



Meeting Minutes of the Lexington Board of Appeals Conducted Virtually, Via Zoom February 12th, 2026, 7:00 p.m.

Board Members: Chair – Ralph D. Clifford, Nyles N. Barnert, and Associate Members Jeanne K. Krieger, Scott E. Cooper, and Patricia S. Nelson

Administrative Staff: Jim Kelly, Building Commissioner, Kiruthika Ramakrishnan, LUHD Office Manager, and EmmaJean Anjoorian, Department Assistant

Address: 5 Rindge Ave (ZBA-25-24)

The Hearing opened on December 11th, 2025, and continued to January 8th, 2026.

At 7:04 p.m., Mr. Clifford moved to grant a continuance.

At 7:04 p.m., Mr. Barnert second Mr. Clifford.

At 7:04 p.m., the Board voted to grant a continuance (a roll call vote took place: Ralph D. Clifford – Yes, Nyles N. Barnert – Yes, Jeanne K. Krieger – Yes, Scott E. Cooper – Yes, and Patricia S. Nelson – Yes).

Meeting Minutes of the Lexington Board of Appeals
Conducted Virtually, Via Zoom
February 12th, 2026, 7:00 p.m.

Board Members: Chair – Ralph D. Clifford, Nyles N. Barnert, and Associate Members Jeanne K. Krieger, Scott E. Cooper, and Patricia S. Nelson

Administrative Staff: Jim Kelly, Building Commissioner, Kiruthika Ramakrishnan, LUHD Office Manager, and EmmaJean Anjoorian, Department Assistant

Address: 15 Holland Street (ZBA-26-1)

The petitioner is requesting TWO (2) SPECIAL PERMITS in accordance with the Zoning By-Law (Chapter 135 of the Code of Lexington) section(s) 135-9.4 and 135-8.4.2 to allow modification of a non-conforming structure.

The petitioner submitted the following information with the application: Nature and Justification, Certified Proposed Plot Plan, Elevations, Floor Plans, Gross Floor Area Calculation Form, Abutter Support Letters, Architect Supporting Statements, and Existing Conditions Plot Plan.

Prior to the meeting, the petitions and supporting data were reviewed by the Building Commissioner, the Conservation Director, the Town Engineer, Select Board, the Planning Director, the Historic District Commission Clerk, the Historical Commission, Economic Development, and the Zoning Administrator. Comments were received from the Zoning Administrator, the Building Commissioner, and the Conservation Director.

At 7:05 p.m., Mr. Clifford opened the Hearing opened.

Petitioner: Elena Murphy

Ms. Keri Murray, the architect for the project, began her presentation by showing a photo of the existing house and by explaining the project's goals. Ms. Murray explained that the project seeks to enhance the exterior of the home and bring some character and presence to the front façade. Ms. Murray then explained that project also seeks to improve access to the front entrance from the street and then showed the front elevations and highlighted the low grade. Ms. Murray also explained that the driveway resides on the right-hand side of the property and that after parking, one must walk downhill to reach the front door. Ms. Murray stated that they want to improve how people approach the home and then showed the proposed elevations which would provide better access to the home and the front door from the side driveway. Ms. Murray explained that the proposed covered porch would eliminate the need to walk down the road and enter the home at the lower part of the grade. Ms. Murray also stated that the porch would help with the sequence and the symmetry that they seek to achieve. Ms. Murray then noted that they plan to present a new roof line that would make the home more colonial style and further noted that the design and construction of the current roof have some challenges. Ms. Murray then explained that the house sits on a pre-existing non-conforming lot that presents significant challenges, and that the house sits close to the street. Ms. Murray further explained that they plan to remove the existing front stairs and rebuild them on the side as a part of the porch entry sequence. Ms. Murray stated that they do not seek to increase the non-conformity and will consider the project's relationship to the street. Ms. Murray noted that the homeowners

seek to improve how they enter and access the home for themselves and guests. Ms. Murray further noted that they will not meet the 30-foot front yard setback requirement since the home sits within its existing setbacks. Ms. Murray reiterated that their request comes from the desire to enhance and improve the house and stated that they seek to stay within the other parameters of the existing roof overhang. Ms. Murray also noted that they plan to add a conforming one-story addition in the back and that they have received support for the project.

Mr. Bill Murphy, 15 Holland St., noted that he and Ms. Elena Murphy, 15 Holland St., have lived in the property for over twenty years and that they love the town and the neighborhood. Mr. Murphy expressed his excitement about making investments in the property to improve its value, appeal, and functionality. Mr. Murphy noted that they want to stay in the home and improve it, and that this project will help them do that.

