

**WELLESLEY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
CALLED MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
NOVEMBER 5, 2019, 6:45 PM
GREAT HALL – WELLESLEY TOWN HALL**

Members Present: Lisa Abeles, acting as Chair; Edwina McCarthy; Emily Maitin; Thomas Paine. **Absent:** David Smith; Eric Cohen; Amy Griffin.

Staff: Dana Marks, Planner.

Others Present: Warren Borgen; Peter Crabtree; David Himmelberger; Rick Klemmer; Sara Klemmer; Jared Powell; Chris Royer; Erin Springhorn; Mark Vaccaro.

Call to Order: Lisa Abeles called the meeting to order at 6:52pm.

Public Hearing HDC 19-05 – 638 Washington Street - Certificate of Appropriateness, Retroactive. Ms. Abeles introduced the first order of business, the difference in as built conditions of 638 Washington Street compared to plans previously approved by the Historic District Commission. Mr. Crabtree and Mr. Himmelberger were present.

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

Ms. Abeles presented pictures she took of 638 Washington Street. The Historic District Commission was also provided Planning Staff photos taken on October 22, 2019, in reaction to Ms. Abeles' concerns. The inconsistencies were listed and provided to Mr. Crabtree:

- The gutter is not returning on the front elevation at the tips of the big central triangle.
- The central ventral roof vent on the front elevation is not done as drawn.
- The further bay on the driveway side does not have the flat roof proposed.
- The two second floor side dormers have two windows rather than three.
- The front brackets are wrong.

Mr. Crabtree spoke to the further bay window on the side. Ms. Abeles noted that it does not have the proposed flat roof indicated in the drawings, however Mr. Crabtree noted that it was previously discussed and agreed to be slightly pitched and receding into the main roof. Ms. Abeles stated that they can go back and check the minutes because that may be correct although she did not remember.

Regarding the second floor dormers, Ms. Abeles stated that the drawings she used to check the current construction conditions had a triple window in the drawings they approved rather than the double window that is present. Mr. Crabtree explained that the drawing set submitted for Large House Review had a triple window, and the drawings submitted to the Historic District Commission had a double window. Mr. Crabtree stated that both he and the Planning Department noticed this discrepancy, and went back through minor revisions for the Large House Review to change the official drawing set from triple windows back to double windows, and such changes to the Large House Review removed the discrepancy.

Regarding the gutter on the front of the house, Ms. Abeles noted that the drawings show that there should be a return below the front roof triangle, and that this element is important. Ms. Abeles stated that instead of having the gutter return, it runs straight across, but there needs to be a return.

Regarding the brackets on the front elevation, Ms. Abeles stated that the brackets are much longer in the elevation drawings previously approved, and the brackets currently on the house are smaller and do not look at all like the drawing. Ms. Abeles referred to photographs to show the discrepancy.

Mr. Crabtree said that the architect's detail called for a 25" bracket, and they put in a 24" bracket to most closely match what the architect had drawn in detail. Ms. Abeles repeated that the brackets do not look like the elevation, and the elevation drawings are what the Historic District Commission previously approved. Ms. Abeles added that the bracket in the drawing is a different shape than the bracket on the building; it looks wrong and needs to be fixed.

Mr. Himmelberger noted that the difference in the appearance of the brackets could be partially due to the banding on the house being deeper than drawn. Ms. Abeles commented that this was part of the problem, and they should have come to the Historic District Commission about that discrepancy as well. Ms. Abeles demonstrated using elevation drawings to show the discrepancies and repeated that the brackets need to be fixed.

Mr. Himmelberger asked to clarify the issue of the return on the gutter. The issue comes from the fact that the facades are on the same plane. Ms. Abeles replied that the front-facing triangular roof should have been projecting a few inches past the perpendicularly-pitched roof in order to get the gutter to return. Ms. Abeles said that the gutter return could and should still be accomplished.

Ms. Abeles stated that these two issues – the gutter return and the bracket – are important to the character of the house and must be addressed. Ms. Abeles said they are not acceptable as built and must match what was drawn.

Regarding the issue of the roof vent on the front elevation, Ms. Abeles stated that it is both in the wrong position and is the wrong proportion. Ms. Abeles referenced that in the drawing it is longer and narrower than what was put in, and it was not put in in the right place. Mr. Crabtree replied that it is the exact measurement that is on the drawings.

