



**TOWN OF WINCHESTER**  
MIDDLESEX COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS  
HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
TOWN HALL  
WINCHESTER, MASSACHUSETTS 01890

**Meeting Minutes**

Date: September 13, 2021

**Virtual meeting via Zoom**

Members Present: Bruce Hickey, Vice Chair  
Jon Carlisle  
John Clemson  
Janet Boswell  
Emily Dowling  
Michelle McCarthy

Members Absent: Jack LeMenager, Chair

Also Present: Brian Szekely, Town Planner  
Rachael Edmonston  
Adam Glassman  
Brian Bell  
Andrew Statires  
Eric Gjerde  
Giovani Miranda  
John Tighe  
Joseph Zampitella  
Steven Meltzer  
Mark Donnellan  
Ken Gordon  
Rakel Meir  
Sally Dale  
Tatiana Davidkovich  
Carl Solander  
A. DiNatale  
Andrew Kook  
Gloria Wlech Legvold  
Robert Legvold  
LeeAnne Tower

A quorum being in attendance, the meeting was called to order at 7:32 pm.

**Public Hearings – Demolition Permit Applications**

Vice Chair Bruce Hickey opened the meeting by explaining the demolition permit hearing process.

**53 Wildwood Street**

Commissioner John Clemson began by explaining that the history of the property at 53 Wildwood was recently researched for a private client. The property, known as the William H. Goodwin House, was constructed in approximately 1892 and originally sat on a deep, narrow lot that extended from its 233-foot frontage on the north side of Wildwood Street in an irregular

rectangle north to Winter Pond. The property, once consisting of the house and a carriage house was divided into two separate properties. The carriage house is now a dwelling and separate property with a current address of 23 Dartmouth Street.

William H. Goodwin acquired the property in 1892 from E.D. Twombly when members of the Twombly family were actively developing the southeast leg of Wildwood Street with suburban villas sited on residential lots of roughly 10,000 square feet. Goodwin, a native of Augusta, Maine, was a Boston-based merchant who married Josephine Freeman in 1878. Goodwin owned the property until approximately 1907. During the first half of the twentieth century, the property changed hands many times and was frequently occupied by multiple families. By 1955 the property was owned by local builder and real estate developer Alfred D. Elliott who applied for a building permit to “remove [the] top story and remodel” the Goodwin House. In 1957 he also made “inside alterations to make [the] present barn into [a] dwelling and garage” at 23 Dartmouth Street. Commissioner Clemson emphasized that Elliott’s additions and alterations to these buildings, as well as his subdivision and development of the Goodwin Estate, were both highly sympathetic to their original feeling and presence in an important historic built landscape.

Commissioner Clemson continued by providing an overview of the house’s construction. Though the current house is an expansive single-story bungalow, with a low, ground-hugging stance, a façade that is set back within a deep front porch, and a main low-pitched, hipped roof, evidence suggests that the house was once a much larger, multi-story house. Existing features, including a deep canopy supported by distinctive L-shaped brackets and a large, deep canted bay centered on the right side, suggest that the house was originally much taller, with complex massing and a silhouette characteristic of the Queen Anne style popular at the time of the house’s construction.

The hearing was opened to the applicant, Andrew Staires, who stated that he currently lived with his wife and three children at 21 Dartmouth Street, directly behind 53 Wildwood Street. He explained that he wished to expand his yard to better suit the needs of his family. In order to do so, he wished to demolish the current property to expand his yard, and then rebuild the house to match the style of the original house that was constructed in 1892. He understood that the house was an important feature of the neighborhood and emphasized that the proposed new construction would match the look and feel of the neighborhood.

The hearing was opened to the Historical Commission for questions and comments. Commissioner Michelle McCarthy asked if Mr. Staires intended to live in the new property. He answered that he would not. Commissioner McCarthy noted that many people in the neighborhood were concerned about the proposed construction and asked Mr. Staires if he had explored other options. Mr. Staires answered that he and his wife had initially intended to preserve the original house but found that the way that the house is situated on the property, combined with setback issues, made it impossible to preserve. Commissioner McCarthy urged that Mr. Staires speak with the Winchester Planning Board and the Town Planner, Mr. Szekely, who were both excellent resources that could help him explore alternatives to demolition. Mr. Staires thanked her and emphasized that he was not demolishing the house to develop it and make a profit, but rather to create a better environment for his family.