Ms. Murphy noted that they value the project and that she thinks that the project will contribute well to neighborhood. Mrs. Murphy stated that they had shown the design to some neighbors and had received positive responses for its coherent look. Ms. Murphy noted that they want to make the project sustainable and that they plan to do HVAC work and have a heat pump. Ms. Murphy concluded by stating that they think that the design will bring out the best in the house.

Mr. Barnert asked if Mr. and Ms. Murphy had seen the Conservation Director's comments. Mr. and Ms. Murphy responded that they had. Referring to the plot plan, Mr. Barnert asked how they would do repairs to the back corner of the deck without stepping on the abutting property, conservation land or not. Mr. Murphy explained that they had bought the house with the deck in that location and that while the Conservation Director noted the changes, Mr. Murphy stated that they do not plan to change the deck. Mr. Barnert noted that when they replace the deck, Mr. and Ms. Murphy will need to do so in a way where they do not have to step on the abutting property. Ms. Murray stated that they want to replace the deck and adjust it so that the deck sits within the property line. Ms. Murray also stated that they do not want to increase the nonconformity or create something more detrimental. Ms. Murray explained that the existing deck needs repair and that they plan to repair it within the bounds of the property. Mr. Barnert stated that they would need to do more than that since they have asked for a special permit for something that does not work now. Mr. Barnert also noted that they cannot do deck repairs without stepping on the abutting property and stated that they will need to make an adjustment so that that does not happen to get the special permit. Mr. Barnert then recommended tapering the deck in some way where one can walk around it to do any repairs. Ms. Murray noted that she thought that the Conservation Director allowed the repairs and that they could have a fence up. Ms. Murray expressed her willingness to write that into the amendment to ensure that the deck falls within the property boundaries and that any repair work would not disturb the conservation land. Mr. Barnert noted that someone cannot walk on to an abutting property to fix something and asked how they would repair the deck without going on to the abutting property. Ms. Murray stated that they would not disturb or go onto the conservation property, and Mr. Barnert asked how they would avoid that. Ms. Murray stated that they could construct the deck from the interior piece and expressed her willingness to move the deck in one foot. Mr. Barnert asked about holding off a foot, which Ms. Murray stated that they could do. Mr. Clifford noted that the Board will have a condition on the special permit that will require them to move the deck in about two feet away from the property line. Mr. Murphy stated that they understand, and Ms. Murray asked if they could write that into the agreement. Mr. Clifford stated that if the Board approved the special permit, they would add that as a condition.

Mr. Clifford noted the shed in the back probably constituted a legal non-conforming structure and stated that it resides too close to the property line. Mr. Clifford asked about moving the shed

so that it has a five-foot setback from the property line. The Murphy's expressed their willingness to move the shed and possibly replace it. Mr. Clifford then noted that the property resides next to sensitive conservation land and noted that they will have no difficulties proceeding with the project. Mr. Clifford then stated that the Board often puts a condition on the special permit that would require compliance with what the Conservation Director deems reasonable to protect the wetlands, mostly during construction. Mr. Clifford noted that common concerns include trees and silt, and that common protections include putting up fences. Mr. Clifford asked if they found that condition acceptable, which Ms. Murphy stated that they did and that they would meet anything that the Conservation Director wrote.

No further questions from the Board.

No further comments or questions from the Public.

No further questions from the Board.

Mr. Murphy thanked the Board and expressed his appreciation for the Board's consideration and time.

At 7:20 p.m., Mr. Clifford moved to close the Hearing.

At 7:20 p.m., Mr. Barnert second Mr. Clifford.

At 7:21, the Board closed the hearing (a roll call vote took place: Ralph D. Clifford – Yes, Nyles N. Barnert – Yes, Jeanne K. Krieger – Yes, Scott E. Cooper – Yes, and Patricia S. Nelson – Yes).

Mr. Clifford stated that the conditions will include moving the deck two feet off the property line, moving the shed to comply with current zoning requirements, and complying with the reasonable requests of the Conservation Director.

No further discussion from the Board.

At 7:21 p.m., Mr. Clifford moved to approve the petition subject to the conditions.

At 7:21 p.m., Mr. Barnert second Mr. Clifford.

