

Members Present: P. Halpern (PH) S. Wagner (SW), H. Stone (HS), M. Burnett (MB), K. Scadden (KS) A. Aydelott (AA), J. Thompson (JT)  
Staff Present: C.Zale (CZ)

Location: online

Attendees: Adrinne Giske, Lori Hess, Laurie Bent, Alicia Primer

See attached Demolition Delay Review Summary on Page 3 - 7

SW called meeting to order @ 7:03pm and read an open meeting law disclaimer from the Governor regarding open meetings.

**Agenda Item:**

**1. Public Comments:** Adrinne Giske noted how good the plaque at South Burying Ground looks.

**2. Demolition Delay Dispositions -- For details, see attached Demolition Delay Review Summary on Page 2 - 5:**

- A. 109 Highland Street            Public Hearing: Continued to 5/31/22
- B. 23 Pinecroft Road            Public Hearing: Proposal not detrimental; No Delay imposed
- C. 23 Old Road                    Public Hearing: Proposal not detrimental; No Delay imposed
- D. 251 Merriam Street            Public Hearing: Proposal not detrimental; No Delay imposed
- E. 12 Hemlock Road              Public Hearing: Proposal not detrimental; No Delay imposed
- F. 266 North Avenue              Public Hearing: Proposal not detrimental; No Delay imposed
- G. 284 Glen Road                Initial Determination: Found Significant. Proposal not detrimental. No Delay
- H. 227 Merriam Street            Initial Determination: Found Significant. Proposal not detrimental. No Delay

**3. Other HC Business:**

- A. Sustainable Tree By-law presentation    Lori Hess along with Laurie Bent, and Alicia Primer, members of the Sustainable Tree Bylaw Working Group, presented the proposed Article 30 for the Sustainable Bylaw. The Sustainable Tree By-Law is a collaboration between the Select Board, Planning Board, and Tree Advisory Group. Lori Hess presented a slide show and discussed the goals of the proposed bylaw and the impact it would have on homeowners. This bylaw will focus on mitigating tree removal during large scale construction. JT stated that areas of South Carolina such as Charleston have a much more restrictive ordinances and this proposal is a good measure. AA asked to make a motion, SW was hesitant to recognize a motion because of outstanding personal questions and would prefer to not take a vote as that was not listed on the agenda. MB was in agreement that there are many questions and addressing them would be a very long conversation. SW shared concern that this bylaw might threaten older homes located on scenic roads. Alicia Primer explained how the Planning Board Scenic Road process differed from this proposed bylaw. HS wanted to get a sense for how the other members of the Commission felt. Laurie Bent discussed how protecting trees protects Weston’s history and legacy, noting the Burgoyne Elm. Alicia Primer and Lori Hess clarified

- 
- questions of SW on how the proposed bylaw would not apply to failing or unhealthy trees. AA discussed how the PB has been working on this for many years and agreed with HS that he would like to get a sense of how the HC feels. The Commission discussed whether or not they should take a vote on the matter, AP said that a negative vote would greatly impact the proposal and for the board to consider that in whether or not they decide to vote. AP said they do not want to push the Commission to make any decisions and requested that anyone with questions reach out to them. No Vote was taken.
- B. 669 BPR - update AA will be presenting the proposal at Town Meeting. He stated that he plans to make a similar presentation to what was made before the CPC, with the hope that Town Meeting votes to approve the funds necessary to purchase a preservation deed restriction. PH noted the house has a demo delay that expires in June of this year.
- C. 55 Church St. – update. Vote anticipated PH discussed Article 19 in the Town Meeting warrant. There is a small group of people working to try to save the Train Depot at 55 Church Street. The property has a very complicated ownership and has not been well maintained. The article would grant the Select Board the authority to work towards the Town gaining ownership of the property and stopping further deterioration. JT made a motion to support the article should it be pulled from the consent agenda at Town meeting. MB seconded, all in favor.
- D. George Washington Memorial Highway Plaque PH gave overview of the Memorial Highway and explained that the original plaque was removed for safe keeping over 20 years ago, but has since disappeared. SW discussed replicating the plaque in order to replace the missing marker and whether or not anyone on the Commission would like to take on the project. HS said he could discuss with his son who is a sculptor to see what would be possible.
- E. Town Center Celebration- May 24-[sic] Update Typo was noted on the Agenda; the correct date is May 21<sup>st</sup>. SW discussed plans for the day and what the Commission will be doing. An information pamphlet will be created to highlight projects like Cemetery Restoration work, the Burgoyne Elm, and the Fiske Law office. SW asked for anyone available that day to contact him if they are able to join and help out.
- F. Public Hearing Notice Update CZ gave an update that the *Weston Town Crier* will no longer be running the print ads for the public hearing legal advertisements. *Metrowest Daily News* unfortunately cannot be the alternative and we will need to use the *Boston Globe* which is much more expensive. Going forward we will be working to cut down the verbiage within the legal ads to keep costs down and make the notices as succinct as possible. AA questioned if the *Waltham Tribune* was still an option. SW questioned if the Commission should consider adjusting the bylaw.
- 5. Treasurer's Report:** JT gave an update noting a few expenses for Gateway Media and Ould Colony Signs. SW asked if the Commission will need to spend any money before the end of the fiscal year. HS asked if money could be earmarked for the George Washington Memorial Plaque. PH said if there was a contract in place we could do that.

