

**DRAFT
CITY OF BEVERLY
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**

COMMISSION: Historic District Commission

DATE: January 26, 2022

LOCATION: Google Meet (Virtual)

MEMBERS PRESENT: William Finch (Chair), Suzanne LaMont (Vice Chair), Gregory Howard, John Leahy, Caroline Baird Mason, Wendy Pearl

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Emily Hutchings

OTHERS PRESENT: Luis-Miguel Correa; Brian Hromadka; William Lowd; Ward 2 City Councilor Estelle Rand; Fay Salt; Gerald Sullivan

RECORDER: Sharlyne Woodbury

Call to Order

Vice-Chair LaMont calls the meeting to order at 7:10 pm, as Chair Finch was experiencing technical difficulties in joining the meeting. Hutchings reads the meeting information and takes roll. Chair Finch joins shortly after.

1. Approval of minutes

a. November 10, 2021

Motion: LaMont moves to approve the minutes as presented. Leahy seconds. The motion carries 6-0.

b. December 9, 2021

LaMont provides a clarification on page 3, noting the “Fish Flake Hill Study Report” should state the “Fish Flake Hill NDC Study Report.”

Motion: LaMont moves to approve the minutes as amended. Leahy seconds. The motion carries 6-0.

2. Beverly Golf and Tennis Rehabilitation: Update and discussion – Brian Hromadka

Finch recuses himself from this portion of the agenda, as he notes he has a professional relationship with the architect for the project, Gerald Sullivan. LaMont chairs the meeting. Mr. Hromadka and Mr. Sullivan present the updates for the building, landscape, windows, and grounds.

Mr. Sullivan begins with the landscaping plans, and reviews how the updated proposed plans include a drop off to the main entrance of the building turning off McKay Street. He states they are exploring material options for pavement that differ from the main road, and that they do not want to encourage this to become a main thoroughfare so that it may be pedestrian friendly. The

green in the front will be reduced slightly but will still remain a putting green. Based off the original design there will be four (4) “oversized bollards” to “denote your arrival” into the space. Ramp remains the same. There will be additional plantings in the parking lot and the traffic pattern will be changed to create a ‘golf bag’ drop off and so that visiting the pro shop is easier. From the parking lot there will be a path leading to the club house, on the south side, for emergency vehicle and golf cart access. They would like to open the south side of the building to this proposed path which will also connect the club house to the 18th green. They would like the public to enjoy the clubhouse. Mr. Hromadka discusses the extended porch, permitting pedestrians to enjoy the walkways and veranda views. He notes that the business aspects and historical preservation goals mostly align according to the business consultant.

LaMont opens the presentation to comments. Pearl inquires about the pedestrian access. Mr. Hromadka notes unless there is an event, the access will largely remain open to the public via walkways. Also noted: the east drop off driveway may be blocked off unless there is an event which will create a safer pedestrian way.

Mr. Sullivan continues the presentation and moves onto the building. He shows how the original 1923 floor plans demonstrate the opening of the fireside and lounge areas. Mr. Sullivan draws attention to the views and activities in the back of the building, and states they want to display that area more prominently. The grill was moved to the south side of the building. The first floor function room is removed, opening the dining room. The function room is relocated to the second floor. The kitchen and restrooms are relocated and the windows are higher to prevent anyone from looking in. The second floor design still emphasizes the veranda.

Mr. Sullivan begins discussion on the proposed changes for the window retrofits, reviewing the quality and conditions of the doors, trim, and glass. Windows located at the balcony include proposed changes for French doors from the existing double hung windows. Mr. Sullivan states they are trying to avoid too many structural changes. He reviews window options, going over storm windows, operable exterior storm windows, sliding windows with insulated glass, and vacuum sealed glass. He notes that much thought was put into the proposed window changes, and acknowledges people like natural ventilation. He review the sashes, trim material (wood/stain), glass preferences, and insulation by discussing four (4) different options. Mr. Sullivan plays a short video explaining Pilkington Spacia vacuum sealed glass panes (4th option), which are significantly thinner than traditional panes, have a higher R value and have been provided as options for replacement windows for historic renovations. This 4th option allows to retain the original sash and only replace the glass. Mr. Hromadka adds a summary of the layout plans and how the business plan and historical considerations are aligned by bringing back the card room, billiards room, and fireside room as the most dominant functions.

