



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

**Meeting Minutes**

Date: August 15, 2022  
Location: Town Hall, Mystic Valley Room with remote access via Zoom

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

Members Absent: Michelle McCarthy

Also Present: Brian Szekely, Winchester Town Planner  
Mark Donnellan, 34 Oak Street  
Diego Bellalta, 11 Mystic Avenue  
Allison Kanges de Bellalta, 11 Mystic Avenue  
Alexandra Murphy, 34 Oneida Road  
Annemarie Colt, 26 Johnson Road  
Robert Colt, 26 Johnson Road  
Fulton Lee Harley  
Richard Leaf, 5 Winslow Road  
Daniel Belknap, 19 Hancock Street  
Martha Belknap, 19 Hancock Street  
Nick Rosettos, Winchester Planning Board

A quorum being in attendance, the meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm. Note: Commission Chair LeMenager participated in the meeting remotely via Zoom. Vice-Chair Hickey ran the meeting.

**Demolition Permit Delay reconsideration – 48 Oak Street**

Mark Donnellan reported that he had spoken with Building Inspector Al Wile who said he could move forward with the plan as submitted without needing a Board of Appeals Special Permit. The plan (attached) would retain the proposed porch, roughly similar to the existing porch in look and dimensions.

**MOTION:** The Commission votes to lift the 12-month delay of the issuance of the permit provided the applicant retain the plan and its specifications as presented. The motion was made and seconded.

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

## **Board of Appeals Petitions**

### **11 Mystic Avenue– Special Permit**

Property owners Diego Bellalta and Allison Kanges de Bellalta are seeking a Special Permit from Section 3.5.5 of the Winchester Zoning Bylaw so as to be permitted to construct an addition that will be that will be located closer to another building than permitted as of right.

After a brief presentation by Mr. Bellalta and discussion by the Commission confirming that the proposed addition is at the rear of the house, a motion was made.

**MOTION:** In accordance with Zoning Bylaw Section 9.4, subsection 8, the Historical Commission finds no adverse effect on a historical or cultural resource. The motion was made and seconded.

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

### **26 Johnson Road – Special Permit**

Property owners Annemarie and Robert Colt are seeking a Special Permit under Section 3.5.5 of the Winchester Zoning Bylaw so as to be permitted to construct an addition that will be located closer to the side property line than permitted as of right.

The applicants explained that they want to replace an existing screened porch with an all-season sunroom on the west, uphill side of their house to assist them in their desire to age in place. In a brief discussion, the Commission found nothing objectionable about the project with respect to the historical resources. Chair LeMenager spoke favorably of the design with the returned gable as an improvement on both the house and the neighborhood.

**MOTION:** In accordance with Zoning Bylaw Section 9.4, subsection 8, the Historical Commission finds no adverse impact on a historical or cultural resource. The motion was made and seconded.

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

### **34 Oneida Road – Special Permit**

Property owners Alexandra and Doug Murphy are seeking a Special Permit under section 3.5.5 of the Winchester Zoning Bylaw so as to be permitted to construct an addition that will be located closer to the side property line than permitted as of right.

After a brief discussion, the Commission found nothing objectionable about the proposed addition.

**MOTION:** In accordance with Zoning Bylaw Section 9.4, subsection 8, the Historical Commission finds no adverse impact on a historical or cultural resource. The motion was made and seconded.

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

## **Other Matters**

### **19 Hancock Street**

Property owner Daniel Belknap has approached the Commission seeking guidance with respect to the possibility of gaining a waiver under Section 4.5 to preserve the historic house and build a new home on the other half of the lot that would require waivers for lot size/width/setbacks.

Mr. Belknap explained that his original plan was to demolish the existing house and build a large duplex. But, when he learned about section 4.5, he decided to pursue the idea of the subdividing the lot while preserving the existing historical house. The existing structure would remain a duplex after renovation while the new house, located on the downhill (west) side, would be a single-family residence.

Town Planner Szekely explained that the Commission could impose restrictions on the renovation of the existing house under the waiver. The first step is for the Commission is to determine the distinctive characteristics that should be saved. The Commission must first find that this is a historically significant resources worth preserving, and then it needs to decide which particular components need to be preserved.

The Commission is generally receptive to this approach. There was a consensus of the Commission that there is a need to obtain a Form B on the property to enable it to determine its historical significance and to develop a list of conditions prior to the formal BOA application. Planner Szekely and Chair LeMenager will explore means of funding the research, either with the help of the Planning Board, the Town Manager or the Select Board.

In response to Mr. Belknap's question, Mr. Szekely estimated that the Commission would have the Form B completed and prepared to continue the discussion in about two months' time, at its October meeting.

### **Rocky Ledge Terrace**

Town Planner Szekely explained that the applicant is proposing a three-lot subdivision and creation of an extension of the existing dead-end Rocky Ledge Terrace to enable the development of three new houses on the ledge above Mahoney's Garden Center.

The land was left by the late Margaret Mahoney to the Archdiocese of Connecticut. The Mahoney family bought the property and is hoping to sell the land to recoup their investment. They reportedly bought it because they were concerned about what might have happened if they had no control over it. The applicant has a pending P&S with the Mahoney family. The applicant had initially proposed a six-lot subdivision, which was rejected by the Planning Board. The new proposal features three lots of 23,000, 24,000 and 20,000 square feet, respectively.

The consensus of the Commission is that there is insufficient information at this preliminary stage to express support or opposition to the project. However, the Commission reserves its right to make further inquiries of the applicant and to consider the matter at a future meeting.

### **Future Historical Commission meetings**

The Commission discussed the possibility of resuming all-remote meetings on Zoom. Vice-Chair Hickey expressed mixed feelings, as did other members. The general consensus is to continue with the hybrid meeting. Planner Szekely reminded the Commission that a hybrid meeting requires four people to be present to achieve the quorum.

**68 Harvard Street**

Commissioner Clemson raised concerns about renovation work occurring at 68 Harvard Street that may border on “substantially all of the building,” and therefore a demolition by the definition as outlined in Chapter 14. He said he would seek the building permit application to determine whether this should have been a demolition permit application.

**Minutes of July 11, 2022**

A vote to approve the minutes of June 13, 2022 was held.

**MOTION:** To approve the minutes of June 13, 2022.

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


**Adjournment**

**MOTION:** To adjourn the Historical Commission meeting of July 11, 2022.

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:53pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jack LeMenager

 September 13, 2022  
Bruce Hickey                      Date