



Ruthanne Fuller
Mayor

City of Newton, Massachusetts
Department of Planning and Development
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone
(617) 796-1120
Telefax
(617) 796-1142
TDD/TTY
(617) 796-1089
www.newtonma.gov

Barney S. Heath
Director

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS
AUBURNDALE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

DATE: May 10, 2022

PLACE/TIME: Fully Remote
7:00 p.m.

ATTENDING: Nancy Grissom, Acting Chair
Paul Dudek, Member
David Kayserman, Member
Richard Alfred, Alternate
Josh Markette, Alternate
Barbara Kurze, Staff

ABSENT: Dante Capasso, Member
Joel Shames, Alternate
Martin Smargiassi, Alternate

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with Nancy Grissom presiding as Acting Chair. Voting permanent member were P. Dudek and D. Kayserman. R. Alfred and J. Markette were appointed to vote as full members. B. Kurze acted as recording secretary and the meeting was recorded on Zoom.

19 Fern Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Anne Damiano presented an application to install composite railings along the front steps. The railing system would have a design like the existing railings on the front entry landing.

Materials Reviewed:

Assessors database map
Plot plan
Photographs
Sketches
Product information

Commission members agreed that the railing system was appropriate. R. Alfred moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted. P. Dudek seconded the motion. There was a roll call vote and the motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

RECORD OF ACTION:**DATE:** May 11, 2022**SUBJECT:** 19 FERN ST - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on May 10, 2022 the Auburndale Historic District Commission, by roll call vote of 5-0,

RESOLVED to **grant** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project as submitted at 19 FERN ST to to install a composite railing system along the front entry steps which has a design that is consistent with the existing railings along the landing.

Voting in the Affirmative:**Voting in the Negative:****Abstained:****Recused:**

- Nancy Grissom, Acting Chair
- Paul Dudek, Member
- Josh Markette, Alternate
- Richard Alfred, Alternate
- David Kayserman, Member

D. Kayserman recused himself.

33 Hancock Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

D. Kayserman presented an application to extend the existing back patio area, build an outdoor kitchen with a stone veneer finish, and install a metal pergola at the back of the house. The pergola would have a black finish to match the existing window muntins.

Materials Reviewed:

Project description

Photographs

Site plan

Plan

Elevation renderings

Product and material information

Commission members agreed that if the fence and vegetation were not in place, the edge of the pergola and part of the outdoor kitchen structures would be somewhat visible at the back of the right side of the house. Commission members said that the project was appropriate. P. Dudek moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted. R. Alfred seconded the motion. There was a roll call vote and the motion passed unanimously, 4-0, with one recusal.

RECORD OF ACTION:**DATE:** May 11, 2022**SUBJECT:** 33 HANCOCK ST - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on May 10, 2022 the Auburndale Historic District Commission, by roll call vote of 4-0 with one recusal,

RESOLVED to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project as submitted at 33 HANCOCK ST to

to extend the existing back patio area, build an outdoor kitchen with a stone veneer finish, and install a metal pergola at the back of the house. The pergola will have a black finish to match the existing window muntins.

Voting in the Affirmative:

- Nancy Grissom, Acting Chair
- Paul Dudek, Member
- Richard Alfred, Alternate
- Josh Markette, Alternate

Voting in the Negative:

Abstained:

Recused:

- David Kayserman, Member

113 Grove Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

This review was continued from a previous meeting. Terry Morris, Verne Porter, Jane Shoplick, and Charles Calhoun presented an application to move the existing house to a new foundation and renovate it. They would build a garage addition, renovate the house, and change the driveway configuration. A new house with an attached garage would be built on the back lot and accessed from Lasell Street. The work would include regrading, building retaining walls, landscaping, and installing a fence.

V. Porter explained that that most of the back lot would be relatively flat. The 10-foot drop close to 107-109 Grove Street would be dealt with by building two two-foot tall retaining walls and 18-inch tall wing walls. The existing house would be moved to a relatively flat area and would be 31 feet from the sidewalk. The floor elevations were the same.

Materials Reviewed:

Assessors database map

Site plans

Photographs of neighboring properties

MHC Form B

Elevations

Roof plans

Renderings

Product and material information

P. Dudek wanted to see site plans and drawings that showed the relationship of the properties to the school; V. Porter agreed that was doable. Commission members also asked for several perspective drawings; one looking down Grove Street at 113 Grove toward the school, a second looking down Grove Street away from the school, and a third showing how 113 Grove Street would look relative to the school.

It might also be helpful to have similar perspective drawings for the new house.

There was discussion about the existing wall with the fence which belonged to the City. The applicants said they might propose fixing it as part of the special permit process. The work would require review and approval by the commission.

J. Shoplick presented the landscape plan which included many native and introduced trees and shrubs. Bluestone patios, New England fieldstone retaining walls and new fencing would be added. They would keep the existing curb cut, but the driveway configuration would change. Commission required details for the proposed materials and construction and a clear fence plan. Vinyl fencing or any shiny finish would not be approved. P. Dudek requested elevations showing the fence and clear information on the material and height.