At 7:22 p.m., the Board of Appeals voted five (5) in favor, zero (0) opposed, and zero (0) in abstention to grant TWO (2) SPECIAL PERMITS in accordance with the Zoning By-Law (Chapter 135 of the Code of Lexington) section(s) 135-9.4 and 135-8.4.2 to allow modification of a non-conforming structure (a roll call vote took place: Ralph D. Clifford – Yes, Nyles N. Barnert – Yes, Jeanne K. Krieger – Yes, Scott E. Cooper – Yes, and Patricia S. Nelson – Yes).

Meeting Minutes of the Lexington Board of Appeals
Conducted Virtually, Via Zoom
February 12th, 2026, 7:00 p.m.

Board Members: Chair – Ralph D. Clifford, Nyles N. Barnert, and Associate Members Jeanne K. Krieger, Scott E. Cooper, and Patricia S. Nelson

Administrative Staff: Jim Kelly, Building Commissioner, Kiruthika Ramakrishnan, LUHD Office Manager, and EmmaJean Anjoorian, Department Assistant

Address: 413 Waltham Street (ZBA-20-59)

The petitioner is requesting ONE (1) SPECIAL PERMIT in accordance with the Zoning By-Law (Chapter 135 of the Code of Lexington) section(s) 135-9.4 and 135-3.4 Table 1: Permitted Uses and Development Standards, Line J.1.02 to allow renewal of special permit dated March 25th, 2021, to allow takeout food service with service hours before 7:00 a.m.

The petitioner submitted the following information with the application: Nature and Justification, Floor Plans, Special Permit Dated March 25th, 2021, and Proposed Certified Plot Plan Waiver.

Prior to the meeting, the petitions and supporting data were reviewed by the Building Commissioner, the Conservation Director, the Town Engineer, the Select Board, the Planning Director, the Historic District Commission Clerk, the Historical Commission, Economic Development, and the Zoning Administrator. Comments were received from the Zoning Administrator and the Building Commissioner.

At 7:22 p.m., Mr. Clifford opened the Hearing.

Applicant: Lisa Hardy behalf of Bruegger's Bagels | Petitioner: Max Merrick

Mr. Max Merrick, property account manager, and agent on behalf of Bagel Brand, the parent company of Bruegger's Bagels, 1720 South Bel Air Street, Dever, Colorado, presented the petition. Mr. Merrick stated he seeks to have the store open at 6:00 a.m. and that they have consistently done so for the past seven years. Mr. Merrick also stated that seventy percent (70%) of their sales occur between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. and asked to renew the license. Mr. Merrick noted that as a breakfast retail brand, the store closes at 2:00 p.m.

Mrs. Krieger noted that when she did her site visit, the store did not have a trash can in the front and asked if the store had put one out. Mr. Merrick said that the district manager had confirmed that trash bins now reside outside and encouraged the Board to do an additional.

Mr. Barnert noted that some issues about early morning noise had arisen previously and asked if the store had resolved the problem or received any complaints. Mr. Merrick stated that to his knowledge, he did not know of any complaints and expressed his willingness to get in contact with the facilities and operations team. Mr. Merrick noted that since their office resides in Denver, he does not have as much insight to the operations but expressed his willingness to address and resolve any early morning noise concerns. Mr. Clifford asked the staff if they had received any complaints. Ms. Anjoorian stated that to her knowledge, they had not received any complaints and stated that she believed that the noise complaints came from removing the

dumpsters early in the morning. Ms. Anjoorian then asked that the store not remove the dumpster too early, and Mr. Merrick asked about the earliest time for dumpster pick up. Mr. Clifford stated that the special permit includes a condition that dumpster removal would occur during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Mr. Merrick stated that they would comply with that.

Mr. Cooper stated that the Building Commissioner had raised some safety concerns and asked if the store had addressed those concerns prior to the hearing. Mr. Merrick asked Mr. Cooper to elaborate on the safety issues, to which Mr. Cooper stated that he had seen comments on the hood cleaning and cooking mechanisms. Mr. Clifford noted that the Building Commissioner had commented on the fire alarms as well. Mr. Jim Kelly, Lexington Building Commissioner, stated that he had done an inspection last week and had observed that some of the systems needed attention. Mr. Kelly then stated that the management had worked on it and sent him the reports for the fire alarms and that the hood cleaning will take place next week. Mr. Kelly then expressed his confidence that the store staff will address the concerns and asked Mr. Merrick to provide the local contacts for Bruegger's Bagels. Mr. Merrick then stated that the regional facilities manager had confirmed that the hood cleanings will take place next week and that the regional facilities manager will take care of the fire test alarm reports.

