

historicdistricts@sudbury.ma.us http://www.sudbury.ma.us

#### **MINUTES**

December 4, 2014 7:30 p.m. Flynn Building, Silva Conference Room

Present: Fred Taylor, Chair; Linda Hawes, Vice Chair; Bill Andreas; and Lee Swanson

HDC Chair Fred Taylor called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

# Case Number 14-27 – Applicant William and Mary Ann LoVerme, 295 Concord Road, (Assessor's Map H09-0006):

Applicants William and Mary Ann LoVerme, along with their architect, Michael Rocino of Genesis Design and Associates, were present to request a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a garage, or Carriage House, on the foundation where the old barn used to stand on their property at 295 Concord Road. The intent is to stay within the footprint of the old structure. They would like a garage in order to park their cars under cover. Their driveway poses a safety issue when backing out onto Concord Road. The LoVermes are concerned that when the Town Center intersection project is complete that cars may be going faster through that area. Difficult to back out right now. If parking can occur in the garage they will have more room in the driveway to turn cars around. They then walked the Board through the plans provided showing historic images of the old barn and the new construction.

Mr. Andreas noted that the proposed garage may be smaller than the barn. Mr. Rocino says that it only appears smaller since they are using the old footprint but in reality in the design he tried to minimize the height and be sensitive to the pitch. Mr. Taylor agreed that the pitch looks more gradual than old one.

Those present discussed the possible use of the barn at certain points in history and whether it might have served a commercial use.

Mr. Swanson asked if there would be a basement. Mr. LoVerme said that there would not be a basement.

Mr. Taylor said that he appreciated the new design's replication of the old structure. However, he noted that the two doors on the front may not fit properly and appears busy. The Board discussed changing the proposed paint color to mitigate that concern. The architect noted that the barn was originally all white. A paint scheme had not been decided upon but all discussed a monochrome color. Most agreed that it should be a color that is different than the house itself.

Board members felt that the door referred to as a "hay door" should be placed higher at the apex. Ms. Hawes felt that hay door could even be eliminated to make the peak of house look better. Mr. Andreas did not mind that the garage appeared busy because if it were used commercially it would have been busy. He said that hay doors have been used primarily as decoration since the 1930s.



historicdistricts@sudbury.ma.us http://www.sudbury.ma.us

The Board asked whether the shed that is in the location of the garage would remain. Mr. LoVerme said that it was new and probably installed in order to sell the house.

Mr. Taylor asked about the width of the fascia board. He did not want to see a wide fascia board. Mr. Rocino asked whether a 1x6" board was preferred. The Board suggested that the applicants look at other samples from around Town.

The Board did not want gutters on the garage.

Mr. Andreas asked about the material selected for the driveway. Mr. LoVerme said that they have crushed stone at present but that is not easily plowed. He asked whether hot top. It was suggested that a chip-seal coating on top of hot-top may work best to achieve the look of crushed stone. Ms. Hawes also suggested stamped concrete.

Mr. Taylor asked about adding strap hinges to the garage doors to enhance aesthetics. The Board discussed the fact that hinges can be found for reasonable prices. Door handles could also be added to garage doors to make them look like the door swings out. Mr. Andreas also suggested having handles cut into wood.

No abutters were present to express any concerns. There being no further discussion from the Board. A motion was made to move the hay door up a minimum of six inches, reduce the fascia board slightly so that what will show is no more than four inches of wood, paint the garage white, pave the driveway with crushed stone to start and then request a certificate of appropriateness for another material at a later date, add strap hinges of good quality on all doors and add door handles either of hardware or cut out of the wood. The motion was unanimously approved.

# Case 14-21 – Applicant Michael Carney, 197 and 197 Lot B Old Sudbury Road, (Assessor's Map H10-0006):

Per the request of the applicant, discussion of case 14-21 will be continued to December 11, 2014, 7:30 p.m. at the Flynn Building, 278 Old Sudbury Road.

Even though the majority of the discussion would be happening on December 11, 2014, while Mr. Walker and Mr. Carney were present they gave the Board a preliminary update on progress made at 197 Old Sudbury Road, noting that the plans would be discussed on December 11. Mr. Walker submitted a sample image for the proposed house to the east. He said they want to modify the basic el layout. The garage would be front-facing, and they would remove the bump out to create more of a modern look than presented. A wrap-around porch is proposed for the front.

The Board suggested that the applicants fix the dormer arrangement to simplify the rooflines. The design for the west house would be different. Mr. Andreas wanted the new houses to follow the historic precedent. It was suggested that the applicants try to find a shingle-style house to emulate, perhaps with eyebrow dormers. He wanted the applicants to settle upon a period style and not a 1980s or 1990s no-style house. Mr. Carney expressed concerns about the cost of building a shingle-style house. The Board



historicdistricts@sudbury.ma.us http://www.sudbury.ma.us

discussed using shingle materials and gable details instead. They appreciated the wrapped porch idea and suggested perhaps a metal roof over the porch. Mr. Carney said that he appreciated the feedback and would have more for review on December 11.

