

ROYALSTON HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 18, 1999 MEETING

The meeting was called to order by Chairman, Patience Bundschuh at 7:40 PM

Members present were: George Krasowski, Clarence Rabideau, Patience Bundschuh, Rick Carrier, Andy West. Alternates present were: Bob Casinghino, John Divoll, Jody Brighenti

Karen Pickford, secretary was not present. The meeting was recorded on tape by Henry Felt. November minutes are transcribed from tape by Karen Pickford. Reading and approval of October minutes are tabled until the next meeting due to the absence of the secretary.

Old Business:

1. Application from Angel & Randy Favreau, 11 Frye Hill Road to pave driveway (after the fact) .

This application was accepted for consideration at the last meeting.

Patience Bundschuh noted that Angel Favreau said she would attend the meeting. At this time she is not present. The application for new construction does not include builders plans or "to scale" drawings. Patience reports that she has spoken to the building inspector Geoff Newton. He has not been contacted yet by the Favreaus regarding their proposed new construction, He states that he will need builder's plans. Patience reports that the application currently includes sketches of plans.

The commission reviews these sketches and determines that the sketches do not give enough information. The commission concludes that the sketches have not been done by a builder and do not constitute an official plan. It is determined that builder's plans will be needed. A discussion follows about the nature of the plans submitted by the Favreaus. Patience notes that she thinks the sketches are a modification of general plans. It is confirmed that Geoff Newton will need a clear building plan as well as the Conservation Commission. Patience notes that the Building Inspector,

the Conservation Commission and the Historic District Commission must sign an approval before the Favreau's can proceed. Patience notes that they cannot even dig a foundation without the approval of the Conservation Commission. Clarence Rabideau suggests that the application be tabled due to insufficient information. There is a brief discussion about the nature of the proposed garage doors as to whether or not they will have window panels. The information provided is not inclusive.

Andy West notes that the commission should give the Favreau's a specific list of what information is lacking so that there are no misunderstandings between the Favreaus and the HDC.

At this point Angel Favreau enters the meeting. Angel Favreau presents the HDC with the general plans she and her husband purchased for their proposed garage. These are shown to the commission. Andy West notes that there is a modification to the plan being presented according to the sketches. The current sketches had the garage gable end facing the street where as the plans showed the roof pitch facing the front.

Mrs. Favreau provided information about the garage doors. There is a discussion about the changes to the roof line and why the changes are necessary. Mrs. Favreau notes that she does not have a builder yet, however she has spoken to a builder who recommended the roof changes. It is noted that there are no dormers as shown on the general plan. Mrs. Favreau states that she has requested more specific plans, but has not received them yet. Therefore she made the sketches that she is submitting this evening. Members of the commission advise her once again that she needs more specific plans for the HDC and she will also need them for the Building Inspector., Goeff Newton.

A long discussion follows as members of the commission try to help Angel Favreau clarify her plans and the commission members try to visualize the breezeway and garage by looking at the general plans and sketches and asking specific questions of Mrs. Favreau. Most of the discussion is concerned with roof lines.

Mrs. Favreau states that if the builder cannot be more specific, she and her husband will attempt to build the garage and breezeway themselves. The commission tells Mrs. Favreau what specifics she will need to provide if she and her husband intend to do the building themselves. They are: front and side elevation (north), specific roofline, graph paper scale drawing, exact measurements.

George Krasowski asks the commission if there are any objections to what Mr. Favreau is proposing. There are none at this point . The objections are to lack of solid diagrams. It is suggested that the Favreaus speak to the Building Inspector and get him to suggest specific requirements for a plan, then return to the HDC with plans that will include the necessary details required by the Building Inspector. This would give the HDC a place to begin an official consideration of the application. Patience noted that the Building Inspector was invited to the meeting but could not attend.

Andy West proposes forming a sub committee as a liaison to interface with the Favreaus on this project. Andy West makes this a motion. The motion is seconded by George Krasowski and the motion is carried, all in favor. Henry Felt says that he will help if needed with his computer program. The committee will include Andy West, Henry Felt and Patience Bundschuh. They will try to facilitate this project by meeting with the Favreaus to help ready their application on request outside the regular HDC meetings. Angel Favreau notes that her phone number is 249-0488 because it is not listed in the phone directory. This concludes the discussion on the Favreau application. Angel Favreau leaves.

Alternate Jody Brighenti must excuse herself from the meeting at this point.

