

Historic District Commission Public Hearing Minutes – September 8, 2020

Time: 7:36 p.m. – 10:56 p.m.

Members Present: Ben Franklin, Chair; Jer Jurma; Sylvia Belkin, alternate; Richard Smith; Ingrid Strong

Members Absent: Andrew Steingiser

Location: Virtual Meeting

The public hearing was video recorded.

Agenda:

CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

- a. **20HDC-49 (85 Walker Road)** – Request to replace basement door, replace exposed corkboard wall, replace lattice walls with lattice arches, remove plastic handrail from staircase, remove all asphalt roofing on dormers, replace exterior light. (Parcel ID: 16-80). Ian Toof, applicant & homeowner, was present.

Mr. Toof explained the scope of work he is performing on property. Stated that the dormers are on hold as he is looking to install cedar shakes there. He would also like to paint the three garage doors the same color as the house but will not be making any structural adjustments.

The main concern of the Commission is the shingling; Mr. Toof explained that the current shingles are hard to come by.

The Commission asked for the shingles on the porch to match the main shingles and for the exterior lightbulb to be a warm incandescent hue.

There was no public comment.

MOTION: S. Belkin to approve the COA with the following conditions: the wood shingles on the dormer are to match the pattern of those on the main floor; the lighting of the new sconce to be a warm incandescent hue. Seconded by R. Smith; unanimously approved.

- b. **20HDC-51 (47 Mountwood Road)** – Request to repair existing rotted front porch, stairs and columns, replace iron rail with wood baluster, widen distance between handrails by six inches, add lattice work underneath porch. Design is inspired by favorite surrounding homes and aligns with characteristics of district. (Parcel ID: 15-27C). Justin and Kate DeRosa, applicants & homeowners, were present.

Kate explained the scope of proposed work and the rotting conditions of the porch.

J. Jurma's main concern that rail height would change with addition of boxes.

Along with guidance from Commission, Justin and Kate decided on second design proposal that shows the columns from top to bottom, no boxes included.

There was no public comment.

MOTION: J. Jurma to approve the COA with the following conditions: design proposal includes uninterrupted columns; wooden rail; and columns would be of wood or paintable fiberglass. Seconded by S. Belkin; unanimously approved.

- c. **20HDC-52 (60 Andrew Road)** – Request to replace six windows, none of which are original to the house, and are currently being held with ropes. (Parcel ID: 1-63). Dylan Sellberg, application & homeowner, was present.

J. Jurma determined, through the existence of the rope and pulley system that holds the windows, that these are in fact the original windows. The windows appear to be in good shape, and typically they can be maintained rather than having to be replaced entirely. Furthermore, window restoration is much more cost-effective than a full-scale replacement. What was being shown in the photos is not necessarily in need of replacement. S. Belkin noted that these windows could be beautiful if restored properly, and I. Strong stated that restoration is more durable than replacement.

There was no public comment.

MOTION: J. Jurma to deny COA, as windows are in fact historic. Seconded by S. Belkin; unanimously approved.

- d. **20HDC-43 (41 Paradise Road)** – Request to install eleven solar lights on fence posts. (Parcel ID: 1-38). Amy and Matt Mastrogiacomo, applicants & homeowners, were present.

Amy explained that the immediate area surrounding their home is very dark at night, especially during months in which tree leaves block light from the streetlights.

R. Smith stated that these particular lights appear to be more accent pieces rather than anything functional.

J. Jurma noted that cap lights were not written into the guidelines because they did not exist when guidelines were written. Therefore, any decision made on this petition would set precedent for future similar petitions.

The Commission discussed whether there were alternative lighting fixtures.

There was no public comment.

Commission moved to continue COA following site visit by J. Jurma.

- e. **20HDC-54 (173 Redington Street)** – Request to replace six windows, none of which are original to the home. (Parcel ID: 4-123). Karen Murphy, applicant & homeowner, was present.

Ms. Murphy explained the scope of the work, and was originally under the impression that all windows were replacements but is now second-guessing those in the kitchen after hearing the petition of Dylan Sellberg.

B. Franklin suggested reaching out to a restoration company for the kitchen windows.

There was no public comment.

MOTION: R. Smith to approve the COA for the side windows, approve CONA for rear-facing windows, and deny COA for the kitchen windows; seconded by S. Belkin, unanimously approved.

2. Other Business

- a. Discussion of Potential Violations at Andrew's Memorial Chapel

B. Franklin introduces Deb and Marilyn from Andrew's Memorial Chapel Committee. They explain the scope of the wooden structure that was built on cemetery property into which a portable restroom would be

installed. Deb stated that the wood was stained to match the façade of the chapel. The chapel currently does not have a restroom facility, and if one is unable to be installed, then this would be the next best option. Having a restroom allows for the chapel to be rented and host various functions.

An application will be filed by the Department of Public Works and a formal hearing will be conducted in October. J. Jurma stated that he would be happy to tour the site with Gino Cresta, Director of DPW.

b. Approval of August meeting minutes

MOTION: R. Smith to approve the minutes from 8/3; seconded by J. Jurma; unanimously approved.

Meeting adjourned at 10:56 pm.