

Historic District Commission Public Hearing Minutes – February 1, 2021

Time: 7:31 PM – 9:56 PM

Members Present: Ben Franklin, Richard Smith, Jer Jurma, Ingrid Strong, Andrew Steingiser

Members Absent: Sylvia Belkin

Location: Virtual Meeting - the public hearing was video recorded.

Agenda:

CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

- a. **21HDC-03 (391 Humphrey St)** – Request to repair front entrance doors and bathroom doors of Fish House for the Town of Swampscott. (Parcel ID: 19-278A). Molly O’Connell, Town Planner and Steve Melke, Architect, were present.

Ms. O’Connell provided the introduction to the petition and Mr. Melke followed by providing the specific details regarding the doors.

Commissioner Jurma appreciated that the door pattern for the entrance to the yacht club would be different than those designated for the bathrooms, which was not the case before. Presented it is room for opportunity while maintaining stylistic and architectural integrity.

MOTION: J. Jurma to approve petition with conditions below. R. Smith seconds; unanimously approved.

1. Exterior door #2 (as designated on plan) is to have window design that matches door above
2. Glazing of windows is subject to approval by Commission, at separate meeting, upon submission of samples

- b. **21HDC-01 (25 Outlook Rd)** – Request to replace a total of six, existing non-original, vinyl windows and one Velux roof window, with new, identical windows. (Parcel ID: 4-25). Edith Harmon Weiss, applicant and homeowner, was present.

Replacement windows to be double-hung, Andersen 400 series. Velux window replacement is to be identical with manual handle that allows window to be operable, as current window is not. Work is simply maintenance without any visible difference.

MOTION: J. Jurma to approve Certificate of Appropriateness for application as submitted. I. Strong seconds; unanimously approved.

- c. **21HDC-02 (17 Andrew Rd)** – Request to remove secondary chimney and subsequently patch roof with existing roofing materials. (Parcel ID: 5-110). Stephen Walnut & Jennifer Donovan, applicants and homeowners, were present.

Secondary chimney serves to power boiler for the house, but once removed, there would be a power vent of PVC tubes to the left of the home toward the rear.

MOTION: J. Jurma to approve Certificate of Appropriateness with condition listed below. R. Smith seconds; unanimously approved.

1. The new power vent to be installed at rear of left side of home and be further concealed by vegetation

- d. **21HDC-04 (14 Devens Rd)** – Request to replace current storm windows with new, Harvey wood and weather-resistant windows. (Parcel ID: 4-98). Maura Sutherland, applicant and homeowner, was present.

M. Sutherland clarified that these originals are new to the home, and would be replaced by double-hung, Majesty wood windows by Harvey. She shared pictures of her current windows, stated that they are over 100 years old, are drafty, and not all of them are in full use. Has recently been unable to open some of her windows.

Chairman Ben Franklin stated that the Commission typically encourages applicants to seek restoration of original windows. M. Sutherland stated that she had not considered that option because regardless of what she does with the interior windows, the exterior storm windows would still have to be replaced. She is simultaneously increase window efficiency while maintaining aesthetics.

It was determined that only half of the windows in question are subject to the purview of the HDC, as the remaining windows are rear-facing. For the remaining, front-facing windows, the Commission consulted the bylines to indicate to Ms. Sutherland that the windows do need to be in a condition that is considered “beyond reasonable repair”. Ms. Sutherland reiterated that due to the necessity of replacing the exterior storm windows, it would be more cost-effective and energy efficient to seek full replacement of the windows rather than restoration.

The discussion continued, with the Commission of the opinion that the windows did not appear to be beyond reasonable repair, and Ms. Sutherland maintaining that her windows lack enough functionality to allow for full replacement and not restoration. It was determined that Ms. Sutherland, rather than seeking a replacement, could proceed with a “new construction,” with windows provided Andersen.

MOTION: R. Smith to continue petition to special meeting on 2/17/21. I. Strong seconds; unanimously approved.

- e. **21HDC-05 (121 Greenwood Ave)** – Request to construct two-story, wood-framed addition at rear of home, six feet of which will be seen from public way. (Parcel ID: 19-70) Applicant and homeowners, Mimi and Steven Spillane, were present.

The Commission viewed the plans submitted by the architect, but were concerned that there was no final rendering of the addition as it would look when built with the house. The Commission therefore struggled to visualize how the addition would actually look, and therefore could not come to any decision.

Mr. and Mrs. Spillane were concerned because they had already had the addition approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals, and had listed on their application to the HDC all of the design specifications which would match the existing characteristics of their house.

J. Jurma said that the architect should have provided them all along with a final rendering, and is doing a disservice in not doing as such. He stated that they should not be charged anything extra to have a rendering drawn up, as it should have been included in the first place. Following submission of a rendering, the Commission can make a decision, as they need to have a document in the applicant’s file that serves as the basis for their decision.

MOTION: R. Smith to continue petition to special meeting on 2/17/21. I. Strong seconds; unanimously approved.

MOTION: J. Jurma to approve minutes from January 3, 2021. I. Strong seconds; unanimously approved.