Vice Chair Hickey asked if it would be possible for the back portion of the house to be removed so that Mr. Statires could create a larger yard. Mr. Statires answered that it would be difficult because the back of the house included a bedroom and bathroom, and also because of the way that the garage was situated on the lot. He emphasized that it would be a major and costly renovation. Commissioner Clemson asked how large the “L” shaped portion on the back of the property was. Mr. Statires answered that it was approximately thirty-five feet from the fence at the back of his property at 21 Dartmouth Street. He noted that he wished to expand his yard by approximately thirty-five feet. Commissioner McCarthy again questioned whether it would be possible to remove the rear portion of the house to achieve the desired effect. Mr. Statires stated that doing so would lose access to the garage and would require a major renovation of the property at 53 Wildwood.

Commissioner Janet Boswell asked whether Mr. Statires had considered moving the house rather than demolishing it. She noted that homeowners often moved houses to other lots. Mr. Statires stated that he did not have anywhere to move the property. Mr. Szekely noted that Mr. Statires could instead move the house thirty feet forward on the lot. He stated that while the move would impact the streetscape, it would also preserve the property. Mr. Statires announced that he would consider this recommendation and would reach out to Mr. Szekely for assistance.

Vice Chair Hickey opened the discussion to the public. Seeing that there were no comments, he closed the hearing for deliberation.

Commissioners Boswell and Jon Carlisle stated that they believed that the house merited preservation. Commissioner Clemson agreed, noting that the quality of the architecture supported the need for preservation. Commissioner McCarthy agreed and emphasized her willingness to work with the owner to provide alternatives to demolition. Vice Chair Hickey and Commissioner Emily Dowling agreed that the house was historic and worthy of preservation.

**MOTION:** The Historical Commission finds the property located at 53 Wildwood Street historically significant. The motion was made and seconded.

**VOTED:** 6 in favor, 0 opposed (1 absent).

**MOTION:** The Historical Commission voted to impose a 12-month delay on issuance of a demolition permit for the property located at 53 Wildwood Street. The motion was made and seconded.

**VOTED:** 6 in favor, 0 opposed (1 absent).

Mr. Statires asked if the Historical Commission would be interested in seeing plans for a design that would capture the look and feel of the original 1892 property. Vice Chair Hickey noted that while the Historical Commission frequently considered plans for proposed properties, the first step was always to consider avenues for preservation but, where preservation is not possible or likely, Mr. Hickey also noted that the Commission is practical and entertains alternative proposals. Mr. Statires registered his understanding.

Mr. Szekely closed the discussion by providing his contact information to Mr. Statires.

#### **44 Clark Street**

Commissioner Clemson began by noting that a survey was conducted in 2007 on 44 Clark Street and the surrounding area. Commissioner Clemson stated that Clark Street was developed as a planned subdivision by real estate speculators, Benjamin and Adeline Church, who were both physicians, between 1894 and 1899. The street was developed as a coherent mixture of single-family and duplex dwellings, constructed in either the side-gabled cottage dwelling style or the clip gabled style. The property at 44 Clark Street was an example of the single-family side-gabled cottage dwelling style.

At the turn of the century, the houses on Clark Street were tenanted by local workers, who were usually employed at the piano case factory or the later felt mill that was located in Winchester. Commissioner Clemson noted that of the twenty-one houses located on Clark Street, thirteen were single-family dwellings. He stated that this kind of property was found all across eastern Massachusetts, as an alternative to the popular three-story apartment building. In the early twentieth century, the Church's began to sell the properties to individual owners.

The hearing was opened up to the owner of the property, Mark Donnellan. Mr. Donnellan noted that he had submitted the floor plans and elevation to Chair Jack LeMenager for consideration. Vice Chair Hickey interjected that the purpose of the hearing is to determine whether the Property is Historically Significant under the By-Law and, as a result, the review of plans for a replacement structure are not relevant. Mr. Donnellan acknowledged such point and also that he believed that the property was historically significant, but that it was not suitable for twenty-first century living because the house was not up to code and the ceilings were too low, at six feet. He emphasized that while the property was similar to other character-defining dwellings on the street, other houses in the neighborhood were being renovated. He also added that many of his neighbors were interested in his plans for the property.

