

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
JUNE 1, 2016**

Town of Bedford
Bedford Town Hall
Multi-Purpose Room / Auditorium

PRESENT: William Moonan, Chair; Alan Long, Vice Chair; Karen Kalil-Brown, Clerk; Lorrie Dunham; Chris Weisz; Kevin Latady

ABSENT: Sal Canciello

Mr. Moonan introduced himself and read the emergency evacuation notice.

PRESENTATION: Ms. Kalil-Brown read the notice of the hearing.

PETITION #011-16 – Doris Webber, 8 Maple Street, for tree removal.

Mr. Moonan stated that Ms. Webber could not make it to the hearing, but the Historic District Commission (HDC) had received her application regarding tree removal. He said they had been provided a letter from an arborist certifying that the tree was dead, along with a plot plan showing the location of the tree. After discussion of the application, Mr. Moonan called for a motion.

MOTION:

Mr. Long moved to approve the removal of a dead tree for Doris Webber, at 8 Maple Street, because the tree has been deemed diseased per the certification letter from Robert Mead, arborist.

Ms. Dunham seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Moonan, Long, Kalil-Brown, Dunham, and Latady

Voting against: None

Abstained: None

The motion carried unanimously, 5-0-0.

At this time, Mr. Weisz arrived at the meeting.

PRESENTATION: Ms. Kalil-Brown read the notice of the hearing.

BUSINESS ITEM: David Goldbaum, 10-12 Maple Street,

Mr. Goldbaum greeted the Commission and stated that he had two primary items to discuss regarding the “finishing touches” of the new dwelling at 10-12 Maple Street.

Tree Removal

Mr. Goldbaum said that the first involved the removal of four trees. He showed a plot plan that marked the location of the four trees. He explained that one of the trees was actually inside the footprint of the existing house; the second was perilously close to the new house; and the remaining two were within a dense row of trees that needed to be scaled back.

Mr. Moonan called for a motion for the tree removal only.

MOTION:

Mr. Weisz moved to approve the removal of four trees at 10-12 Maple Street, marked as A, B, C, and D on Exhibit A.

Mr. Long seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Moonan, Long, Kalil-Brown, Dunham, and Weisz

Voting against: None

Abstained: None

The motion carried unanimously, 5-0-0.

Elevation Change and Garage Doors

Mr. Goldbaum said that the other items involved changing the garage door color and also a roofline change. He stated that the roofline would be shifting slightly, which would change the roof pitch, but it would still be lower than the existing structure at 10-12 Maple Street. He said that he had provided new plans that reflected the changes.

Mr. Long said that, in looking at the new plan compared to the original, it appeared that the chimney was going to be removed. Mr. Goldbaum said that was correct, because the chimney was only there on the original plan to bridge the gap between the two roofline elevations, but there was no need for it now that the rooflines were being shifted. He said that he proposed to put copper “crickets” in its place, which served as an architectural form of flashing.

Mr. Long asked whether the garage door in question was the one originally approved. Mr. Goldbaum said that it was, aside from the color, which he decided would look better in brown rather than black – but the manufacturer, Garaga, was the same. Mr. Moonan said that Garaga had been specified as the manufacturer in the original approval but he did not recall the specific type being approved, and he felt that the proposed style would

look a bit modern. The other HDC members agreed. Mr. Goldbaum said that he would be happy to change to the more traditional model, and it was agreed that that would look more appropriate.

There was extensive discussion about the aesthetics and architectural details of the proposed roofline and window changes.

After further discussion, Mr. Moonan called for a motion.

MOTION:

Mr. Long moved to approve the following four modifications to the proposed house at 10-12 Maple Street:

1) Roof line will be raised two or three feet as shown on the Maple Street elevation marked as Exhibit A, to accommodate the new style dormer with steeper pitch. Elm Street rear elevation marked as Exhibit A and Maple Street side elevation marked as Exhibit C. Six-pane windows to match the upper portion of main house.

2) Previously approved garage doors will now be brown; manufacturer will still be Garaga, as shown on Exhibit E.

3) The chimney previously approved in the center of the proposed structure did not serve a ventilation purpose; that chimney will be removed and will be replaced by copper cricket roofing that will not be visible from a public way.

Ms. Kalil-Brown seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Moonan, Long, Kalil-Brown, Dunham, and Weisz

Voting against: None

Abstained: None

The motion carried unanimously, 5-0-0.

PETITION #010-16 – CONTINUATION – First Parish Church, 75 Great Road, for solar panels.

Mr. Moonan commended the members of the First Parish Church for all the time and effort they had put into this presentation. He said it was clear that they were all very passionate about this cause and he was impressed by how they had all come together to voice their support.

Karl Winkler, of the First Parish Church Energy Conservation (ECO) Taskforce, greeted the Commission. Rebecca Neale, a member of the Church and its legal counsel for this meeting, also greeted the Board. She noted that 79 postcards had been submitted to the Code Enforcement Department that showed support from Town residents, some of whom were members of the Church but many of whom were not. She also handed out pictures drawn by the children at the Church showing their support for solar panels on the building and their interest in helping the climate.

Mr. Winkler thanked the Commission members for the time they had taken to visit the Church site and to review all the documentation given to them. He went through an updated PowerPoint presentation that showed in more detail how the proposed panels would be installed. He explained that the roof shingles would, with the HDC's permission, be changed from gray to black so that the panels would be less visible; the panels would be matte finish to minimize reflections; they would be arrayed in rectangles, set back at least two feet from the roof edge, equidistant from the top and bottom, with no more than one-inch horizontal and vertical gaps between panels; any electrical wires and conduits would be hidden; and a black ice skirt (chamfered guards) would be used, along with black critter guards and black finish plate. He said that all of this would be done to reduce visual noise and keep the panels as unobtrusive as possible.

