

## Minutes of HDC meeting - Nov 19, 1998.

The meeting was called to order ~~by~~  
~~chairman~~ Andy West at 7:40 PM. ~~Commissioners~~  
~~members~~ In attendance were: Karen Dickford  
John Poor, Andy West, Patience Bunschub~~er~~,  
Bob Casinghino, Rick Carrier and Clarence  
Rabideau.

The minutes were read for the Oct.  
1, 1998 Special Meeting and the Oct 23  
regular meeting. Both minutes were ~~passed~~  
~~and~~ approved with minor adjustments. ~~Chair-~~  
~~man~~ Andy West ~~then moved on to old~~  
~~business.~~  
OLD BUSINESS.

Rick Carrier reported his contact  
with the M.H.C. (Mass. Historic Commission)  
on matters pertaining to public hearings  
and letters to abutters. This topic has  
been of great concern to the commission  
at recent meetings and the subject of  
much discussion. In an effort to clarify  
the legalese of the bylaws - Rick posed  
our questions about when letters and  
hearings are <sup>REALLY</sup> required ~~to the greater~~  
~~M.H.C.~~ He <sup>WAS ADVISED</sup> ~~reported~~ that for all  
applications to the H.D.C. you must  
have either a public hearing, or  
send letters <sup>sent</sup> ~~to~~ ~~abutters~~ <sup>to</sup> notifying  
them of the pertinent applications,



without  
~~There are no~~ exceptions ~~to this~~. This ruling  
~~information~~ was followed by much discussion  
amongst members; 2.8,

Karen Pickford inquired about a streamline  
process - if certain items can be fast-  
tracked through the process.

John Poor ~~inquired about~~ <sup>suggested trying to</sup> amend ~~ing~~  
our local bylaws. Andy West answered  
that our bylaws were the State's verbatim.  
and such amendment very unlikely.

Rick Carrier then stated that a <sup>MHC</sup> representative  
was willing to come out and speak to us  
about all <sup>such</sup> ~~of these~~ matters - Everyone  
agreed this was a good idea - ~~4~~ suggestions  
were tossed around about format - none ~~were~~ <sup>was</sup>  
conclusive and it was left that Rick would  
recontact the M.H.C. and try to set up a  
date (other than our regular meeting) in  
January. It was also decided a subcommittee  
would be formed to come up with specific  
questions and concerns to pose at this  
forum. Karen Pickford was named chairman  
and given the task.

FAVREAU  
The next topic was the Fry Hill Rd.  
property. ~~It was first reported that~~ The



learning the foundation nearly as exposed  
as before, including the parged area.

grading was still not properly done.  
An ~~half-hearted~~ attempt had ~~not~~ been  
made to push existing <sup>sand</sup> fill up the side  
of the foundation. The report of this  
inadequate effort left many commission  
members frustrated and extremely ~~are~~  
dissatisfied. It was felt that our efforts  
to work with the Favreus were  
patient, ~~and~~ tutorial, and unceasingly  
good willed. Their efforts in return  
were incomplete, inadequate, or non-  
existant. A discussion ensued - again -  
of how to continue with this matter.

At this point John Poor ~~asked~~  
~~for the floor to present some of~~  
~~his prepared and written suggestions.~~

He ~~had~~ <sup>offered</sup> three ~~approximate~~ courses  
of action the commission could take;

~~1.)~~ <sup>much as:</sup> Adopt a passive attitude and  
see what happens. If nothing does  
close the books and sit on with life,  
having learned a hard lesson about how  
Confession and HDC's don't mix.

2.) ~~Continue putting them along~~

3.)



But John for pointed out the fact the Farreau application was a proper one to start with - the problem was their non-performance.

which these <sup>proposals</sup> would do  
Andy West felt that we should not compromise procedure and that <sup>by law</sup> proper ~~proper~~ ~~channels~~ ~~procedures~~ should be followed - however laborious and difficult and frustrating.

Patience Bunschuk suggested that we grant ~~them~~ <sup>the Farreaus</sup> a certificate of hardship. ~~after they have completed outstanding items.~~  
In this way we are closing the whole matter but not granting our approval.

~~This approach was considered promising since~~  
Rick Carrier read the bylaws <sup>and</sup> ~~proper~~ ~~noted~~ that if we do not act upon ~~an~~ <sup>proper</sup> application in 60 days - the applicant will automatically receive a certificate of hardship. This approach ~~appears~~ was met with a positive response - it seemed a solution to many.

