

Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Minutes May 15, 2019

The meeting was called to order in the Heald Room at 7:00 pm.

Members present: Kathy Keller (co-Chair), Annette Lee (co-Chair), Geoff Freeman, Ed Rolfe, and Eric Adams.

Others Present: Shelley Dweck and Ted Van Valey (East St.) and Wanda Avril (Carlisle Mosquito).

Draft Minutes 4/10/19

The Commission reviewed the draft Minutes from this meeting and a few revisions were proposed. Mr. Rolfe moved that the Commission approve the Minutes of 4/10/19 as amended, Mr. Adams seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously (5-0).

Application #19-05: Hardscaping at 11 East St. – Shelley Dweck and Ted Van Valey

Ms. Dweck and Mr. Van Valey were both in attendance for this hearing. Ms. Dweck presented a Layout and Materials plan depicting the four main hardscape revisions being proposed:

- Stone walkways along the front and to the entrance, with new garden beds to frame the area between the front of the house and the stone wall
- New parking area for guests, with a turnaround area
- New stone patio path from the front entrance to the patio at the right of the house, and
- Planting beds along the slope adjacent the stone patio.

Ms. Dweck explained that the hardscape changes will be installed in phases. Ms. Dweck reviewed a number of details of the proposed hardscape changes with the Commission, including the possible installation of an antique copper planter as a centerpiece in a garden.

Concerning the gravel driveway, which will be extended to the front entrance, Ms. Dweck and Mr. Van Valey asked if the Commission would consider approving granite edging along the driveway, and the Commission agreed, requesting horizontal placement of the edging. For the proposed stone walkway, Mr. Van Valey indicated a preference for large bluestone pavers of slightly irregular shape, and had provided a photo of the proposed pavers. The Commission agreed with this choice.

Ms. Dweck and Mr. Van Valey proposed lighting on two wooden posts, as well as lights at the front door, noting that there is currently one light at the door. Mr. Freeman asked that they submit information on the proposed lighting. When the property owners asked for lighting placement ideas, Mr. Freeman suggested lighting from within a tree as a possibility for one location, possibly eliminating one of the proposed posts.

Mr. Freeman stated his approval of the overall design, indicating that the lines make sense, adding that it would be good to see what the lighting looks like. The Commission was in agreement with the proposed hardscaping, and asked that lighting product information be provided. The applicants agreed to do this.

The applicants also asked about extending the deck at the rear of the residence from the porch to the patio. The Commission agreed that this change would not be visible from a public way, and therefore would not be under Commission jurisdiction.

This public hearing was continued to 7:10 pm on Wednesday, June 12, 2019.

Informal discussion re: 21-23 Bedford Rd.

Mr. Adams, partner of Adams + Beasley Assoc. and co-owner of this property, asked to speak with the Commission about 3 points: a proposed relocation of a doorway on the front facade of the plans for the reconstructed residence, a site plan for the proposed business use of part of the property (special permit request to

the ZBA), and the Commission's opinion on the use of the Distinctive Structure Preservation Zoning Bylaw (Sec. 3.2.4) to allow this proposed combination residential and business use, as authorized by the Carlisle Building Commissioner. Mr. Adams sought to get the Commission's feedback on these proposed changes prior to the public hearing with the Board of Appeals for their proposed business use of part of this property.

Mr. Adams provided a revised front elevation plan (from that of the 7/9/16 plan set for reconstruction of this property "in-kind" approved with application #16-08) and explained that with a new proposal of partial business use of the residence, doorway #10 located at the first floor of the ell will need to be shifted 3 feet closer to the barn in order that it access its housing unit directly, and not enter into an area now planned for office use. He displayed a proposed elevation of the revised front façade. On discussion, the Commission was in agreement with this proposed relocation of the door.

Mr. Adams provided a preliminary site plan dated 5/7/19 showing the footprint of the approved design for the reconstructed dwelling, including the proposed addition in the location of the former barn. The site plan depicted an extension of the driveway at the east end of the property to the rear of the lot at which 9 parking spaces were proposed. He explained that utilization of the Distinctive Structures Preservation Bylaw, as authorized by the Building Commissioner, will allow an intermediate approach to the design of this site for a combination business/residential use. Mr. Adams further explained that if this Bylaw did not apply, site plan review (SPR) would be required, which would call for 17 parking spaces, among other requirements. Mr. Adams asked if the Commission is in agreement with this overall "intermediate" approach to the design of this site, utilizing the Distinctive Structures Bylaw for this property.

When asked to further explain the determination that Site Plan Review was not required, Mr. Adams said that the primary use for this property will be residential, and that therefore the Building Commissioner has determined that SPR is not required, adding that the Building Commissioner's opinion is that the requirements of SPR would be too onerous to result in the preservation of this distinctive property which will remain mainly residential. Mr. Adams further explained that he meets with the Board of Appeals on June 3 for a special permit hearing for operating a professional office in a distinctive structure.

On discussion, the Commission agreed that the use of the Distinctive Structures Preservation Bylaw allowing the site plan as designed would allow this property to be reconstructed in-kind, utilized appropriately, while maintaining its historical character. Mr. Adams asked if the Commission would consider writing a letter of support to the Board of Appeals regarding this proposal, and the Commission agreed.

Mr. Rolfe moved that the Commission send a letter of support for the proposed use of this distinctive structure, and the proposed site plan to the Chair of the Board of Appeals, Mr. Freeman seconded the motion, and it was approved 4-0-1 (Mr. Adams abstained).

Other Business

Co-Chair Keller, Commission appointee to the Community Preservation Committee (CPC), explained that the CPC wants to know what the CHC may want to utilize from the CPC Historic Funds category next year. She suggested to the Commission that the Central Burying Ground Preservation Plan commissioned a few years back be revisited, and perhaps broken into several components, which could be individually put forward for funding. She suggested that the proposal be revised to greatly lessen the number of trees to be removed, and that a materials conservator be sought to provide an opinion on the condition of the stones. Further discussion of this topic was planned.

At approximately 8:25 pm, Mr. Rolfe moved and Mr. Adams seconded the adjournment of the meeting, and the motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

Respectfully submitted,
Gretchen Caywood
Administrative Assistant,
Carlisle Historical Commission