

Historic District Commission
Town Hall, Room 9
Meeting Minutes, 20 November 2015

Meeting called to order at 7:37 PM. Attending: Fran Arsenault (FA), Ron Regan (RR), Anita Rogers (AR) joining at 7h40, and David Foley (DF), David Honn (DH), David Shoemaker (DS; note-taker); not present Chingsung Chang (CC, Selectmen Representative)

Citizens: Victor Normand from Acton Real Estate; Pete Henry from Lone Star

Move to approve Oct 20 and Nov 10 Minutes; accepted unanimously

7:38pm Citizens Questions: David Honn recuses himself and poses a question: CNA to redo roof, same materials, same appearance DH rejoins

7:45 Public Hearing Continuation – Acton Real Estate Signage: Called to order #1531, Interactive signage. Legal Notice read to the committee and citizens. No questions on the application.
Discussion: DS: have there been any changes in the application?
VN: no. AR: Don't want anything 'moving' on the screen when it is not being interacted with. We spoke of the HDC having input and review of the 'Home Page' images and design. DH: will it change periodically? VN: Yes; on a yearly basis, perhaps, the design. AR: will it be a home? Logo? VN: Yes. Meant to be read from the street. DF: Treat it as a sign in terms of the home screen; and any change in a normal sign would trigger a review by the HDC. Would like to have this procedure in place for this sign as well. AR: We classify this as a window sign. VN: On the home page there will be a basic layout or template, and all pages at a level of the system are consistent. DH: We would approve the template. VN: proposes that we reserve the right to review it, but not the obligation to make an explicit approval of every change. DH: This sounds appropriate. RR: The approval could work like a CNA, with the information on the standard form. DS: Changes to be brought to the HDC's attention. DH: Brookline's adoption of this sign has some sensible conditions – e.g., "Design of home screen subject to review and

approval; no additional text unless prompted by a pedestrian. Will return to home screen after 5 minutes.” DH: time to extinguish 30 minutes after business hours. What is your business day? VN: until 20:00, so would normally extinguish by 20:30. DF: Does the applicant have questions? VN: No; appears the HDC understands the issues and advantages. Objective is really to entice someone to enter. DF: is there a virtual keyboard? VN: believes yes, or soon; to get a phone number, email address, name. RR: HDC does not want videos, so a ‘Skype-like’ interface would not be allowed. AR: Assume it comes on when the business opens; and last person in the storefront would set the signal to shut down? VN: would be a burden; proposes that the operation is ‘not to exceed the duration’ of the building illumination. DS: a Typical business day; DH: consistency would be best. AR: Should indicate the time; will be a case study for Acton to understand the impact of this kind of sign. DS: perhaps the sign should be illuminated only while other businesses in the center are open. VN: Sounds like having the sign illuminated until 10pm would be workable; a simple solution seems best. AR: Suppose Sun-Thurs to 9:00, Fri-Sat 10:30. VN: Suggest to HDC to choose the latest times that are acceptable to the HDC and leave the right to review/modify. AR: Want to start on the conservative side, and welcome a request to extend the times. RR: Does it turn off if it is in the middle of a transaction? We would be comfortable with the machine continuing until an interaction was completed. DS: collect statistics and use that to help provide the argument for any changes in timing. AR: the Brookline sign may change every 5 minutes; the Acton HDC does not wish this to be true for Acton.

AR: Move that we approve the sign, with the requirement that the HDC review the template and a typical listing page for the sign. Also require that future design changes be submitted to the HDC for review. The proposed on times would be from 8am 7 days/week, turned off Sun-Thursday at 9pm, Fr-Sat 10:30 pm. The installation will serve as a case study for Acton to determine the use for this kind of sign. One sign of 24x42” screen dimensions. No moving images will be shown (e.g., no Video). The image will be the static home display when not in use (i.e., not showing different images after a period of time). Motion passes. Public meeting is closed.

8:28 525 Mass Ave – True West Restaurant: Peter Henry. COA submitted. Brought samples for discussion. Two signs proposed; design elements discussed at the last meeting. Two samples circulated with gold leaf on a high-density polymer base, the other gold paint on a wood substrate. All characters are to be carved into the surface. Both surfaces carry brush strokes. For the Circular sign, the normal requirement is no more than 6 sq ft of frontage; that is the surface area of the circle. N.B.: The circular sign may need to wait due to financial constraints. The larger rectangular sign is subject to an exception for the Village district by the HDC. The HDC looked at images with a code-consistent sign and one following the request. DH: a font in between the two examples for the smaller lettering may be preferable. Current lettering is 2.7 and 3.9; split the difference would be 3.30 inches, and the HDC likes this.