Commissioner Hickey asked if the property had any safety issues. Mr. Donnellan answered that the plumbing needed to be replaced but that there were no imminent safety issues. Commissioner Dowling commented on an earlier renovation that Mr. Donnellan had carried out at 139 Washington Street, and asked whether he could do a similar job on 44 Clark Street. Mr. Donnellan thanked her but emphasized that the house was not up to code and was very cramped, making it nearly impossible to renovate effectively. He stated that while the house was livable, he would not make a profit by renovating it in its current state.

Commissioner McCarthy asked whether he had plans for the planned new construction. Mr. Donnellan confirmed that he did and showed the plans to the Historical Commission. He proposed that the new house was constructed upon the original 2,200 square foot foundation, with approximately 400-500 square feet of space devoted to the basement so that the structure was a similar size to the surrounding properties. The structure would be a four-bedroom classic New England colonial house, with a central entrance, and an addition on the back. It would likely be painted white.

Commissioner Carlisle noted that while he believed that the structure was historically significant, he liked the plans presented and thought that the proposed property would fit in well with the surrounding houses.

The hearing was opened to the public for comments. Hearing no response from the public, the hearing was closed.

Mr. Donnellan added that he had given his plans, as proposed, to his neighbors and asked for their input. He also provided and read from a petition that he had written and distributed to his neighbors, which had received the signatures of support from several of his surrounding neighbors. He also received a letter from a neighbor requesting that he take any steps necessary to improve the current structure.

Commissioner Dowling stated that she believed that it was historically significant and contributed to the streetscape but was in favor of the plans presented. She suggested that perhaps Mr. Donnellan could replicate the roofline of the existing house in the new construction but stated that she was generally in favor of demolition.

Commissioner Clemson clarified that Commissioner Dowling was suggesting that Mr. Donnellan mimic the shed dormer design in the new property. He thanked Mr. Donnellan for his candor and his efforts here and for the work that he had done in Winchester. He added that the block represented a building design that was rapidly being lost, though he respected the developer's efforts to create smaller, affordable houses with more space. He noted that while he liked Mr. Donnellan's plans, he believed that the house and the block as a whole were worthy of preservation.

Commissioner Boswell stated that she was conflicted and that she agreed with both Commissioners Dowling and Clemson. She noted that while the plans were beautiful, she was concerned with the loss of historic working-class housing in Winchester. She was also troubled by the idea of losing affordable housing and the fabric of the neighborhood. As such, she announced that she was in favor of preservation.

Commissioner Carlisle stated that he liked the plans for the proposed replacement, and while he believed that the house was historically significant, he did not want to impose a demolition delay. Commissioner McCarthy agreed, noting her appreciation for the plans and her belief that the property was beyond repair. She also said that the streetscape had already been changed irreparably.

Vice Chair Hickey expressed his concern that allowing the demolition of the property might set a precedent that would contribute to an increase in demolitions in the neighborhood. He stated that he believed that the property was historically significant and was in favor of implementing a delay so as to work with Mr. Donnellan closely to have more control over the proposed plans. Commissioner Carlisle suggested that the Commission include several conditions in the motion. The Commissioners agreed.

**MOTION** The Historical Commission finds the property located at 44 Clark Street historically significant. The motion was made and seconded.

**VOTED:** 6 in favor, 0 opposed (1 absent).

Commissioner Carlisle believed that Mr. Donnellan was very considerate and stated that he was open to not issuing a delay with the understanding that Mr. Donnellan adhere to the plans as presented.

Commissioner Clemson stated that while he understood Commissioner Carlisle's opinion, he believed that the plans should be altered slightly based on the Commission's input. He suggested that the height of the proposed property be reduced, and that shed dormers and side gables be added to the plans.

Mr. Donnellan stated that he had three options currently available to him. He could either put the house back on the market, he could wait a year for the demolition delay to lift and could consider other options in the meantime, or he could consider the Historical Commission's proposed alterations to the plans. In reference to the last option, however, he noted that he could not add the shed dormers to the front of the property, as that style would likely not sell.

Commissioner Carlisle asked Mr. Donnellan if he would start construction immediately if permitted. Mr. Donnellan stated that he needed to begin construction immediately—before winter set in—to avoid selling the property. Vice Chair Hickey noted that the Commission's next meeting was on October 4 and asked if Mr. Donnellan could attend to further discuss the proposed plans. Mr. Donnellan agreed to attend and added that while he would work to reduce the height of the proposed structure, the planned eight-foot floors could not conceivably be reduced by much. He also added that the front façade could also not change.