Mr. Clifford stated that on his site visit, he observed open trash bins in the back and stated that the open trash bins constituted a health concern. Mr. Merrick agreed with Mr. Clifford, and Mr. Clifford noted that the location had had problems with trash supervision. Mr. Clifford then stated that the Board puts a short timeline on special permits to make sure that businesses run according to the standards that the Board sets. Mr. Clifford further noted that the store must follow the conditions on the special permit and meet the Health Department standards, something that the store currently does not do. Mr. Merrick stated that he would check with the operations team to make sure that the staff complies.

Mr. Merrick reiterated that they seek the special permit renewal to open at 6:00 a.m. and that he will address the concerns that the Board had raised.

No further questions from the Board.

No further comments or questions from the Public.

No further questions from the Board.

At 7:30 p.m., Mr. Clifford moved to close the Hearing.

At 7:30 p.m., Mr. Barnert second Mr. Clifford.

At 7:31 p.m., the Board closed the hearing. (a roll call vote took place: Ralph D. Clifford – Yes, Nyles N. Barnert – Yes, Jeanne K. Krieger – Yes, Scott E. Cooper – Yes, and Patricia S. Nelson – Yes).

Mr. Cooper commented that the memo that the Board had received from the Zoning Administrator recommended that the special permit not have a term limit. Mr. Clifford noted that while special permit renewals can cause an inconvenience to business, the issues addressed by the Board showed why the Board puts limited terms on the special permit. Mr. Clifford also noted that term limit remains open to the Board's discussion and that the Board can consider individual circumstances. Mr. Cooper stated that he did not object to the term limit but just wanted to note the Zoning Administrator's recommendation. Mr. Clifford expressed his content

with the five-year term limit, and the other Board Members echoed the sentiment. Mr. Clifford then stated that the Board will renew the special permit on the same conditions as the existing permit and that the permit will expire in 2031.

No further discussion from the Board.

At 7:33 p.m., Mr. Clifford moved to approve the petition.

At 7:33 p.m., Mr. Barnert second Mr. Clifford.

At 7:33 p.m., The Board of Appeals voted five (5) in favor, zero (0) opposed, and zero (0) in abstention to grant ONE (1) SPECIAL PERMIT in accordance with the Zoning By-Law (Chapter 135 of the Code of Lexington) section(s) 135-9.4 and 135-3.4 Table 1: Permitted Uses and Development Standards, Line J.1.02 to allow renewal of special permit dated March 25th, 2021, to allow takeout food service with service hours before 7:00 a.m. (a roll call vote took place: Ralph D. Clifford – Yes, Nyles N. Barnert – Yes, Jeanne K. Krieger – Yes, Scott E. Cooper – Yes, and Patricia S. Nelson – Yes).

Meeting Minutes of the Lexington Board of Appeals
Conducted Virtually, Via Zoom
February 12th, 2026, 7:00 p.m.

Board Members: Chair – Ralph D. Clifford, Nyles N. Barnert, and Associate Members Jeanne K. Krieger, Scott E. Cooper, and Patricia S. Nelson

Administrative Staff: Jim Kelly, Building Commissioner, Kiruthika Ramakrishnan, LUHD Office Manager, and EmmaJean Anjoorian, Department Assistant

Address: 451 Marrett Road (ZBA-25-26)

The petitioner is requesting ONE (1) SPECIAL PERMIT in accordance with the Zoning By-Law (Chapter 135 of the Code of Lexington) section(s) 135-9.4 and 135-6.2 to modify the dimensional controls of §135-4.0 to allow for the preservation and relocation of a historic building to a lot that would have 0 ft. of frontage rather than the required 125 ft. and an area of 15,206 sq. ft. instead of the required 15,500 sq. ft.

The petitioner submitted the following information with the application: Nature and Justification, Certified Proposed Plot Plan, Elevations, Floor Plans, Photographs, Special Permit Narrative, Historical Commission Support Letter to the ZBA, Proposed Building Height Comparison Drawing, Neighborhood Context and Consistency Narrative, Neighborhood Density and Precedent Analysis, Bridge House Video, Elevation Drawings, Gross Floor Area Calculation Form, Adaptive Reuse of Bridge House Narrative, Average Natural Grade Worksheet, Definitive Subdivision Plan, Abutter Support Letters, Authorization Letter for Relocation of Historic Structure, Comprehensive Cultural Resources Survey, Site Plan, Plot Plan with Driveway, Emergency Vehicle Access Plan, Driveway Easement Agreement, and Yard Easement Agreement.