Bob Casinghino said that it was important for us to address the ~~se people~~ Farreaus (not mother and grandmother) and explain our procedures to them so there are no doubts and changes in the future. A discussion ensued about this topic of meeting with them personally. Some members felt it was important and necessary to have their presence at a meeting. Other members felt that in light of the history of this



matter- having them present had too much potential for anger and recrimination to erupt - and thus a derailing of the whole process. A registered letter seemed an alternative to some.

A straw poll was taken as to who preferred a letter or <sup>in-person</sup> confrontation. The letter approach won out.

Discussion returned then to the grading. As to our earlier dictates - we would not proceed without the smaller <sup>outstanding</sup> items being taken care of, especially ~~of~~. The grading <sup>which</sup> must be completed before any further applications ~~were~~ accepted <sup>for the</sup> deck and dormer. It was then ~~agreed~~ <sup>noted</sup> that the only action to take at this point was to notify the Favrears ~~of ~~that~~ Rd.~~ that the grading <sup>has</sup> not <sup>been</sup> done. ~~to our satisfaction, as promised.~~

The next order of old business was the Eldora Bowers house. Andy Wes read a copy of ~~the~~ <sup>to be</sup> letter sent by the ~~man~~ Selectman (per suggestion of the H.D.C.) to Mrs Bowers <sup>stating</sup> ~~noting~~ that the H.D.C. had notified the Selectman of her violation (purple trim.)



This letter was drafted by Andy West and upon signing by Select chairman Vyto Andreliunas would be sent to Mrs. Bowers. (See attached copy of letter for specifics.)

The next topic was the Chase property on Fry Hill Rd. It was decided to first contact them informally <sup>in an attempt</sup> to clear up their violations. <sup>?</sup> offered to do this.

The following topics were then covered briefly:

1) Clarence Rabideau said he would pursue the topic of Design Guidelines on the Internet

2) it was reported that Jason Fortunato of The Common would be <sup>white washing</sup> ~~staining~~ his fence. ~~white~~ - <sup>and sample</sup> an application would be received in the spring.

3) John Poor noted that the Vangel property <sup>might</sup> ~~was going to~~ be restored. (It is currently in deplorable condition)

4) John Poor noted that although money had been appropriated, <sup>no painting</sup> ~~nothing~~ had been done ~~at~~ the Town Hall this summer. It was <sup>agreed</sup> ~~noted~~ a letter should be sent <sup>to the Selectmen</sup> ~~urging~~ and reminding in the spring.

5) ~~The~~ <sup>A</sup> violation of bylaws by the Lively's was <sup>discussed</sup> ~~noted~~. They have



erected a temporary speeding <sup>limit</sup> sign - which seems to have become permanent. Although all members are Sympathetic to the intent and purpose of the sign - the sign itself (large - handmade - unapproved) was deemed to be a violation. A ~~discussion~~ <sup>lively exchange</sup> followed as to how best to handle this matter while aiding the Lively's cause: the elimination of speeding through the central and settled areas of town. No conclusion was reached.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 PM.

Respectfully Submitted  
Secretary  
Karen Pickford

\* The HSC Bylaw is not at all specific about signs, however.



*Town of Royalston*  
*Office of the Selectmen*  
*Royalston, Massachusetts, 01368*

November 19, 1998

Eldora Bowers  
P. O. Box 27  
Royalston, MA 01368

Dear Mrs. Bowers:

We have been informed by the Historic District Commission(HDC) that you have changed the color of your house without approval from the HDC. We are also aware that you changed the color of your house from brown to white and the trim from brown to lavender.

In March, and August of this year the Royalston Historic District sent you a letter indicating that your application for the color change to your house was not approved. Under the Royalston Historic District Bylaw, you, as a property owner in the district, are responsible to secure prior approval for any changes to structures on your property visible from a public way. Currently, you do not have approval for the color change which you have already made. This is a violation of the bylaw. You must, under this law, return your house to its original color and trim, or submit another application to the HDC with a different color scheme. The HDC has informed us that they are willing to approve the house color of white. The issue that they take is with the lavender trim. You will need to submit another application with the white siding request and a new trim color.

The selectmen are responsible for enforcement of this bylaw. The Commission has reported this violation to us in an attempt at resolution of this matter. It is our hope that legal action will not be necessary. Please contact this office so that this matter may be settled.

Sincerely,

Vyto Andreliunas,  
Chairman



## Subcommittee Report

due to the busy scheduling of December - I have not yet called together a meeting to clarify our questions and concerns for the Mass Historic Commission - I will do this right after the 1<sup>st</sup> of the year and in time for our proposed meeting date

Karen Pickford