Chairman Drake called the meeting to Order, 5:30 PM.

Public Comment
None

Approval of Minutes – None

Review proposed exterior lighting pursuant to Historic Preservation Restriction. 1924 LLC, 49 Round Hill Road, Map ID 31B-004.

Ms. Estes recused herself from discussion of this item.

Ms. LaValley stated that the City Solicitor provided an opinion that all lighting meeting zoning is exempt from Local Historic District review, even if it is part of a larger project that requires a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Historical Commission holds a Historic Preservation Restriction that was required to be placed on the building for zoning reuse of a former educational structure, and the lights will require review pursuant to that Agreement. Chairman Drake read from the Preservation Restriction, noting that the lights are considered a ‘major’ change and the Commission will need to review the work pursuant to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

Ms. Blumenthal suggested that there could be another way to provide lighting rather than making holes in the building’s façade.

Ms. Lyon noted that the Secretary’s standards for rehabilitation do not provide specific guidelines for lighting, but that alternate forms of lighting may be less compatible with the character of the building.

Janet Gross, abutter, suggested that solar panels on pole lights would be more appropriate. Tom Douglas, project architect, expressed concerns about a ‘public hearing,’ since public comments are being made. Ms. LaValley noted that all determinations pursuant to Preservation Restrictions held by the City must be voted on by the Historical Commission, and all actions of the Commission must occur during a posted public meeting. Chairman Drake added that the Commission generally accepts public comments on any agenda items. Ms. Blumenthal stated that buildings need to be able to change and adapt, and the wall lights seem less intrusive than other options.
Ms. Fogel asked about motion sensing. Mr. Douglas replied that building areas are proposed to react to different sensors. 
Ms. Lyon moved to approve the lighting as proposed pursuant to the Preservation Restriction. Seconded by Ms. Blumenthal. The motion failed, 3-2. At this time the Commission does not find the lighting to be in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards. 
The Commission suggested that the applicant could present additional information regarding how the proposed work is consistent with the Standards, or a revised plan at any time. Previously existing lights may be replaced. Ms. LaValley suggested that the Commission consider each request under a restriction on its own merits, as each building and area is different.

Review and Approve Proposed ‘Alternate Plan’ Design for 43 Finn Street
Ms. LaValley summarized events to date; the Commission approved an alternate plan that included demolition of the structure, with a condition that final construction plans include design elements discussed at the March Historical Commission meeting, and the Commission reviewed submitted plans. 
Ms. Estes suggested that the federal style elements shown in the plans are not necessary since they are not from the same era of the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Fogel moved to approve the plans as presented, and that trussing and ornamental gable details could be removed at the applicant’s discretion. Seconded by Ms. Lyon, the motion carried 4-1.

Discuss Local Historic District Ordinance Project Categories
Ms. LaValley highlighted the list of items exempted from the Ordinance, noting that most were developed when the Ordinance was first drafted in the 1990’s. Some are included in the MGL Chapter 40C Section 8 list of features which Commissions may select not to regulate, some were created so as not to be onerous to homeowners, and others are based on activities unlikely to affect the District. Tom Douglas added that the list was developed to generate support for the District. The Commission agreed to continue discussing in the future.

Review Proposed Plans for 43 Finn Street
Jay Heilman, contractor, presented sketch plans for the new home that are proposed to include design elements from the neighborhood, including stick frame decorative detail, incorporation of the gable detail into the porch, and shifting the side elevation to include additional detail. 
Chairman Drake expressed concern about massing of the house. Ms. Lyon noted that the existing house has a fractured roofline. The Commission discussed porches with the applicant, and agreed that having a porch with a different architectural style would be acceptable since this was common in houses of that era.
Mr. Gaffney moved to find that the intent if the Demolition Ordinance is met through the planset for a replacement structure provided, and to approve an alternate plan including the elements discussed. Seconded by Ms. Lyon, the motion carried unanimously.

Review of Potential CT River Underwater Rock Cribbing Removal
The Commission reviewed proposed removal of exposed portions of a rock cribbing structure that had been used during log drives in the late 1800s. It is deteriorated and poses a navigation hazard. A structure on Shepherd’s Island will remain.
Ms. Blumenthal moved to support the removal as outlined in a memorandum from Wayne Feiden, with a comment that interpretive signage would be beneficial if possible. Seconded by Ms. Lyon, the motion carried unanimously.

**Cemetery Preservation Projects Update**

The Commission agreed that collaboration with Historic Northampton on tours and outreach regarding Bridge Street Cemetery would be ideal if the organization has time during the upcoming stone restoration work.

**Other business not foreseen when agenda was prepared**

Mr. Della Penna stated that a historic home tour will be offered June 29 to benefit Cooley Dickinson, all homes on the tour have received historic awards in the past.

Ms. Estes informed the Commission that she will unfortunately not be able to continue serving on the Commission due to potential conflicts of interest.

**Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 7:13 PM