Prior to the meeting, the petitions and supporting data were reviewed by the Building Commissioner, the Conservation Director, the Town Engineer, the Select Board, the Planning Director, the Historic District Commission Clerk, the Historical Commission, Economic Development, and the Zoning Administrator. Comments were received from the Zoning Administrator, the Building Commissioner, the Historical Commission, the Engineering Department, the Planning Department, and the Fire Department.

At 7:34 p.m., Mr. Clifford opened the Hearing.

Petitioner: Owen Curtin

Mr. Owen Curtin, 451 Marrett Rd., began his presentation by stating that as a resident, he seeks to use the Town's Historic Preservation Incentive to save the Joseph Bridge/Eli Burdoo House. Mr. Curtin then thanked the Board for their willingness to volunteer, their time, and their expertise, and further thanked the Town Staff for their services. Mr. Curtin continued by giving an overview of the history of the land where the Bridge/Burdoo House currently resides and further gave an overview of the history of the Bridge Family and Eli Burdoo. Mr. Curtin then explained that the relief that he seeks will allow him to subdivide his lot and that he hopes that the value of the new lot will offset the cost of saving the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Curtin noted the unclear nature of the economics and stated that he will take a significant risk attempting this.

Mr. Curtin further explained that the new lot will form from the rear of his existing lot and that both lots will have a shared driveway. Mr. Curtin then stated that as he explained before the Historical Commission, the construction cost on a historical structure can reach four times that of a new construction. Mr. Curtin further explained that the Bridge/Burdoo House, with its seven-foot ceiling heights, historic layout, and three-hundred-year-old construction methods, does not improve the value of the land if preserved in its existing state. Mr. Curtin then stated that with these limitations and after reviewing the Historical Commission's recommendations, he had provided plans for what he believed will serve as the only viable option for a private landowner to continue the stewardship of the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Curtin explained that they designed the project to focus on the exterior of the Bridge/Burdoo House and that through adaptive reuse, the project will spotlight the Bridge/Burdoo House for the public, will conceal the new construction, and will serve as monument to the history of the Town. Mr. Curtin then explained his binary choice to the Board; failure to move the project forward will result in the Bridge/Burdoo House's demolition, but moving the project forward would result in him restoring the Bridge/Burdoo House to its historical condition and preserving the Bridge/Burdoo House's historical significance so that it will last for years.

Mr. Curtin then continued his presentation by introducing his team, which consisted of his architect, Ben Nickerson, his engineer, Mike Novak, and his legal counsel, Jonathan Silverstein. Mr. Curtin then showed some pencil sketches of the Bridge/Burdoo House, noted that the Bridge/Burdoo House currently has some additions that dominate over it, and also has some arborvitae that conceal it. Mr. Curtin further noted that all structures on 419 Marrett Rd, historical or not, have plans for demolition. Mr. Curtin then focused on the rendering of the Bridge/Burdoo House, with a plaque, that he hopes to achieve. Mr. Curtin noted an area where he does not plan to remove trees and stated that he plans to have the Bridge/Burdoo House face the Town's Old Reservoir (Old Res) parking lot. Mr. Curtin then showed the elevations from the Old Res parking lot and noted that the proposed lot has a hill that will elevate the Bridge/Burdoo House above the parking lot. Mr. Curtin then showed the plot plan and noted that the Bridge/Burdoo House will have a seventeen (17) foot setback from the rear neighbors. Mr. Curtin then reiterated his request to subdivide his lot and stated that the Planning Board defines a front yard, with or without frontage, and that he had met the front setback requirements using an easement. Mr. Curtin then showed more elevations, noted that the foundation will slope with the hill, and stated that the Bridge/Burdoo House will have a traditional colonial layout. Mr. Curtin then played a video clip from his Historical Commission hearing where he gave a description of his proposed plans. The video showed an interaction between Mr. Curtin and one of the Historical Commission members, where Mr. Curtin described possibly using the Bridge/Burdoo House as storage. The video also showed Mr. Curtin explaining that the important part of the project, the outside of the Bridge/Burdoo House, will sit beautifully on the hill, and that the hill will ensure that any additions to the Bridge/Burdoo House will remain subordinate to it. Finally, the video showed Mr. Curtin stating that he would add an addition to the Bridge/Burdoo House and that he and his family would live in the new addition.