**MOTION:** The Historical Commission voted to impose a 12-month delay on issuance of a demolition permit for the property located at 44 Clark Street. The Commission invites Mr. Donnellan to attend the October 4 meeting of the Historical Commission to discuss the plans for the proposed new construction. The motion was made and seconded.

**VOTED:** 6 in favor, 0 opposed (1 absent).

#### **40 Foxcroft Road**

Commissioner John Clemson presented a map of the Wedgemere National Registered Historic District, which is near 40 Foxcroft Road. He noted that the dwelling at 40 Foxcroft is one of a group of 19 properties that should be included within the expanded boundaries of the Wedgemere National Registered Historic District.

Commissioner Clemson continued by describing the property at 40 Foxcroft Road, known as the Lovejoy House. The Lovejoy House is a well-preserved variation of the center-entry garrison colonial. Three broad bays across, the east or left side of the first floor is recessed under an

overhang, echoing a feature commonly revived from 17th century or First Period design, with a canted bay window beneath. Its garage wing is topped by a gambrel roof with a saltbox profile. Covered in clapboards, the building has an exterior brick chimney and a concrete foundation.

Commissioner Clemson also provided a brief overview of the property's history. The developer of the parcel was Emil Fellman (1895-1959). Born in Finland, he married Swede Jennie Hammer in 1919 and with their son were long-term residents of Arlington. Fellman worked as a painter but later identified himself as a builder. He purchased the lot and applied for a permit in 1940, as trustee for the Manadnock Realty Trust, formed in 1939 to hold and develop real estate for a 20-year period and to benefit his wife and son. The architect of this dwelling was Joseph Selwyn (1907-1980), a Russia-born and Northeastern-educated architect and civil engineer. In addition to dwellings, he designed shopping malls, restaurants, and stores across the Boston area. He also specialized in zoning law and undertook an urban renewal plan for Lowell. The property was held briefly by Eric Carlson of Arlington, but its first long-term owners, Charles W. and Constance Lovejoy owned the property from 1941 until 1967. The property was later owned by Mortimer J. and M. Marilyn Buckley from 1967 to 1974 and until recently by Frances P. and Patricia Furey and their family.

The owner being absent, the hearing was opened to the public. Hearing no comments, the Commission closed the hearing to the public.

Commissioner McCarthy stated that the property was beautiful and historic and should be preserved. She noted that the property had been sold privately within the family. Commissioners Carlisle, Boswell, and Dowling agreed. Commissioner Clemson added that it contributed to the look and feel of the neighborhood and should be included in the nearby National Registered Historic District due to its age and significance. Vice Chair Hickey echoed Commissioner Clemson's point and agreed that the property should be preserved.

**MOTION:** The Historical Commission finds the property located at 40 Foxcroft Road historically significant. The motion was made and seconded.

**VOTED:** 6 in favor, 0 opposed (1 absent).

### **Board of Appeals petitions**

#### **9 Chardon Road – Site Plan Review**

Dorothy and Joseph Zampitella, of 9 Chardon Road, are seeking a Site Plan Review under Section 9.5.1(5) of the Winchester Zoning By-Law so as to be permitted to construct an addition where the total floor area of the single-family dwelling will be greater than 5,000 square feet.

Eric Gjerde, the architect representing Mr. and Mrs. Zampitella, described the property at 9 Chardon Road. The property is a single-family house that was constructed in 2000 in a cul-de-sac. Mr. Gjerde described the proposed two-story addition that the owners wished to construct on the right side of the house, which would be partially visible from the street. He noted that the details of the addition would be in keeping with the design of the house, and would feature materials identical to the original house, including asphalt roof shingles and brick. Mr. Gjerde

also added that the owners were in communication with their neighbors about the proposed plans.

Commissioner John Clemson asked if the Design Review Committee had discussed the property. Brian Szekely, the Winchester Town Planner, confirmed this and noted that the Design Review Committee had voted unanimously on September 8 in support of the proposed project, with two conditions. The conditions stipulated that the construction should not impact the surrounding vegetation, but that if the vegetation was impacted, that it would be replaced by the owners to screen the property from neighboring houses.

**MOTION:** In accordance with Zoning Bylaw Section 9.5.7 the Historical Commission finds no adverse effect on a historical or cultural resource.