Mr. Himmelberger said that they do not take issue with the location discrepancy, but believed it was an 18" x 30" dimension, as indicated in the drawings. Mrs. Abeles, Mr. Crabtree, Ms. Maitin, and Mr. Paine discussed the size and depth of the vent. Mr. Crabtree asked that if the vent is indeed 18" x 30", would that be an acceptable size. Ms. Abeles said yes. Mr. Crabtree went on to say that if the vent is not 18" x 30", he will get a vent that is 18" x 30", and he will relocate it down. Ms. Abeles said that was acceptable. Ms. Abeles requested that Mr. Crabtree give the Historic District Commission a picture of the vent with a measuring tape on it to confirm the dimensions when they take it out to relocate it on the front façade.

Mr. Crabtree clarified on the gutter return that the Historic District Commission wanted a 3” return. Ms. Abeles confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Paine commented on the face board on the top of the first story above the windows as built compared to the drawings. The drawings show at least one or two rows of clapboard between the top of the windows and the start of the face board, however this did not happen in construction. Mr. Crabtree presented the building permit set of drawings to the Historic District Commission. Mr. Paine and Ms. Abeles saw and stated that this set shows the dropped down face board.

Ms. Abeles made a motion to approve the following:

- The longer fascia (face board) above the window is not an issue
- The two windows rather than three in the second floor dormers are not an issue
- The roof above the bay window on the driveway side is not an issue
- The central vent will be moved down to the position shown on the drawings; a photograph will be sent to the Historic District Commission with a measuring tape on it to show the size of the vent as 18” x 30”
- The gutter returns will be done as shown on the drawings with a 3” return at the large triangular gable on the front of the house
- The brackets will be redone to reflect the elevations – the length and profile of the brackets should reflect what is drawn in the elevations

Mr. Paine seconded the motion. The Historic District Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to approve these conditions.

Public Hearing HDC 19-09 – 126 Woodlawn Avenue - Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Abeles introduced the public hearing for HDC 19-09 – 126 Woodlawn Avenue, where the owners have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the gutters on the Fiske House. Dr. Erin Springhorn, the applicant, and Mr. Vaccaro, a representative from G.F. Sprague, were present to speak on the matter.

All documents from the Commission Meeting are on file in the Planning Department

Dr. Springhorn stated that they are planning to take off the existing copper gutters and replace them with a copper gutter attached to the house of a different size to accommodate the amount of water coming off of the roof.

Ms. Abeles asked if the profile will be the same on a larger gutter. Mr. Vaccaro answered that the profile is different. The current gutters are a “half-round,” which is very shallow, and the new proposed gutter is a bigger profile that can handle a larger volume of water.

Ms. Abeles then asked if they are going to use aluminum downspouts rather than copper downspouts. Dr. Springhorn answered that they are going to use aluminum downspouts. It was unclear what types of gutters and downspouts were previously on the house before the current installation.

Dr. Springhorn said she would like to know what color downspouts she should install. Ms. McCarthy said that whatever is in the picture from 2015 should be used because that is when she believed the house was

made into a Historic District. Ms. Maitin's recollection of the photos is that the downspouts were white, and there was not the contrast between the gutter and the downspout, and therefore the gutters and downspouts should stay white. Mr. Paine agreed.

Ms. Maitin asked if Dr. Springhorn had a photo of what was on the house before what is currently on the house. Ms. Abeles said that there was a half-round gutter, and stated that what Dr. Springhorn is proposing is similar to a half-round. Mr. Vaccaro explained that this proposed gutter has a bigger trough and will hold a lot more water. Dr. Springhorn added that there will also be a slightly bigger downspout.

Ms. Abeles asked to clarify if the sample shows the box connector between the gutter and the downspout. Mr. Vaccaro answered affirmatively that this sample is the outlet. Ms. Abeles asked how they are separating the aluminum from the copper. Mr. Vaccaro answered that they use "Rocket Tape" to avoid the galvanic reaction between the two metals.

Ms. Maitin asked if the downspouts are going to be round. Mr. Vaccaro answered that they will not be round – they will be 3" x 4". Ms. Abeles asked if the downspouts are currently round. Dr. Springhorn answered that they are not circular, they are in a rounded square shape. Mr. Vaccaro elaborated on the reasons for the proposed shape. Currently the house has an underground capture system for the water to remove it and get it away from the property. If you have a round downspout they do not have a cleanout system for that built into the round. They do have that system for a 3" x 4" so you can capture the dirt and debris and it does not ruin the dry wells.