AR: Motion to approve the urethane and gold leaf True West sign, 24" x 216" wide which requires a special permit by the HDC (granted). "True..." 10.8" inches per the artwork, and an 'Village supported...' to be 3.3" (halfway between smaller and larger artwork examples). Attached with hidden fasteners. Lighting is per cut sheet for Focus SLS-02 with the 45 deg angle. Brush strokes are not to be exaggerated while still appearing to have been brushed. Sheen and color per sample for the base of the sign. For the Projecting (circular) sign, the HDC also approves a 33" diameter sign to be mounted above the restaurant entrance, blade between the two doors. No illumination specific to the sign, and conforming to bylaws. Applicant to provide updated artwork for a confirmation of appearance font size. Motion approved unanimously.

8:57 10 Wood Lane – Roof, Chimney Demo and Rebuild, Skylight Replacement: Nigel Godley, applicant. DF: Applicant wishes to replace some of the roofing, rebuild a chimney, and renew a skylight. 3-Tab shingle, matching the current shingles. Applicant has recovered ~350 old bricks which are hoped to be used to replicate the old chimney. Shows a simple plan views to show where things lie. The chimney in question has 3 flues, and is the main chimney for the house. Current roof leaks in multiple places. DF: two other chimneys were previously rebuilt, and are different from the chimney to be rebuilt already. The HDC has previously

allowed only the face to carry old bricks, but the applicant would like to use *one* kind of brick, and will insist on old bricks if the recovered ones do not suffice. The replacement skylight is the same size as the present, and the same external appearance as the present skylight. DF: notes that it can be ordered with clear glass which would give a better external appearance. It appears a CNA will be appropriate due to the effort that the applicant is making to reproduce

DF: Motion to issue a CNA #1537 for 10 Wood Lane. Shingles be replaced with a 3 tab... etc. DH to prepare the CNA.

9:11 12 Wright Terrace – Deck: Gregory Turner (contractor) #1536. AR: Visited and photographed. Stairway barely visible from the street. The Deck Repair is out of sight. Change of material is proposed to cellular PVC. GT: Wood ‘does not last anymore’ – new growth is not durable. The INTEX product is Extruded PVC around an Aluminum core. Also well dimensioned, and hidden fasteners. Will be painted to match trim.

Motion to approve the existing stair railing repair of the Deck railing and newel posts for the South stair using the INTUS railing system per the application. 1 ¼ sq balusters, 8x8 posts, installed with concealed fasteners. Elements to be painted to match the trim of the house. HDC is approving the alternative materials due to the limited visibility of this stair railing from the street.

Finding: the Stairs are 60-80 feet from the street, leading to the limited visibility. (maybe also approved before?)

Motion approved unanimously.

9:35 6 Newtown Road – Roofing: Discussed need for Certificate of Applicability by DF.

9:45 Exchange Hall Fence Application: Glenn Berger. #1532. 127, 129, 131 Main St. DF: Extension given for the consideration of the application. Desires to install site fencing. Fencing is proposed around the property carrying several buildings. The material is Aluminum, to appear like wrought iron, and would be 3’6 off the ground. Objective is to make the collection of buildings and the property more a single coherent whole. Previous steps up to the Exchange hall and property nearby has been subsumed into road right-of-way, and provides default constraints on the position of the

fencing. A variance from the Planning board would be needed to re-create an entry that would be more historically appropriate. Adequate clearance is needed to allow snow removal. The Applicant hoped to have a start on the fencing soon, but if a request for a variance on the fence position were pursued a delay would be imposed. Recent public works are now completed making the installation of the fencing relatively simple. The Committee would like to see historical photos to help guide their recommendation. The proposed fence is cast aluminum, pre-colored black, and a smooth surface. Posts are 2 ½" square; units are 6' long, and so that is the frequency of posts. Exchange hall is ~1860; at that time typically there were stone bases with wrought iron on top. The building is also tall; important that the fence height be well scaled to the situation. AR: put in a bed of flowers to moderate the fence apparent height. The fence will be on the stone (retaining) wall ground, and the committee likes the idea of it being installed *in* the wall. Consider 90 degree turns at the entries to provide the desired sense of enclosure. Changes in level should leave vertical pickets (steps or parallelograms). DS: note that the fence is near tall and not-so-tall buildings; advantageous to put the fence near the taller building up on granite piers, a stone wall, or raised ground behind a retaining wall. HDC proposes meeting again, informed by experiments with different fence heights, a look at an historical photo or two, to help find an optimal solution.

85 School St

Women's Club Lift and Fire Alarm, CAN. #1340

- 10:11 Administrative Discussion: DF will hand responsibility to DH for several weeks.
- 10:43 Move to adjourn; seconded and voted unanimously