**VOTED:** 6 in favor, 0 opposed (1 Absent)

### **Other Matters**

#### **14 Fenwick Road**

On the July 26 meeting of the Historical Commission, the Commission had voted to impose a twelve-month demolition delay on the property at 14 Fenwick Road. Kenneth Gordon, representing the owners of the property at 14 Fenwick Road, announced that his clients, Brian Bell and Rakel Meir, sought to petition the Historical Commission to lift the 12-month demolition delay early. Mr. Gordon stated that his clients were presenting plans created by architect Adam Glassman to illustrate to the Commission that demolition and reconstruction of the property at 14 Fenwick Road was the best course of action. Mr. Gordon added that the façade of the proposed property would directly mirror that of the existing structure and would be constructed with identical materials. He also added that his clients would prove that no other buyer would purchase the property in its current state.

Rakel Meir emphasized that the proposed replacement would replicate the original house almost identically. She reiterated that due to the gross negligence of the contractor that she and her husband had hired to complete a renovation of the property, it was now structurally unsound, unsellable, and could not be preserved. She noted that no contractor would take on the work, and therefore the best course of action was to demolish the property and recreate an identical structure on the lot.

Adam Glassman, the architect, showed the Commission the new proposed plans. He noted that the only difference in the proposed structure was that a chimney would be removed. He added that all other changes had been discarded to faithfully recreate the original house.

Vice Chair Hickey stated that the Commission's responsibility was to determine whether or not it was appropriate to lift the demolition delay, with conditions, based upon a full review of the proposed plans. He noted that only the front elevation had been provided for the Commission's review. Mr. Gordon answered that under the Bylaw, the Commission was only concerned with the front elevation of a property, visible from the public way. Mr. Glassman echoed this but



added that he could send the rest of the plans for the property to the Commission. Commissioner Carlisle noted that the sides and garage were visible from a public way.

The meeting then moved to a deliberation by the Commission on the request. Commissioner McCarthy noted that her concern was that this case would set a precedent that would make it easier for future homeowners to demolish their historic properties. She asked if the owners had discussed the possibility of selling the house with a real estate agent.

Mrs. Meir answered no, but that she and her husband did not want to expose themselves to legal action. Mr. Bell added that they sought the advice of sixteen contractors and were sure that the property was structurally unsound.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if there was a way to completely reconstruct the damaged back of the house while maintaining the façade. Mr. Glassman answered that they could not find a builder who would take on liability for the project.

Commissioner Clemson asked Mr. Szekely if this project triggered a review by any other of the town's review boards. Mr. Szekely answered that the project would be subject to a Site Plan Review if it was over 5,000 square feet, but that he did not have enough information about the property to say for sure. He asked Mr. Gordon if the property was nonconforming. Mr. Gordon answered that they had already received a permit for the rear addition and Mrs. Meir added that the property had no setback issues and should be a conforming property. Mr. Szekely stated that if Mrs. Meir was correct and the property conformed to the existing Bylaw, then it would not be subject to the review of other boards.

Vice Chair Hickey noted that there was a garage in the plans. Mr. Bell stated that they had to tear down the original garage because it was completely rotten. He noted that they would construct an identical one on the property.

Vice Chair Hickey reiterated that it was the Commission's responsibility to decide whether or not to lift the delay early. He noted that the Commission must weigh the prospect that the owners would faithfully recreate the house against the possibility that it could be preserved.

Commissioner Clemson noted that there was no way to determine if the house truly could be salvaged. Vice Chair Hickey agreed but stated that without the additional plans, the Commission would not have as much detail as it normally would. He added that the Commission and the owners would typically create a letter of agreement that would be signed by both parties.

Commissioner Carlisle added that any property could be preserved, but that it would be a question of cost. He noted that he believed that the owners had exhausted every opportunity to try to preserve the structure. Commissioner Boswell agreed, adding that she didn't believe they could ever know enough, but that the legal proceedings would go on too long for them to wait to lift the delay until they had a final resolution. Commissioner Dowling agreed but added that she knew that several neighbors had voiced concerns about the rear addition and therefore she wanted to see all of the proposed plans.

Commissioner Clemson stated that this was the worst case he had ever seen while a member of the Commission and that he did not believe that the delay should be lifted immediately,

particularly when the house might become part of a Local Historic District. He also added that they should also wait to ensure that no other boards would have to review the project. Commissioner McCarthy restated her belief that this case would set a bad precedent should the Commission lift the delay early. She also added that a house in Winchester without a rear wall had recently been preserved, noting that preservation was always possible. She closed by expressing her sympathy for the owners but believed that the house was historically significant and worthy of preservation.

