

MINUTES
Hamilton Historic District Commission / Historical Commission
April 18, 2018

Members Present: Tom Catalano, Chair, Stefanie Serafini, Edwin Howard, and Jack Hauck.

Staff Present: Dorr Fox

Tom Catalano opened the meeting at 6:03 p.m.

MINUTES

Jack Hauck made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 5, 2018 meeting as submitted. Ed Howard seconded the motion and they were approved with three members voting in favor and one member abstaining.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Catalano stated that they should elect a chair of the Commission and a vice chair. Other members concurred. There was a discussion whether the officers should be elected when there were more members in attendance and when there were more members appointed. Mr. Hauck made a motion to delay the decision on the election of officers to a subsequent meeting. Stefanie Serafini seconded the motion. There was a discussion regarding whether there was a requirement for the American Institute of Architects (Boston Society of Architects) to recommend a member. Mr. Catalano noted that he had not been unable to place a free ad with the Boston Society of Architects. He noted that it only needs to be announced and that no advertisement is required. He will look into the matter. Ms. Serafini noted that it would be important to have an architect on the Commission. The Commission members discussed architects within the town that might be interested in serving.

Mr. Hauck called for the vote. Mr. Howard stated that the voting should be completed with the existing members. He believes that since the topic has been advertised they should vote on it at this meeting and not postpone it. He put his name forward and stated that he would like to be the chair of the Commission. The Commission members decided to hold a meeting on May 10, 2018. The motion was amended to make the decision at this next meeting on May 10, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. at Town Hall. The motion was approved with three members voting in favor and one member voting in opposition.

REVIEW OF PLANS FOR 604 BAY ROAD

Mr. Catalano stated that he believes that the revised plans reflect the changes that were requested at the public hearing. Mr. Hauck stated that the public hearing on this project demonstrate the need for an architect on the Commission. He believes

that Mr. Catalano's contributions made the Commission's decision better. Mr. Catalano stated that he believes that the Commission may not need an architect, but could benefit from a person with a background in historic preservation. Mr. Hauck stated that he was also impressed by the revised plans. Karen Doggett, the applicant stated that they are very pleased with the revised plans.

Mr. Catalano made a motion to approve the submission as reflective of the conditions of the decision of the Commission.

Mr. Catalano stated that they need to produce submission requirements. These requirements should show the proposed projects in the context of the existing circumstances of the structure. He noted that most towns have submission requirements. He will bring in examples from other towns.

Mr. Hauck seconded the motion. Three members voted in favor of the motion, and Ms. Serafini abstained. Mr. Catalano signed the plans as final approved plans.

TOWN MEETING REVIEW

The Commission members reviewed the approval of the Demolition Delay bylaw at Town Meeting. They noted that one person spoke in opposition to the bylaw and that there were flyers in opposition to it. Mr. Catalano noted that a woman who lives in the neighborhood adjacent to Asbury Grove spoke eloquently in favor of the bylaw and noted the loss of historic housing in her neighborhood and its impact on affordable housing.

Mr. Howard noted that the Salem News reported that the demolition delay bylaw only pertains to the historic district. He noted that there are people who are confused about what has been approved. It was decided that Mr. Fox should contact the newspaper to print a correction.

Mr. Fox noted that there is an issue with the bylaw. A ten day decision period was supposed to replace a twenty-one day decision period in regard to the determination of whether a public hearing was required. While the ten day period was inserted, the twenty-one day period was not deleted. It was decided to discuss the issue with legal counsel after the Attorney General reviews the bylaw.

The meeting was adjourned 6:35 p.m.