



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Minutes

In-Person and Remote Zoom Meeting Clark Room, Town Hall

Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order Concerning Open Meeting
Wednesday, June 15, 2022 7:00 pm

Members Present

Kathy Keller, *Co-Chair*, Annette Lee, *Co-Chair*, Geoff Freeman, Eric Adams

Alternates Present

Chip Dewing

Others Present

Matt Herweck, *Owner, Fern's*; Steve Hinton, *Municipal Facilities Committee (MFC)*; Bill Risso, *MFC*; Brian Waterson, *Chair, Carlisle Playground Project Committee*; Deepa Chuing (Zoom); Jennifer Kaczenski (Zoom); Carrie Patel (Zoom); Krissy O'Shea, *Carlisle Historical Commission (CHC) member candidate (Zoom)*; Ben Herter, *CHC member candidate*; Ed Rolfe, *CHC alternate member candidate*; Wanda Avril, *Carlisle Mosquito (Zoom)*; Jennine Blum, *Administrative Assistant*

7:00 pm Co-Chair Kathy Keller called the meeting to order.

7:01 pm Informational Discussion for 8 Lowell Road, Fern's

Matt Herweck, *Owner of Fern's*, will discuss repainting the building.

Matt Herweck announced that he and his wife will become the new owners of the property at the end of the month. He stated that the entire building needs to be painted and he was interested in painting sooner rather than later to prevent deterioration of the building.

He had notes on colors from the previous owners, from around 2004. He identified the colors previously used as Benjamin Moore HC-11 (Marblehead Gold), HC-121 (Peale Green), and white which is standard high gloss white. The color he'd like to consider for the building is HC-12 (Concord Ivory) which is a slightly muted version of HC-11. Matt brought color chips for the colors being discussed.

The members agreed that the softer, subtler HC-12 would be acceptable and was preferred by most. Members requested that Matt purchase samples of the paint colors being discussed and paint 24" x 36" posterboards and notify Jennine Blum when he was ready to have selected Commission members Chip Dewing and Ben Herter view them.

Kathy Keller expressed that Matt was basically keeping the same color and thought the Commission could move quickly on this.

Matt inquired when the phrase “like for like” changed in the Rules and Regulations because he went ahead and fixed the exterior gooseneck light fixtures and wanted the members to know that he didn’t intend to overstep. It was unclear to the members when this change was made. The Commission noted that it has been their experience that people can’t always accurately judge like for like.

Matt explained that the brackets and fixtures are the same existing metal fixtures – just repainted green (HC-121). He added that he had the sockets inside of the fixtures rebuilt to accommodate LED bulbs. Larger lag bolts were used to secure the fixture because LED bulbs are heavier. He explained that he went ahead and fixed these fixtures because one was hanging, and he didn’t want it to fall on anyone.

The members welcomed this discussion with Matt. Kathy stated that these are the kinds of discussions the Commission likes to have. The Commission is here to advise, so if you have questions about anything you can call us or get on the agenda and come to a meeting. The members thanked Matt.

The Commission discussed issuing a Certificate of Non-Applicability for this project.

7:18 pm Informational Discussion for Outdoor Classroom; 83 School Street, Carlisle Public School Playground Project

Brian Waterson, *Chair of Carlisle Playground Project Committee*, to further discuss the outdoor classroom after recent site visit with Dr. Dennet Sidell, *CPS Elementary Principal*, and the Commission.

Brian Waterson thanked the group for the recent productive site visit and asked the members which of the two proposed sites the Commission preferred for the outdoor classroom. Site 1 was identified as being in the woods further from the parking lot and site 2 is closer to the parking lot. Three members/soon to be members preferred site 1 and four preferred site 2. Members were asked to informally share their thoughts on the two proposed sites. Comments made regarding each of the sites are as follows:

Site 1:

- Ed Rolfe preferred the feeling of being more in woods rather than being so close to the solar parking lot.
- Krissy O’Shea expressed a preference for the more natural element of site 1. She stated a practical concern about the poison ivy and its continued encroachment. She would like to see enough of the trees and lower growth remain to buffer the classroom from the Church Street view.
- Ben Herter felt site 1 was fine. He didn’t feel the impact from Church Street would be much different one site to the next. He noted that the challenge is to try to integrate the design into the landscape as minimally as possible and that there’s an opportunity at both sites for the amphitheater/tiering concept if that’s of interest.
- Geoff Freeman expressed that there would be more of an imposition in the landscape with site 1 and difficult to do with the tree canopies with large branches overhead and the possibility of falling tree debris.
- Annette Lee felt that stripping away the forest in site 1 would be incongruent with the Commission’s preference to preserve the landscape.