Leahy asks about the space and fitting the “19th” hole (grille area) and kitchen. Mr. Hromadka states the business consultant suggested changing the grill/kitchen location, bringing back the billiard room, and restoring the fireside room. Pearl asks for additional historical information on the first-floor layout, and whether any of the first-floor historical components be preserved. Pearl asks if the first floor windows are replacements, and Mr. Sullivan responds affirmatively. Mr. Sullivan shows additional renderings of the inside as well as photos of what the inside current looks like. Mr. Sullivan goes through which architectural components are original and which are

not. Pearl also asks if the interior finishes be preserved, calling attention to the bathroom windows originally arched with a high sill.

Mason appreciates the first-floor revisions, stating the layout is elegant, and appreciates the improvements. Leahy asks about the windows, particularly the vacuum-sealed windows. Mr. Sullivan responds they are about the same cost as restoring the historic windows; however, he believes they are slightly higher in cost than the representative quoted. Leahy asks what the replacement/repair costs are because there is concern about golf balls breaking the windows and the repair costs being too much which will lead to panels covering some windows. Mr. Sullivan states he does not believe the repair cost will be much higher. Pearl notes the effort put into the analysis of the windows, and asks about current conditions. Sullivan quotes about a 50% total failure of the windows, while others are in rough shape but salvageable and that windows will need to be stripped of paint because there is potentially lead paint present. Members review the options considered with the glass replacements. Mr. Sullivan goes into further detail about the types of glass. Pearl asks about the proposed strategy in replacing the glass. Mr. Sullivan states it will be determined by location and façade, with more prominent windows to receive the full historic treatment. Mr. Hromadka further reviews the window options.

Mr. Sullivan moves onto the final presentation piece discussing the porch and the new balcony. He reviews that the clubhouse is an historic arts and crafts building. Proposed changes include changing column width (columns will sit on the plinth), railings, and awnings. There are two different options for railings which includes glass balustrades with no wood cap, or wooden railings. Sullivan explains the benefits and drawbacks of each railing option. Mr. Hromadka summarizes and asked for the commission's opinion on the railings.

Commission members provide input on the balcony. LaMont states she prefers the wood railings, and that the glass does not look like it fits well with the historical context; plus glass maintenance is not ideal. Other members concur the wood is preferred to the glass. Mr. Sullivan clarifies that the front was always going to be wood. Pearl states she does not prefer the glass but notes the architectural design is falsely historic and more like a replication than an addition. She states the design does not satisfy the Secretary of Interior's Standards, as it does not distinguish enough between the new from the old. What is proposed looks like an "old" veranda with modern materials, creating a false sense of history. Pearl states she was hoping to see a modern porch, distinguishing it from the historic aspects of the building. Leahy disagrees and states me can see a difference between old and new. Mr. Sullivan notes the porch does not have to be a post-modern addition, and that it is difficult to avoid the spirit of the age. Mr. Hromadka notes there are only so many variables and materials they are able to work with; steel and glass do not seem to be the appropriate materials to highlight. Wood is the preference. Pearl suggests a black metal railing and an alternative column style, and that this could be a missed opportunity to create something distinguishable. The Standards says to not create a false sense of history, and that this is a part of the building where the proposed changes fall short. Mason and Pearl discuss. Mason suggests following Pearls idea of black wrought iron and to create a third option. Pearl states she does not feel the glass design was distinct enough. Mr. Sullivan briefly discusses some design alternatives and the pros and cons of that in regard to the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Mr. Hromadka summarizes and speaks logistically about the project urging commission not to get 'hung up' on one component of the project and reminds commission this

is not a final design. Mason suggests the commission revisits balcony materials and continues on to approve the rest of the schematic design.

Lamont and Leahy communicate that they prefer the 4th option of vacuum sealed glass. Pearl asks for further clarification about the window proposals. Mr. Sullivan notes that about 75% of the windows would receive the vacuum glass with the existing sash; others would take pieces of the glass to replace and fix the sash, with storm windows on top. The others will use the existing sash or rebuild them. There are a handful that are new windows proposed where the sashes are not salvageable. Leahy asks a clarification question and Sullivan replies stating that about 10%-15% of windows would be fully preserved. Pearl notes the sash is not being saved if the muntins are removed. Pearl states she would rather have as many original windows preserved as possible with the storm window. Members concur and note there is a lot of confusion about the windows, referring to the provided chart with the 92 windows listed in various states.

Mr. Hromadka provides clarification on the proposal for the windows, stating they would prefer to keep the wood windows wherever possible. The preferred options are to a) either apply a storm window on the outside with single pane glass and only restore the original windows in terms of paint and support or b) no storm windows and rebuild the windows with the vacuum pane and apply new muntins (getting rid of the original glass and muntins). The majority of the window replacements replacing portions of the windows only.