The existing chimneys would be duplicated as boxes with brick veneer finish. Commission members said the existing look needed to be replicated: dimensions and design details including the indentation and the painted areas. Details on the "box" construction, including the depth of the brick veneer, needed to be provided.

Commission members said that the proposed molded concrete foundation was not acceptable. The owners needed to pursue a cut stone veneer and to try to match the existing foundation.

C. Calhoun presented the window and door details and trim. Most of the existing windows were two-over-two, so that was the proposed lite pattern. Commission members agreed that was appropriate and said that the window construction details (SDLs with interior and exterior grilles and dark spacer bars) and the exterior muntin pattern and width needed to be clearly documented. Staff noted that historic muntin widths were either 5/8" or 7/8". The proposed trim would be AZEK; commission members agreed that AZEK and the proposed window trim details were appropriate.

Commission members approved of refurbishing the existing front door which was lovely. Most commissioners did not want to see the bullseye glass detail carried over to the garage doors as that was a formal detail.

N. Grissom said that the new house design was still not a unified style; there was a mix of dormer, roof and window styles. P. Dudek agreed and said the garage roof stuck out in an inappropriate way.

Commission members said the proposed HardiePlank siding had to have the smooth side on the exterior.

P. Dudek needed to see dimensions and profiles for the proposed columns; they looked spindly relative to the house.

The window SDL construction and exterior muntin width and profile details needed to be provided.

All product and material details needed to be provided, including clear photos.

The applicants agreed in writing to continue the review to a future regularly scheduled meeting.

R. Alfred recused himself.

32 Woodland Road – Certificate of Appropriateness (Violation)

Meng Heap presented an application for changes made to the driveway area by replacing a planted area with gravel and extending the planting bed retaining wall. These changes were not reviewed by the Commission.

The owners had safety issues backing out of the driveway because the plantings blocked visibility and the pitch of the area meant that rain water ran from the bed into the basement.

Materials Reviewed:

Aerial views 2000 – 2021

Site plans

Photographs

Material information

MHC Form B

P. Dudek was sympathetic to the issues but said the white gravel was very stark and not appropriate. Permeable concrete grass pavers would be a better solution. P. Dudek moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted with the requirement that permeable concrete grass pavers replace the gravel and that plans be submitted to Staff for final review and approval. D. Kayserman seconded the motion. There was a roll call vote and the motion passed unanimously, 4-0.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: May 11, 2022

SUBJECT: 32 WOODLAND RD - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on May 10, 2022 the Auburndale Historic District Commission, by roll call vote of 4-0,

RESOLVED to **grant** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project as submitted at 32 WOODLAND RD to extend the planting wood retaining wall, build the stone wall for the planting bed, and to install permeable concrete grass pavers to replace the gravel area with the requirement that plans be submitted to Staff for final review and approval.

Voting in the Affirmative:

- Nancy Grissom, Acting Chair
- Paul Dudek, Member
- David Kayserman, Member
- Josh Markette, Alternate

Voting in the Negative:

Abstained:

Recused:

24 Robin Dell and Lasell Village – Working Session

Steve Buchbinder, Katherine Adams, Anne Doyle, and Philippe Saad presented an application for feedback on a proposed project to demolish 24 Robin Dell and build a new building with approximately 42 independent living units.

Materials Reviewed:

Assessors database map

Project description

Photographs

Renderings

MHC Form B

2006 decision to deny demolition

Staff advised that the property was a contributing building to both the National Register and the local historic districts. P. Dudek wondered if the house was isolated from its context; he was sympathetic to the proposal. N. Grissom stated that it was very rare to allow demolition and the commission had previously denied an application for demolition. This property was one of the older ones in the district and was historic. J. Markette said it was difficult to see the case for demolishing a contributing historic district.

Abutter Ewen Cameron said it was an important house that had previously been denied demolition; he was concerned that the house was being demolished by neglect and thought the proposed expansion was massive and unnecessary. Abutters Steve and Iraida Alvarez said the project was not related to education and that the project would require upgrading Robin Dell and adding a fire road at the back. The house had been neglected for sixteen years when it should have been treated as a significant property. Marylee Belleville was concerned with the tension between preserving the character of the historic district and properties and proposed expansion. She wondered if the house could be incorporated into the plans or relocated. The abutter at 228 Grove Street commented that the 24 Robin Dell property created a buffer. N. Grissom said the applicants needed to explore renovating the building and incorporating it into the plans. She thought the building could be moved.

Administrative Discussion:

Minutes: The April minutes were approved.

Update on Design Guidelines and Rules & Regulations: Staff asked commission members to start looking at the Auburndale documents and to review the draft Chestnut Hill Historic District Commission Rules and Regulations as a possible template.

Commission process: Commission members were asked to forward feedback on what process information would be helpful, especially for newer members.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Recorded by Barbara Kurze, Senior Preservation Planner