Site 2

- Brian Waterson mentioned that Dennet Sidell preferred site 2.
- Geoff expressed that site 2 has real potential because it’s connected to built forms making it easier for the landscape architect to make a more successful design as a transition from the

existing hardscape of pathway and driveway as it comes into the woods and it's much more open. He agreed with Dennet that the lack of canopy and lack of pines overhead with great big branches is probably right way to go. He thought it would be easier and more successful to be coming off that space with an accessible entrance and it would have more minimal intrusion.

- Chip Dewing agreed that putting the classroom closer to the parking area supports the point about it being a little more in the vocabulary of built forms. He further explained that it seems to be a little less forced in that respect. He expressed that he didn't have a clear enough vision yet about what the total consumption of land would be with either of these sites. He added that there may be some overlap from site 1 to 2 by virtue of the geography that will be needed.
- Annette Lee pointed out that site 2 is already partially cleared and it's easier to visualize what the classroom might look like there.
- Kathy Keller said she liked the idea of maintaining as much of a barrier as we can with the trees. She also felt that if you're closer to the sidewalk it makes for an easier entrance and there would be less people rummaging around in the woods.

Ben Herter asked for clarification on whether it was correct that no trees would be cut on either site. Brian replied that no big trees would be cut and added that on site 1 there are a couple of smaller trees in the middle. Annette Lee mentioned that there is a tree that was topped off and that would come down. Geoff Freeman agreed. Brian confirmed – it is the one on the (Historic District) line. Ed Rolfe added there is a dead birch bent over and quite tall with no leaves on the top and thought there was a lot of clean up to be done.

As a matter of process, Chip Dewing requested that Brian put up yellow tape or something else to describe the geography that is being recommended so we can make a site visit and get a better sense of how much space the classroom will require. He added that it's hard to choose one site over another until it's laid out. And concurrent to that, there would be some new layouts proposed that we could look at when we make the site visit. In support, Eric Adams added that it could be misleading without the design of the installation.

Geoff stated that in terms of a near tie in site preference, Dennet's preference for site 2 is significant taking into consideration how he's moving students to that area from an accessibility point of view and the amount of light coming in. Regarding the light, the tree canopy of site 1 with the high pines can't be touched. Dennet felt site 2 had great light. It provided shelter but it isn't direct sunlight that would put students to sleep. Dennet expressed that site 2 was a bit cheerier than site 1 – more open. It's a challenging design problem on either site to do. It will be easier to integrate the classroom in site 2 in a more natural way because it's an easier transition in terms of built forms. Geoff reiterated that he felt the Dennet's comments are important.

Ed asked if it made the most sense to mark out site 2 and members agreed.

Brian and others (including landscape architect and Krissy O'Shea) put together a slide deck of images which ranged from informal summer-camp-like settings to Architectural-Digest-worthy settings with beautiful stonework, wood structures, grass and plantings.

As members discuss their thoughts on the images, Kathy noted that both sites 1 and 2 were well suited to students sitting in a circle around the teacher and wondered if that made sense from an educational perspective. Ed asked whether it would be reasonable for seats to be used as writing surfaces with students sitting on the ground. In reference to images where sections of logs were used for seats, Chip

proposed that the oak tree on the Historic District line slated to be taken down be repurposed – mill it up at the site, use it and then claim it as from the site.

Kathy stated the Commission likes a variety of the ideas and these are much closer to the direction the Commission wants to head in than the previous designs. The Commission is looking for a more organic integration into the property. She was appreciative of Brian's receptiveness to the members' suggestions.

Ben thought maybe there's a combination of some of these concepts that would work well. He also like the built-in amphitheater-style seating but reminded the members that Dennet spoke about desks/writing surfaces as well as seating. Ben is drawn to the log images – they're movable, you can roll them around, you can sit on them, they're semi comfortable, they could be writing surfaces, they could be seating, they can be moved out of the way. From a material standpoint, they're of the environment that they'd be in. From a visual standpoint they're not attracting much attention or detracting from the context.