- 6. **Administrative approval:** Administrative approval issued for **391 Boston Post Road**. They will be doing minor front façade alterations and it will be a positive update.
- 7. **Approval of minutes:** JT made a motion to approve meeting minutes 1/11/2022, 2/8/2022, and 3/8/2022. MB seconded, all in favor.
- 8. **Calendar** Next meetings; May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2022, June 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022
- 9. **Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned 9:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted: Christine Zale

**Demolition Delay Review Summary:**

A.	Location and Documentation	Process	Applicant(s) Present	Building Data	Proposed Demolition	Notes
	<a href="#">109 Highland Ave</a> MHC Form B MHC Form A (Love Lane Historic Area)	Public Hearing	N/A	2 story, approx. 1757	Replace 18 windows	Previously found significant. Continued to 5/31/2022 hearing.
<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW gave overview of the property and proposal. No new information has been received from the applicant.</p>						
<p><b>Disposition:</b> JT made motion to continue hearing to 5/31/2022, HS second. All in favor.</p>						
B.	Location and Documentation	Process	Applicant(s) Present	Building Data	Proposed Demolition	Notes
	<a href="#">23 Pinecroft Road</a> MHC Form A Pinecroft Rd Subdivision Historic Area)	Public Hearing	Josh & Caroline Balder; O, Jared Kent; C	1941, Colonial Revival	Remove Vinyl Siding, window Replacements	Previously found Significant. No Delay
<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW provided brief overview of property and recapped the initial determination meeting that found the house significant.</p>						
<p>Owners Josh and Caroline Balder discussed their proposal to replace the existing windows and to remove the vinyl siding on the exterior. Jared Kent, the contractor for the project, provided more details on the proposal. The present windows are not original to the house and the owner proposes new vinyl clad wood windows with simulated divided lights in the same configuration as the existing. The existing vinyl siding will be removed, and the existing shingle siding shall be exposed and repaired as needed. The Commission discussed whether or not the original siding was shingles or clapboard. AA discussed that the house may have shingle siding on the gable ends and clapboards on the front façade, and suggested the replacement be in kind for what is found underneath the existing vinyl. The applicants and their contractor agreed that is how they intend to replace the siding based on what they uncover.</p>						
<p><b>Disposition:</b> JT made motion to approve the proposed siding and window replacements as presented and not impose a delay. MB seconded, All in favor.</p>						
C.	Location and Documentation	Process	Applicant(s) Present	Building Data	Proposed Demolition	Notes