Old Business continues:

3. Patience reports to the commission on the November 5th site visit at The Bastille. The members of the HDC were invited to join the Massachusetts Historical Commission and David Tansey of The Landmark Trust USA and his architect to review proposed changes to the Bastille as they affect the grant application between The Landmark Trust and The Massachusetts Historical Commission. John Divoll, Karen Pickford and Patience Bundschuh were able to attend. Patience summarized the meeting and reports that David Tansey laid out three options concerning the back ell which he laid out to the MHC and the RHDC members present. They were:

1. replace the back ell with a one story ell that would replicate what was there originally.

2. Take down the ell and not replace it and put the kitchen inside the house.

3. Rebuild and restore the ell as is.

Andy West asked if David Tansey was aware of the photo that shows the 1900 ell with its shed roof that was formerly thought to have a gable roof. Patience states that Mr. Tansey is aware of the photo and believes he has a copy. The HDC looks again at this photo. It shows that the "original" ell in this 1900 photo did not have a gable pitched roof facing south but a solid clapboard wall facing south with a shed roof sloping back on the north side. The flat clapboard wall is similar to the existing ell at Pat Jackson's house and an early ell (no longer there) on the Humphrey Nash property. It is noted that this ell was replaced at a later date with a square, one story, hip roofed, lattice walled addition. The second story sleeping porch was then added on top of this at a later date.

Patience notes that the MHC has copied the RHDC with their letter to David Tansy dated 11/17/99. Patience reads the letter to the commission. The letter states that the MHC will consider two options in regard to their grant with Landmark Trust. They are

1. Retain the existing ell and repair with funds from the grant.

2. document existing ell and demolish, then rebuild. The MHC states that they prefer option 1 and continue with specifics for each option. MHC notes that they will not fund the second option but they will allow it under the terms of the grant. This letter also states that the MHC will consider funding the restoration of the fence on the Bastille property. The commission is cheered by this news as the members of the commission agree that the fence is important. A discussion followed about the contents of this letter. Patience Bundschuh tried to explain, based on the context of conversations and questions that occurred at the Nov. 5 site visit, that the MHC motivation for their decision seemed to center on the lack of documentation available on the former ell. Patience noted that conversations about the fence occurred at this meeting. She also noted that by Nov.5, David Tansey should have received the letter sent by her on behalf of the commission. No response to this letter has been received. David Tansey stated that at this point funds do not exist to restore the fence. Patience noted that the architect for Landmark Trust suggested repairing gates and pillars right away as a show of good faith. MHC concurred and at this point noted that they would consider funding restoration of the fence. A discussion followed

amongst members about this topic. Patience notes that the future of the grant with MHC is now in David Tansey's hands as he must now respond to the letter which was just copied to the HDC

The discussion then turns to the topic of David Tansey's preference for a metal tern roof at The Bastille. John Divoll explains that the preference for this roof is determined by the pitch of this roof. John feels it would be well suited to the metal material. The commission members wondered if the balustrade could be attached to the terne roof. John Divoll noted that he felt that the MHC felt that David Tansey had not produced enough reasons for rebuilding or demolishing the ell. The structural integrity of the present ell was then discussed.

New Business:

1. New sign at the Post Office.

Patience reports that Keith Newton requested feed back from the commission about the new sign design. Two options are represented..

A. The existing sign would be replaced with a like sign that would be painted white with black lettering.

B. A white old fashioned board sign with trim molding and black lettering to be mounted above the main door. Member, Peter Kraniak who is also President of the Historical Society, the building which houses the post office, says that a sign above the main door would be unacceptable because it would designate the entire building as the post office and not the Historical Society Building. John Divoll recommends adding a post office sign to the existing Village Improvement sign below the current sign. Peter Kraniak maintains this would interfere with the "open" sign in summer (museum open). A discussion follows about the sign options. It is concluded that the following be recommended:

1. A wooden sign, white with black lettering to be put at the right of the front door within the set back opening.

2. the same sign outside the frame on the clapboard wall. Peter Kraniak objects to this.

3. sign added to the Village Improvement sign as John Divoll suggested.

It is determined that the commission will require application for whatever is proposed.

New Business continued:

Andy West presents an application from Maxine Wilcox, South Royalston Road. The application is for a metal cap to be added to her chimney. Questions about this chimney and its original use follow. It is noted that the bottom of the chimney has been removed. It is no longer functional. Other solutions are discussed that would not be noticeable. The application is withdrawn by Andy West pending the exploration of other options. He reconsiders and submits the application for consideration. Clarence Rabideau makes a motion to accept the application for consideration. The motion is seconded by George Krasowski and the motion is unanimously approved. Andy West excuses the abutter notification as he is the abutter.

A discussion follows about the design guidelines and fast tracking certain items. The possibility of pre-approved items is discussed. Instead of forming a new committee to explore this, it was decided that this should be included in the work of the Design Guideline Committee.

There was no further business and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Pickford, Secretary