Maitin noted that this would give plenty of time for official and unofficial noticing and public outreach.

Citizen Speak. No one was present for Citizen Speak.

Executive Session pursuant to: M.G.L. ch. 30A, § 21(a)(7) – To comply with, or act under the authority of, any general or special law or federal grant-in-aid requirements. Specifically: Review the draft Executive Session minutes of February 4, 2020 for approval and release. Mr. Smith made a motion to enter into Executive Session under Purpose 7, to review the draft Executive Session minutes from February 4, 2020 to determine whether they are ripe for release, in compliance with the Open Meeting Law, and then to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Maitin seconded the motion. After a roll-call vote, the Commission unanimously (7-0) voted to go into Executive Session and then adjourn the meeting.

Adjourn. Mr. Smith adjourned the meeting at 9:10pm.

Next Meeting: October 6, 2020

Minutes Approved: October 6, 2020

Minutes Compiled by: Dana Marks, Planner

A full recording of this meeting can be viewed through www.wellesleymedia.org.