Kathy mentioned to Brian that Chip and Ben have offered to act as liaisons for the outdoor classroom project and can provide guidance. They're architects with a lot of experience. We want to offer that to you. Brian replied that he thought that would be great and he appreciated the offer. He would contact the landscape architect and get Chip and Ben involved.

Geoff reminded Brian that the landscape architect should show design ideas as sketches as a way to best communicate – not finished ideas at this point. Geoff declared that the challenge here is meeting the program requirements and the goal is that it be designed as an outdoor classroom. He acknowledged that it will be used for other things, but primarily, it's a classroom.

Regarding requirements, Geoff recalled that Dennet was clear that he wants 24 seats and 24 tables which are moveable in addition to benches for 24 students and a platform for the teacher. It would be best to try to find a way to combine those in a way that there is flexibility to group students as required. Dennet mentioned he has a machine to take tables in and out. There might be a long period of time that the tables won't be used. The images shown today make use of natural landform, but they are missing the tables and chairs so it's only half the solution. Dennet was also clear that he doesn't want lighting or amplification on the site. He was very clear about that

Eric also gravitated towards the log images. From financial and practical standpoints, he thought some of the images presented are outside the scope of the budget. He also pointed out that when stone or wood is set into the ground, tree roots will be disrupted and the whole point is to preserve the canopy. His opinion was that it might be worth talking with Dennet about it as there are so many questions unanswered such as how practical is this idea? How is it going to be used? How much will it be used? He suggested preparing a base and putting in some tree sections in the space. Eric thought it might be an inexpensive and easy way to dip the toe in to see if this is really functional and if we're going to get use out of this before investing in a grander idea. He agreed with what had been said about summer camp. He recalled fond memories of sitting on logs – sitting on a tree among trees. It made an impression on him. He feels there is an intentionality around the focus on nature. Eric also expressed that picnic tables are a basic form that we're all accustomed to and they're low profile.

Kathy agreed that the design does not need to be grandiose and mentioned that she likes the log ideas and thought they might introduce an element of fun. She also likes the idea of portability idea – the more portable it is the more useful it is. She thought perhaps the kids could be involved in moving the log sections if they're not too heavy and large.

Geoff asked about the timeline for completing the classroom and inquired if there was time to think it through. Brian replied that it would be ideal to work on the classroom in September when the when volunteers are scheduled to work on the playground but added that it's important to get the classroom right and hopefully we can rally the volunteers to help with that, too. The playground is proceeding and let's continue to work on the classroom through the summer and go from there.

Kathy mentioned that the Commission already approved the playground application, so we can close that out. She suggested that when Brian is ready, a new application can be opened for the outdoor classroom. She mentioned that applications for certificates remain open indefinitely and that the new application for a Certificate of Appropriateness will not be tied to the other playground projects so this will not hold anything else up.

Geoff stated that if the intent is for it to be built by volunteers, then that is a major criteria for design because the ideas in the images being looked at are beyond the scope of volunteer help and would require profession construction and be a major investment. He feels these ideas are way beyond the scope of what anyone was envisioning. Brian commented that he felt some of the ideas would work with volunteers.

Annette asked if the school would oversee this space. Brian replied yes.

Ed speculated that the kids might again need to be 6 feet apart due to the pandemic and asked how that might change the footprint needed. In response, members stressed the importance of portability and flexibility.

Chip said there are so many precedents that might not sound right when said, but this outdoor classroom is a little like a picnic space that many of us have been to in camps and whatnot where there are a series of movable picnic tables. They are very portable. You can write at it, eat at it, you can sit and watch – there are so many benefits to that. He added that if they are small enough, they can be moved around and used in many ways.

Geoff supported Chip's comments and stated that there are great examples at summer camps where spaces have been created to bring people together and feels that's what this space is. He feels this type of space is something that is much more relatable. It's not the formality of a classroom that is put in the woods. It's coming to something more like summer camp that can be used for teaching and communication and meets the teachers' needs and has the complexion of fun. He remarked that it's a great analogy.

Chip further explained that he would want it to have some infrastructure to it that allows the tables to take a place in the space and avoid looking helter-skelter.

With the discussion coming to an end, Kathy remarked that the classroom conversation moved forward quite a lot this week. She was pleased that there were lots of fresh ideas and some that will not require further fundraising. Brian, Chip and Ben will make plans for further discussion.