<a href="#">23 Old Road</a> MHC Form B	Public Hearing	Joseph W. Dick; Ar., Will & Nicole Seddon; O	1902, Dutch Colonial Revival, 2 ½ Story	Additions/renovations & window/ door replacements	Previously found Significant. No Delay
<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW provided background information on the house and gave a recap of the initial determination meeting.</p> <p>Architect, Joseph Dick discussed the evolution of the house and described photos of the current house. He also discussed the proposed elevations and materials. The Commission reviewed drawings A1 – A7 by Joseph W. Dick Architecture, Inc. dated 2/16/2021 that show a major renovation of the existing house. The proposal saves what remains of the original front entry gambrel, removes previous additions, and expands the existing house with gambrel shaped masses at all sides, including the front entry. The proposal includes replacing all the windows with wood sash using 5/8” putty profiles and simulated divided lights, designed with period proportions. Existing doors, including the garage doors would be replaced. The existing chimney would be rebuilt and topped with clay chimney pots. The house would be re-sided using white cedar shingles with woven corners and shingles along the rakes. In general, the proposal re-visions the house with gambrel forms, a diminutive scale and a style adapted from the original intent that ties together the facades in a complementary manner.</p> <p>HS questioned the Palladian window and noted that it seemed out of character. Joseph Dick discussed the proposed window. JT commented that it was a very good adaptation and was very well done with a whimsical touch. SW agreed and said that it would fit well into the neighborhood.</p>					
<p><b>Disposition:</b> HS made motion to approve the additions and renovations and window and door replacements and not impose a delay. MB seconded, All in favor.</p>					
<b>Abbreviations</b>		O = Owner; OR = Owner’s Representative; D = Designer; Ar = Architect; Att = Attorney, C = Contractor			
<b>D. Location and Documentation</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Applicant(s) Present</b>	<b>Building Data</b>	<b>Proposed Demolition</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<a href="#">251 Merriam Street</a> MHC Form A (Silver Hill National Register District and Silver Hill Historic Area)	Public Hearing	Sean Greene & Fujiko Duke; O, Jamaal Siddiqui; Ar.	1921, Colonial Revival, 1 ½ Story	Porch extension and window replacements	Previously found Significant. No Delay.
<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW opened the public hearing and recapped the history of the house and the initial determination meeting.</p> <p>The application is to remove a window and replace it with new double entry doors, to extend the existing porch, and to create a new barrel roof entry. Additionally, several of the existing windows will be replaced. During the Initial Determination meeting, the Commission had expressed concerns regarding the appropriateness of the proposed barrel roof new entry. Architect Jamaal Siddiqui spoke on behalf of the applicants and showed a revised gable roof entry, a change the Commission appreciated. Applicants did want to retain the double arch front doors. The proposal is shown on revised drawings by Yusra Design – Build dated 4/18/2022.</p> <p>The architect also showed the Commission additional proposed changes to the house including a dormer addition. These changes are not part of this application and were not considered. SW made note that a separate application for demolition will need to be submitted for any additional changes.</p>					

		<p>The Commission discussed the porch columns and the first-floor window replacements. The replacement windows will be wood clad aluminum. Owner Sean Greene discussed the window configurations and whether or not they could change the grid styles.</p> <p>Commission agreed that grid pattern could be an admin approval.</p> <p>A neighbor at 227 Merriam was supportive of the project.</p>				
<p><b>Disposition:</b> AA made motion to approve to approve the porch extension/ modifications and window replacements and not impose a delay. HS seconded, All in favor.</p>						
<p><b>Abbreviations</b></p>		<p>O = Owner; OR = Owner's Representative; D = Designer; Ar = Architect; Att = Attorney, C = Contractor</p>				
<p><b>E.</b></p>	<p><b>Location and Documentation</b></p> <p><a href="#">12 Hemlock Road (previously known as 315 Boston Post Road)</a> MHC Form B MHC Form A (Boston Post Road National Register Historic District)</p>	<p><b>Process</b></p> <p>Public Hearing</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s) Present</b></p> <p>Joseph Wilson; O; Josh Balder of JLK Construction, C</p>	<p><b>Building Data</b></p> <p>1885. Queen Anne w/ colonial Revival. 2 ½ story.</p>	<p><b>Proposed Demolition</b></p> <p>Infill Porch Windows</p>	<p><b>Notes</b></p> <p>Previously Found Significant. No Delay</p>
<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW discussed the history of the property and gave an overview of the proposal and opened the public hearing.</p> <p>Owner, Joe Wilson discussed the elevation drawings that had been submitted. He explained that they would like to finish the two sleeping porches on the second floor of the house to create new bedrooms. The existing screens will be infilled with double hung windows. Mr. Wilson stated that he would like to retain the curved shapes that currently exist on the screen framing to keep with the aesthetic of the original sleeping porch.</p> <p>HS liked the idea of the curved windows to harken back to the sleeping porch. SW and AA discussed the scuppers and whether or not they could remain when the porch is fully enclosed. Because of the way the scuppers were built, the ones on the front porch will need to be removed, but the one at the back porch can be altered but will remain.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the window layout and proportions shown on drawings dated 5/2/2022 by MF Design Group. PH questioned the extreme horizontal proportion of the grilles in the proposed double hung sash at the front of the house. AA recommended maintaining the single openings of the screens and making the windows all infill rather than making individual windows, adjusting the mullion width to fit with the various ganged double hung windows proposed. This would solve the problem of the different window widths. AA discussed doing a sketch of the proposal he had in mind. Other HC members liked AA's concept.</p> <p>The Commission discussed if the plans could be approved with changes to the window layout to have an administrative approval. The owner noted that the new windows will be wood.</p> <p><b>Disposition:</b> JT made a motion to approve the plans as submitted with any</p>						