### **Other Business:**

#### 233 Concord Road, Lot B:

Next the Board discussed a timely matter regarding a re-vote on Case 14-8, 233 Concord Road, Lot B. The new address assigned the parcel is 239 Concord Road.

Applicants Mike Carney and Jeff Walker were present to discuss the height of the building. He said that when he submitted his previously approved plans to the Building Inspector the Building Inspector, Mark Herweck, noted that the height did not meet Sudbury's zoning code and the house needed to be dropped at least two feet. Their architect re-worked the plans which were submitted to the Board at the meeting.

Ms. Hawes said that she liked the lower height.

Mr. Carney said the main roof ridge had to be brought down. Mr. Walker added that most who reviewed the new plans felt that the house looked more authentic at the lower height.

Mr. Carney said that the project had been through the state-mandated storm water review. They did not want to have to go through that process again with re-siting the house. He noted that the landscape plan takes into consideration a seven-foot drop in the terrain. The wall line and grade line is not changing.

The Board discussed issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness with a modification to the original certificate in order to meet the height requirement. The house will now sit at the same height as the house next door at 233 Concord Road.

Mr. Andreas asked about any interior space changes. Mr. Carney said that only the attic space is affected cutting down usability of attic. The change does not effect any living space or appearance from the street.

Teri Frasca, the neighbor at 233 Concord Road, was present and did not have any concerns about the change to the plans.

A motion was made and unanimously approved to lower the height of the façade by two feet plus or minus as shown in the drawings submitted to the HDC on December 4, 2014 so that the project would comply with Sudbury's zoning code.

#### 233 Concord Road:

Next the board discussed with homeowner Teri Frasca, 233 Concord Road, a modification to her previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness for a new windows. Builder Matthew Noah was present with Frasca to explain that when Mr. Noah went to cut out the area of the wall for the window



historicdistricts@sudbury.ma.us http://www.sudbury.ma.us

installation he discovered that barn braces were in the way of where he wanted to do the installation. Therefore the applicant was requesting an alternative window configuration to work around the beams.

The applicant was proposing double-hung three over three pane windows from Sudbury Lumber to match windows that appear elsewhere on the house. Mr. Andreas felt that the three over three windows would be fine and more traditional for barn windows.

HDC member Frank Riepe, who was not present, had submitted a sketch via e-mail on December 4, 2014 for consideration however, due to the location and size of the barn beams the configuration had to be revised somewhat and the framing would dictate the size.

Ms. Hawes felt that since the windows would be on side of the house with a landscaping to shield the windows would not be highly visible. Mr. Andreas agreed that it is difficult to see that side of barn.

Mr. Taylor had difficulty with the double window. Mr. Andreas and Mr. Swanson felt that many barns have smaller windows adjacent to one another and a uniform layout would not be entirely appropriate. Ms. Frasca and Mr. Noah sketched over Mr. Riepe's drawing so that the three windows appeared one to the left of the interior post and two together to the right of the post. Mr. Taylor asked that there be a minimum of eight inches in between the casings for the two right windows. Trim would be replicated from existing windows on the barn.

A motion was made to modify the Certificate of Appropriateness as previously approved on November 20, 2014 to include the same product specifications for three over three windows with one placed to the left of the center post close to the rear of the property and two to the right of the post with an eight inch separation or more between casings as shown on the drawing sketched at the Dec 4, 2014 meeting and submitted to the file. All members approved the modification.

#### **Approval of Minutes:**

Next, minutes from the November 20, 2014 meeting were unanimously approved with changes as proposed by Mr. Taylor.

#### **Single-property Historic Districts:**

Mr. Taylor reported on his research into the possibility of securing single-house historic districts. He noted that it would be possible but the HDC bylaws would need to be modified with a two-thirds vote at Town Meeting. The Planning Board would need to hold a public hearing and would report at Town Meeting. Ms. Hawes said that she has worked on two historic districts since she has been on board, the Pitts Tavern and the extension of the King Philip District. The HDC met with neighbors who wanted the district and who circulated petitions. The HDC served as advisors to the project. Ms. Hawes suggested that any neighborhood that wants to be included in a district should contact the HDC.



historicdistricts@sudbury.ma.us http://www.sudbury.ma.us

The Board then discussed using Sudbury's walkway program process as model for creating procedures for Historic Districts. Mr. Taylor spoke with Chris Skelly at the Massachusetts Historical Commission about the 40C regulations. There is nothing prohibitive in 40C to stop individual districts. The most challenging part is getting the homeowner interested.

Mr. Taylor said that perhaps the HDC could print a story in the Town Crier and as a group the Board could identify some key houses. A letter could be drafted telling of the benefits. All agreed that this was not a project for the 2015 Town Meeting, however.

## **Discussion of Specific Guidelines:**

The Board discussed working on the HDC guidelines a little at a time.

There being no further discussion the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.