Bill Risso added that if school is maintaining this space, he suggested the playground committee discuss plans with the facilities manager who may have some comments. Brian replied that the facilities manager has been in touch with comments about the playground as well.

Commission members thanked Brian for all the thoughtful time he's put into this project.

7:55 pm Hearing for Application No. 2022-03 for Certificate of Appropriateness, 22 Bedford Road, Gleason Public Library

Proposed Work: remove and replace existing low slope and asphalt shingle roof system. The existing slate roof components of the original building are designated to remain. Replace existing copper ridge caps with vent to provide natural ventilation under roof deck.

Steve Hinton informed the Commission that it was not possible to obtain roof asphalt shingle samples because of supply chain issues. Steve inquired if the Commission would be willing to issue the Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the Municipal Facilities Committee (MFC) come before the Commission with the shingles for approval before construction begins. The MFC feels that they have to issue the RFP and get a company onboard that will have the leverage to get the product. The Commission agreed to vote on the application with some conditions to help move the project along. The color/manufacture of the aluminum ridge vents and flashings was identified as Dark Bronze/Metal-Era and asphalt shingle sample color identified as 2051.

Kathy Keller asked if everyone was ready to vote. All replied affirmatively.

Kathy Keller asked for someone to make the motion

Eric Adams made motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for application number 2022-03 for 22 Bedford Road, Gleason Public Library to complete the roof repair work as indicated in the application with the approved flashing and ridge vents in color Dark Bronze as indicated on manufacturer's (Metal-Era) spec sheet as submitted by the applicant with the condition that before construction begins, the applicant provides us with a live sample of the asphalt shingles to be used for our approval.

Geoff Freeman seconded the motion.

Roll call vote: Annette Lee – Aye, Eric Adams – Aye, Geoff Freeman – Aye, Kathy Keller – Aye, Chip Dewing (deputized) – Aye.

Motion carried 5 to 0

Steve asked if there is an appeal period. The Commission informed him that the appeal period is 20 days. Steve express that he hoped the Commission would presumably be sensitive to any difficulties that may arise in getting something perfect. Geoff acknowledged this very real issue.

Steve is taking possession of asphalt shingle samples, aluminum ridge vent, aluminum color samples and the manufacturer's spec sheet for safe keeping.

Minutes Approval

- April 20, 2022 – approved
- May 18, 2022 – approved with minor edits

Project Update Reports

- Police Station – Steve Hinton reported that they are proceeding with the RFP. It will be a design-build situation. After a company is selected and design is created it will be presented to the Commission.
- FRS play yard fence – Susan Emmons emailed that they haven't yet received a quote from Classic Structures.

Old Business

Member Updates/Inputs

- Kathy Keller is stepping down from the Community Preservation Committee (CPC).
- Kathy nominated Krissy O'Shea to be the Historical Commission's representative to the CPC if she'd like to. If not, perhaps Ben would consider this.

Administrative Updates

- New Commission will formalize leadership roles at next meeting.
- Friends and Neighbors in Historic District letter written in August 2021 was briefly discussed and suggestions were made for changes in both content and tone.
- Jennine Blum will find minutes from years past not on the website.
- Jennine to find out when Rules and Regulations were last updated and what those updates were.

Adjournments

Motion made at 8:35 pm by Eric Adams to adjourn the June 15, 2022 meeting.

Geoff Freeman seconded the motion.

All voted Aye.

Motion carried 5 to 0

Next Meeting

Wednesday July 20, 2022

Documents and Samples Submitted

- June 15, 2022 Agenda
- 83 School Street, Carlisle Public School – Outdoor Classroom
 - Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 2022-01
 - Slide deck of images of outdoor amphitheaters and classrooms for inspiration and discussion
 - Schematic – overhead view of CPS campus
 - Schematic of proposed playground design
 - Schematic of proposed playground design – historical district area and elements enlarged
- 22 Bedford Road, Gleason Public Library
 - Application for Certificate of Appropriateness No. 2022-03
- April 20, 2022 Minutes
- May 18, 2022 Minutes
- Hybrid meeting equipment recommendations to Carlisle Town Administrator from Mark Pauley of Minuteman Media Network
- Friends and Neighbors in Historic District letter written in August 2021