Ms. Maitin said that the proposed new look is drastically different and asked if it was possible to get larger downspouts that are round. Mr. Vaccaro answered that it was possible to have round downspouts, however without the cleanouts, which act like a filter that catches the debris while the water keeps going.

Ms. Abeles made a motion to approve the proposed copper gutter, copper gutter connector profile and a 3" x 4" rectangular downspout to be finished in white and made of aluminum with the proper connectors. Ms. McCarthy seconded the motion. The Historic District Commission voted (3-1) to approve the gutter replacement and grant a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Maitin had the one dissenting vote, stating she was in favor of everything except for the downspouts.

Public Hearing HDC 19-04 - 29 Cottage Street - Certificate of Appropriateness, Continued. Ms. Abeles introduced the continuation of the public hearing for HDC 19-04 – 29 Cottage Street. Mr. Borgen and Mr. Royer were present.

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

Mr. Royer requested that the public hearing be continued for the next month's meeting. Ms. Abeles then made a motion that at the request of the homeowner of 29 Cottage Street, the Historic District Commission will continue the public hearing to their next meeting on Tuesday, December 3, 2019. Mr. Paine seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (4-0) to continue the public hearing.

Public Hearing HDC 19-08 – 33 Cottage Street - Certificate of Appropriateness, Continued. Ms. Abeles introduced the continuation of the public hearing for HDC 19-08 – 33 Cottage Street. Mr. Powell, a representative from Pella Windows, and the homeowners, Mr. and Mrs. Klemmer, were present.

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

Mr. Klemmer introduced himself and addressed questions that arose at the previous Historic District Commission meeting.

Ms. Abeles asked if they intended this to be the replacement of just the window sash, or the entire window frame. Mr. Klemmer answered that he would like to avoid doing the entire window frame. Ms. Abeles stated that if all they do is put a replacement sash in, it will no longer look historic because it will be a frame within a frame.

Ms. Abeles said that the issues Mr. Klemmer has with his windows could be repaired rather than replaced. Mr. Klemmer understood that is a possibility. Ms. Abeles said he could repair the windows and get a high-functioning storm window.

Ms. Abeles believed that Mr. Klemmer has two options. The first option is to take the whole window out and replace it with a whole new window. The second option is repairing the windows that they have and putting a decent storm window on it.

Mr. Klemmer stated that they can go the suggested route and find out if they can repair the existing windows.

Mr. Klemmer asked to clarify which windows on the house were in question. Ms. Abeles explained that any windows that are visible from a public way are applicable. Ms. Maitin added that they can be visible from a public way behind the property as well. Mr. Klemmer commented that that is very subjective and would need someone from the Historic District Commission to say what is or is not okay. Ms. Abeles said that they could have someone from the Historic District Commission go walk past the house and see which windows are visible from a public way.

Mr. Klemmer stated that they would like to request a continuance until further information is gathered. Ms. Abeles made a motion to grant the applicant a continuance to give the applicant time to research repairing the existing windows and adding storm windows, and to look at options for replacement as well. Ms. McCarthy seconded the motion. The Historic District Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to grant a continuation to their next meeting on Tuesday, December 3, 2019.

Approval of Minutes. Minutes from past meetings listed below were circulated among members of the Historic District Commission for review and approval:

- January 16, 2019
- February 5, 2019
- March 6, 2019
- March 13, 2019
- April 4, 2019
- May 7, 2019
- May 28, 2019
- September 3, 2019
- October 1, 2019

With so few members present that were also present at past meetings, Ms. Abeles stated that they would postpone approving minutes until their next meeting.

Historic Preservation Design Guidelines Discussion. Ms. Marks shared Planning Department staff goals for completing the Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. Ms. Marks stated that she had circulated a full draft to the Commission for review, and her goal is to compile all of their comments and edits into one marked-up copy to forward to the consultant.

Ms. Maitin and Ms. Abeles suggested that the Commission have a meeting dedicated solely to the Design Guidelines to discuss their thoughts. Ms. Abeles further suggested that Ms. Marks poll the Commission to find dates that could work for such a meeting in January or February.

Adjourn. Ms. Abeles moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Maitin seconded the motion, and the Historic District Commission unanimously (4-0) voted to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 8:22pm.

Next Meeting: December 3, 2019

Minutes Approved: December 3, 2019

Minutes Compiled by: Dana Marks, Planner