		modifications to be administratively approved and not impose a delay. KS seconded. All in favor.			
<b>Abbreviations</b>		O = Owner; OR = Owner's Representative; D = Designer; Ar = Architect; Att = Attorney, C = Contractor			
<b>F. Location and Documentation</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Applicant(s) Present</b>	<b>Building Data</b>	<b>Proposed Demolition</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	<a href="#">266 North Ave</a> MHC Form A- (North Avenue Historic Area)	Public Hearing O	Albana Gurguri: O	1891, Colonial Revival, 2 ½ Story	Window & Door Alterations
<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW opened the public hearing and recapped the initial determination meeting.</p> <p>Owner Albana Gurguri discussed revised elevation drawings by Vita Architects. Her proposal is to replace all the attic and first floor windows. The windows on the front façade will remain in their existing locations. Several windows on the sides will be re-located or replaced. All windows replacements will be vinyl material, as are the existing windows. Muntin, or grill patterns on replacement windows will match the patterns of the existing windows. All the new double-hung windows will have 6/6 patterns.</p> <p>HS asked what the reason for the replacement windows. Ms. Gurguri said many of the windows are single pane and extremely drafty. PH asked about the wood door replacements proposed. Ms. Gurguri stated the doors were not original and they are interior grade doors. The existing clapboard siding on the house will remain and will be patched as necessary where openings will change.</p> <p>HS stated this house has been highly modified and that the proposal is not detrimental.</p>					
<p><b>Disposition:</b> HS made a motion to approve the proposed window and door alterations and not impose a delay. KS seconded, all in favor.</p>					
<b>Abbreviations</b>		O = Owner; OR = Owner's Representative; D = Designer; Ar = Architect; Att = Attorney, C = Contractor			
<b>G. Location and Documentation</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Applicant(s) Present</b>	<b>Building Data</b>	<b>Proposed Demolition</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	<a href="#">284 Glen Rd</a> MHC Form A (Glen Rd National Register Historic District & Glen Road Historic Area)	Initial Determination	John Gray Parker; O, Emory Patterson; C	1924, Colonial Revival	Window and Chimney modifications
<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW discussed the history of the property and its location in the Glen Road Historic Area and Glen Road National Register Historic District.</p> <p>The contractor, Emory Patterson, discussed the proposal and photos submitted. The proposal is to remove a center chimney in the house from the first floor through the roof. The roof would be patched to match. Also proposed is removal of a non-historic bay kitchen window on the first floor of the west side. A double-hung wood Pella window that matches the existing windows will be installed at this location. This new window will be flanked by shutters that match other shutters on the house. Lastly, they plan to relocate one existing upstairs bedroom window on the east side from its position of symmetry on this façade, toward the rear of the property. The new location for the window will allow the shutters to remain. There will be no changes to the windows on the front elevation.</p> <p>All of the windows are currently Pella replacement windows and the original jambs are no longer there.</p>					

		<b>Disposition:</b> HS made motion to determine the house is significant because of its age and location in the National Register Historic District and architecture/history. MB seconded, All in favor. JT made a motion to accept the proposed window and chimney modifications and not impose a delay. HS seconded, all in favor.				
<b>Abbreviations</b>		O = Owner; OR = Owner's Representative; D = Designer; Ar = Architect; Att = Attorney, C = Contractor				
<b>H.</b>	<b>Location and Documentation</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Applicant(s) Present</b>	<b>Building Data</b>	<b>Proposed Demolition</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	<a href="#">227 Merriam</a> MHC Form B MHC Form A (Silver Hill National Register District & Silver Hill Historic Area)	Initial Determination	Josh Weissman; O Jay Podolsky;C	1892, 2 ½ story, Queen Anne	Window Replacement	Found Significant. No Delay
		<p><b>Discussion:</b> SW gave an overview of the property and the property's MACRIS form.</p> <p>Owner Jay Wiessman discussed the proposal to replace 12 windows on the house. He stated they had originally applied for this in 2015 but did delay the project and kept up with the windows as they are. He explained that he has attempted to repair the windows during a period of years and that the expense associated with the repairs is too great. Most all of the windows are original and are 2/2 configuration.</p> <p>Jay Podolsky of Renewal by Anderson discussed the proposed Fibrex window replacement. They will be 2/2 full divided light and will match the configuration of the originals.</p> <p>The Commission strongly suggests restoration of old windows over replacement. In this case the Commission felt that the owner has attempted to repair the windows and as a last resort is turning to replacement. The Commission appreciates that the owner has said he will store the original windows for possible future use.</p>				
		<p><b>Disposition:</b> HS made motion to determine the house significant due to its age and location in the historic area. KS seconded. HS made a motion to approve the window replacements and not impose a delay. KS seconded, motion passes 6-1.</p>				
<b>Abbreviations</b>		O = Owner; OR = Owner's Representative; D = Designer; Ar = Architect; Att = Attorney, C = Contractor				