Pearl states that their priority is for preservation of the original window and that the project should aim to keep and restore as many original windows and associated components as possible. Mr. Hromadka then summarized and states that keeping the windows would be a 'big win'.

Mr. Sullivan states that about 50% of the windows can be left 'pretty much as is', around 40% have to be taken apart and fastened back together in order to be restored to have the same glass and the same wood but with new paint/stain and then paired with a storm window, and then the remaining 10% of the windows may not be able to be restored with all original components.

Leahy communicates that after the further discussion, the original window with storm window paired is the preferred choice.

Hutchings informs the Commission that Mr. Hromadka and Mr. Sullivan are looking for a letter of support to the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) stating that the Commission supports the projects and has found the proposed designs meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Hutchings states that this letter could be issued with conditions or caveats, depending on the Commission's perspective on the project. Hutchings states that the applicants have discussed applying for a Massachusetts Preservation Projects Fund (MPPF) grant for a portion of the restoration, which would require an additional letter of support from the Commission. Hutchings reviews the two letters of support, and members discuss the best way to move forward. The Commission discusses the need for additional review of certain aspects, including the south veranda and balcony, as well as the windows, and how to craft a motion. Hutchings states that the Commission could elect to have her write a letter to MHC relaying the motion.

Motion: Pearl moves to designate Hutchings to draft a letter of support to the Massachusetts Historical Commission, stating that the Commission confirms its support for the Beverly Golf and Tennis Clubhouse restoration and the schematic designs shown, noting the design meets Secretary of the Interior's Standards provided that the project team continues to work with the Commission regarding (1) additional details for the railing treatment of the addition, and (2) a solution for preserving windows that will maximize the preservation of historic windows in good condition. Leahy seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

Bill Lowd, Chairman of the Beverly Golf and Tennis Commission, addresses the Commission along with architect Luis-Miguel Correa to discuss the MPPF grant application. Hutchings suggests the team to return to the Commission for review of the grant application if they decide to move forward to review the application in more in depth. She notes that the MPPF grant requires extensive information, citing for comparison the City's previous application for the Powder House restoration. LaMont informs the design team the Commission could have a special meeting if necessary to review the application and consider a letter of support.

Finch rejoins the meeting at 9:25.

3. Consideration for letters of support for CPC funding applications

a. Lynch Park National Register Nomination

b. Historic Resource Survey Project: Cabot-Rantoul Residential Neighborhood (Phase 1)

Hutchings summarizes the reasoning for the letters. Members state they have no concerns with the letters as written.

Motion: LaMont moves to approve the letters of support for both projects as presented. Leahy seconds. the motion carries 6-0.

4. Update on the development of Neighborhood Conservation District Ordinance

Hutchings provides a summary of work completed to this point and shares an unfinished draft of the ordinance. Hutchings states that Mason, Leahy and Councilor Rand have been meeting weekly to work on the ordinance, with Hutchings present for staff support. Hutchings provides the updates on the draft ordinance and states that the Commission can start discussing the ordinance, or postpone the discussion. Howard and Mason suggest the discussion can be continued due to late hour of the meeting. Pearl notes that Councilor Rand is present and asks if she would like to provide any comments. Councilor Rand states that she has enjoyed the work with the group and looks forward to the discussion.

Finch continues the agenda item to the next meeting.

5. New/Other Business

Pearl notes that there was information in the Commission's staff report about the proposed development on lower Cabot and Rantoul Streets, and that the staff report stated that the subject shouldn't be discussed. Pearl asks if the project can be discussed if there is no quorum of

members, as there is no application that is currently awaiting Commission review. Hutchings clarifies that because the project is coming and that the applicant has stated as much, it is best practice not to discuss the subject at this meeting or in a quorum.

LaMont shares that Chris Koeplin provided a presentation to the Ward 2 Civic Association regarding the proposed demolition work on lower Cabot and Rantoul Streets, which stated the demo request should be before the Commission in February.

Hutchings stated she provided the related information in the staff report out of an abundance of caution, and that if any members would like additional information on Open Meeting Law, she can provide information on training.

a. Election of 2022 Officers

Members discuss whether current officers are willing to continue to serve.

Motion: Mason moves to elect William Finch as Chair. Leahy seconds. The motion carries 5-0-1. Finch abstains.

Motion: Leahy moves to elect Suzanne LaMont as Vice-Char. Mason seconds. The motion carries 4-0-1. LaMont abstains. Howard disconnected due to technical difficulties.

6. Adjournment

Motion: Leahy moves to adjourn. LaMont seconds. The motion carries 5-0 (Howard absent).

Meeting adjourned 9:39 pm. Next meeting scheduled for 2.24.22.