

**Historic District Commission
Town Hall, Room 126
Final Meeting Minutes, January 28, 2014**

**RECEIVED
MAY 21 2014
TOWN CLERK
ACTON**

Meeting called to order at 7:30 PM. Attending Kathy Acerbo-Bachmann (KAB), David Honn (DH), Pamela Lynn (PL), Ron Regan (RR), Anita Rogers (AR). Mike Gowing as BofS rep.

7:30 PM Citizens' Questions:

RR recused himself in order to ask a question about his own pending certificate. AR will be issuing it shortly.

7:31 PM Delayed approval of January 14, 2014 Minutes.

7:32 PM Discussion of Sign, 10 Wood Lane

KAB explained that the process for obtaining an historical sign begins with the Historic Commission.

AR was comfortable with the larger sign. DH indicated that the smaller one is very small. Everyone was comfortable with the sign proposed by the applicant.

KAB moved to accept Application 1401 for 10 Wood Lane, a 12 x 16 marker for the Samuel Jones House with the format indicated on the application. Seconded by AR and approved unanimously.

7:35 PM Citizens' Questions cont.

Matt Morizio and Addie Morizio who have recently purchased 603 Mass. Ave. asked about the general process for making applications. They will be returning on Feb. 11 to begin to explore the process. KAB explained the purview from the public way in response to their questions about window changes.

Franny Osman asked about the Wright Terrance property which has been recently purchased. Her concern focused on the HDC's control over fencing. KAB explained that it is relatively limited.

7:45 PM Discussion of Elevator Installation at 470 Main St.

PL shared the concerns of the group expressed during the last meeting.

Dean reminded the group that he had suggested several options to the HDC when the application was originally discussed. DC explained that the plantings have been cut back for winter and may soften the impact a bit in the future.

As the building sits very high, the elevator installation rises too. DC reminded that the HDC that it had not been in favor of plexi-glass which he had thought might allow trees beyond to be seen. DC reminded the HDC that it does not have control over paint color.

DC shared that the closest point is 117 feet from Main St., quite a distance.

KAB summarized that this was an unusual project and HDC was just trying to consider a compromise. RR explained the trigger of this discussion. Members were asked to visit the site and express their reactions at the last meeting. DC had wondered about a hanging pot or trellis. AR indicated that something to soften the lines might well help. DC shared that there are additional plans to work on plantings at the location in the spring. The Commission supports a strategy focusing on enhancing the plantings.

8:10 PM Discussion of Current Signage Violation Issues

Waiting for the next applicant, KAB informed the Commission of an upcoming meeting about how violations will be treated – what is the logical next step.

8:15 PM Discussion of Stair, Window and Door Violations, 102 Main St.

KAB explained that there are three main violations. Two vinyl windows on the front were installed sometime between 2011 and 2013.

RR asked about the responsibility if the owner is new and the violation was caused by a previous owner.

AR explained that the second violation involves an approved door. The door installed was not what had been indicated. The door is solid, most likely wood, without any windows as had been allowed in the certificate.

DH and AR are inclined to accept the current door as an amendment.

The third violation involves the stairwell as the newel posts were to be 4x4 with wood caps to be painted or a solid stain. Concern also focuses on the handrails and the balusters. The handrails should have been shaped.

KAB suggests that AR work with the Building Department staff to explain the proposed solutions for the stairs.

Splice in elements, add caps, and paint. The change should not be particularly visible. The intent is to minimize the amount that needs to be taken apart.

MG asked whether it would be possible to put a screening piece in to minimize the amount of change necessary. AR explained and DH concurred that that solution would still look too contemporary.

Belle Choate indicated that the owners are in violation of the Board of Appeals decision which indicated that the stairs must follow the HDC decision.

The Commission considered how this issue could have arisen. How did a second set of drawings, not the accepted plans, become those accepted by the Building Department? Perhaps it would be wise to insert an intermediary step in the permitting process to insure that the correct drawings are used.

In summary, the door will be acceptable, the two windows must be replaced, and the railing needs to be cured. The owner may be able to reuse the balusters and may be able to patch the railings.

8:44 PM Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully submitted,

**Pamela Lynn
Secretary**