Vice Chair Hickey believed that the house could not be preserved. He expressed his desire that the Commission and the owners come up with a signed letter of agreement that would provide the building department with conditions regarding the house's demolition and faithful reconstruction. Vice Chair Hickey also asked Mr. Glassman to provide the full plans for the replacement structure to the Commission for consideration. Mr. Glassman agreed to do so.

Mr. Bell stated that they needed to move forward immediately to demolish the house and retain the services of the contractor that they had hired. He noted that they could not afford to wait until October 4. Vice Chair Hickey emphasized that the Commission did not feel comfortable lifting the demolition delay until all four sides of the elevation plans were submitted for their review.

Mr. Glassman asked if one member of the Historical Commission could review the plans and be responsible for lifting the delay. Vice Chair Hickey responded that the Commission did not cede such power to a single member. Mr. Szekely informed the Committee that all of the elevations, a site plan, and a list of conditions were all that was needed to be sent to Al Wile, the Winchester Building Commissioner.

Vice Chair Hickey asked if the Commission would be willing to meet in two weeks, on September 27. Commissioner Boswell stated that she was unsure, but Commissioner Clemson and Vice Chair Hickey noted that they were available. Commissioner Clemson also stated that he would be willing to go on a site visit to 14 Fenwick Road.

Vice Chair Hickey summarized the proceedings, stating that the Commission would not hold a vote at present, but would aim to meet in two weeks to discuss the full plans. He added that he would send a draft letter of agreement with a list of the required materials therein to Mr. Gordon.

### **23 Pine Grove Park**

Carl Solander, the architect of the proposed project at 23 Pine Grove Park, announced that he was seeking guidance from the Commission to understand what would be necessary to lift the demolition delay early. He asked if there was a way that he could retain the current structure as an accessory structure and construct an adjacent property as an addition. To do so, he would need to repair the exterior and remove the existing shed, the right side, the front porch, and the existing garage.

Vice Chair Hickey noted that the Commission was always in favor of preservation. Mr. Solander elaborated that he could convert the current house into a garage or carriage house, with an additional structure on the side.

Mr. Szekely stated that accessory dwellings were allowed in Winchester. Mr. Solander asked if he could reclassify the addition as an accessory structure. Mr. Szekely stated that it sounded as if the addition would look like a second full house, but that he was unsure if he understood Mr. Solander's plans. Mr. Solander assured Mr. Szekely and the Commission that he had not drafted plans yet and was gathering information from the Commission before doing so.

Commissioner McCarthy noted that a project similar to the one described by Mr. Solander was carried out in the Flats, at 6 Harrison Street.

Mr. Solander noted that he could not find a limit on the size of an accessory structure. Mr. Szekely confirmed that there was no size limit, but that the project as described would likely end up looking like two houses on one lot. Mr. Solander emphasized that this was not his final design and thanked the Commission for their input. Mr. Szekely urged Mr. Solander to meet with him regarding the plans for the property. Mr. Solander agreed to do so.

### **Symmes Corner Survey**

Chair Jack LeMenager and Mr. Szekely sent the official correspondence to the Massachusetts Historical Commission relaying the news that they had determined that the consultant Claire Dempsey would be hired to conduct the Symmes Corner survey.

### **North End Survey**

Commissioner Clemson announced that the North End survey was nearly complete. The survey included the history of Winchester's African American community. Commissioner Clemson noted that Phase 3 of the survey would be completed in approximately one week and that he would review the work and make any appropriate changes at that time.

### **Approve July 26, 2021, meeting minutes**

MOTION: To approve the minutes of the July 26, 2021, Historical Commission Meeting.

VOTED: 6 in favor, 0 opposed (1 absent).

Vice-Chair Hickey stated that he would discuss the possibility with Chair LeMenager of holding an extra Historical Commission meeting on September 27. He also noted that Mr. Szekely would look for a previous letter of agreement that had been sent to Mr. Wile to serve as a precedent for the letter that would be sent to the owners of 14 Fenwick Road. The letter of agreement would be signed by both a commissioner and the applicants.

The meeting adjourned at 10:34 p.m. Next meeting: September 27 (tentative), via Zoom.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Rachael Edmonston, Recording Secretary

  
Bruce Hickey  
Date 9/28/21