Mr. Winkler said that the iconic image of the Church on the Town Common would not be altered; they deliberately kept panels off that side of the roof so that image would not be affected. He talked about other installations on other historic churches in Massachusetts, particularly the South Church in Andover.

Mr. Winkler showed a series of videos that showed the First Parish Church from various walking perspectives around the structure, along with an animatic that displayed the locations of the proposed panels on the roofs.

Ms. Neale pointed out that several trees on the Common blocked much of the roofline, at least when the trees were leafed out. She noted that the Church would be willing to plant another tree to help block that roofline, if the Board desired it. Mr. Long said he would rather not have another tree blocking the Church, because he didn't want to see such a beautiful structure hidden behind trees.

Mr. Moonan opened the hearing to the public.

Aubrey Jaffer, of 33 Buehler Road, said that this proposal was in keeping with the specifications written in the HDC guidelines, and he felt that it would help promote positive changes in the District and in the Town.

Benjamin Littauer, of 37 Fletcher Road, said that Bedford was a Green Community, and allowing solar panels on this structure would be in keeping with that. He added that a Commission such as this one needed to consider the preservation of natural beauty in addition to the preservation of historic structures.

Stephen Fusi, of 17 Gould Road, said that the HDC would show considerable foresight if they approved this application, and he urged them to do so.

Ronald Green, of 12 Old Stagecoach Road, said that the postcards received by the Commission were available to the general public at a festival that the Church had had the previous weekend. He said that the public was asked to comment on the solar panels,

either in a positive or negative way, and all opinions were welcomed; he stated that it was important to note that people were not only asked to write in support.

Brown Pulliam, of 102 Badger Terrace, stated that it was imperative that the world reduce its fossil fuels. He said that the next couple decades will see more advances in technology to meet this goal, and therefore solar panels were not a permanent solution. He requested that the Commission tolerate the anachronism of solar panels while the world needed them for either the life of the roof or for 25 years, whichever was shorter.

Benjamin Bennett, of 10 Sweetwater Avenue, commented that he fully supported the proposal put forth by the First Parish Church.

Terry Gleason, of 10 Lido Lane, said that he was a member of the Sierra Club, the oldest environmental activism group in the country. He said that the planet desperately needed renewable energy, and solar panels were an important step in the right direction. He encouraged the HDC to vote in favor of this application.

Barbara Feldman, of 21 Brooksbie Road, said that, before she moved to Bedford, she was on the Lexington Historic District Commission. She noted that the Lexington HDC was always very supportive of solar panels, provided that they were kept as invisible as possible. Mr. Weisz said that he felt it was important to note that the Bedford HDC was not against solar panels and would, in fact, probably grant them on almost any other structure in the District. He added that the HDC members were also in support of panels on the back half of the First Parish Church, but it was the proposal of panels on the oldest part of the parish structure that they were struggling with.

Mr. Moonan thanked everyone who had spoken and said it was clear how heartfelt this issue was to the congregation. He said the time had come to make a motion, and that motion could be either to approve or deny. Ms. Kalil-Brown said that she felt that they had all of the documentation and information they needed to vote to approve the proposal with exhibits, so she suggested the Commission start there. The other members agreed.

MOTION:

Ms. Kalil-Brown moved to approve solar panels for the First Parish Church, at 75 Great Road, as shown on Exhibits A through E.

Ms. Dunham seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Kalil-Brown and Dunham

Voting against: Moonan, Long, and Weisz

Abstained: None

The motion did not carry, 2-3-0.

Mr. Moonan said that, since the vote to approve the panels did not pass, the Commission now needed to vote to deny them. He said that they must provide reasons why they were denying the application, and he handed out some wording he had drafted that summarized the HDC members' concerns from the last two meetings. He suggested using those reasons in the motion.

MOTION:

Mr. Weisz moved to that the Commission deny the application for First Parish Church, 75 Great Road, for solar panels, for the following reasons:

1) The Church is one of the first meeting houses built in Bedford and it is located centrally on the Town's Common. Its "wedding cake" style and visage have become iconic symbols of the Town. As such, its historic and architectural value is of great significance to Bedford.

2) Under the Town's enabling legislation, the Commission is charged with the preservation and protection of the distinctive characteristics of buildings and places significant in the history of the Commonwealth and the Town.

3) The installation of solar panels on the roof would be highly visible and incongruous to the historic aspect of the Church and its architectural characteristics.

Mr. Long seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Moonan, Long, and Weisz

Voting against: Kalil-Brown and Dunham

Abstained: None

The motion carried, 3-2-0.

Mr. Moonan said that he was torn by this decision, and he knew that this was a difficult decision for all involved. He thanked those in attendance for coming to the meeting and voicing their opinions.

Mr. Winkler thanked the Commission members again for their time.

May 4 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Moonan stated that Ms. Neale had recently made some suggested changes to the May 4 meeting minutes, and he was uncomfortable voting on the changes until the other Commission members had had a chance to review them. He said they would, then, vote on the minutes the next time they met.

Adjournment

With no other business to discuss, Mr. Moonan called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION:

Mr. Long moved to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Weisz seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Moonan, Long, Kalil-Brown, Dunham, Weisz, and Latady

Voting against: None

Abstained: None

The motion carried unanimously, 6-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 PM.

William S. Moonan *11/2/16*
William Moonan, Chair Date

Respectfully Submitted,

Scott Gould
HDC Assistant