Mr. Cooper noted that this project had had a lot of correspondence and stated that he had watched Mr. Curtin's videos. Mr. Cooper also stated that he had watched the Historical Commission hearing and noted that he believed that much confusion had arisen at the hearing and that clearing up the confusion would help. Mr. Cooper stated that not once during the Historical Commission hearing did Mr. Curtin propose to use the Bridge/Burdoo House as a garage. Mr. Cooper then stated that during the Historical Commission hearing, Mr. Curtin had suggested that he could not finance renovating the Bridge/Burdoo House and hence proposed adding the addition, which would serve as the primary residence. Mr. Cooper then noted that at the Historical Commission hearing, some discussion had occurred about possibly using the

Bridge/Burdoo House for storage but that no discussion had occurred about using the Bridge/Burdoo House as a garage. Mr. Cooper then asked what remains of the Bridge/Burdoo House since as he understands it, Mr. Curtin does not propose moving the Bridge/Burdoo House but rather proposes to dismantle it and reassemble the structural elements. Mr. Cooper noted that while Mr. Curtin had not finalized his plans at the time of the Historical Commission hearing, Mr. Cooper stated that to him, it seemed as though the garage idea came after and that Mr. Curtin had not discussed the idea at the Historical Commission hearing. Mr. Curtin then stated that he could have brought these plans before the Historical Commission without garage doors but stated that he wants to explain to the Board exactly what he wants to do with the project. Mr. Curtin then explained that he had flagged his property with blue flags so that his neighbors could see what he wanted to do and noted that the idea for the garage came about because he wanted to find something affordable to do with the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Curtin acknowledged that while some confusion had occurred, he believed that he had communicated to the Historical Commission that he would not use the Bridge/Burdoo House as a residential structure or restore the interior, and that he would potentially use the Bridge/Burdoo House for storage. Mr. Curtin then stated that he believed that the garage doors and the adaptive reuse would serve as the most sensible use in this case. Mr. Curtin explained that he does not want to create a monolith that sits overlooking and serving no purpose but rather seeks to build a structure that someone would want to keep and continue to preserve. Mr. Curtin stated that should the Bridge/Burdoo House serve no use or purpose to the community or landowner, it could face demolition again. Mr. Cooper then stated that he appreciates Mr. Curtin's desire to preserve the Bridge/Burdoo House but stated that he wants to understand what remains of the Bridge/Burdoo House since Mr. Curtin plans to dismantle the Bridge/Burdoo House and not move it. Mr. Curtin then explained other historical structures in town do not have their original siding after three hundred years and stated that some historical structures consist of replicas built in the 1920s and 1970s. Mr. Curtin then showed a photo of the Samuel Hartwell House, 1695, a structure that consists of a preserved frame and chimney, and noted the value of saving history like that. Mr. Curtin then explained that he proposes putting on period appropriate windows and siding and stated that currently, the Bridge/Burdoo House does not have proper windows and that the front façade completely blocks its original pilasters. Mr. Cooper then asked Mr. Curtin to clarify that when looking at the Bridge/Burdoo House from the Old Res parking lot, the reconstruction will look like the original Bridge/Burdoo House, and the back will have a hollowed-out garage, which Mr. Curtin confirmed. Mr. Curtin then stated that the three-bay garage will have a salt box roof line, something historically accurate to the era, and that the interior will have the preserved beams. Mr. Curtin then explained that while he cannot finance a museum quality replica of the Bridge/Burdoo House, someone will have that option in the future should Mr. Curtin preserve the Bridge/Burdoo House now. Mr. Cooper then asked if the Historical Commission understood his plan for the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Curtin highlighted that one of the Historical Commission members had repeated back his intent to use the Bridge/Burdoo House as storage and to live in the new addition, then played another part of the Historical Commission hearing where one of the Historical Commission members stated that the Commission does not know what the house will look like. In the Historical Commission video, Mr. Curtin stated that he will build something behind the Bridge/Burdoo House, and the Historical Commission member asked if Mr. Curtin would attach the new structure to the Bridge/Burdoo House. In the video, Mr. Curtin responded by stating that historically, the Bridge/Burdoo House has always had an addition and that Bridge/Burdoo House's design lends itself to expansions. Finally in the video, Mr. Curtin noted that the new structure will not overpower the Bridge/Burdoo House and that the new structure will attach to the Bridge/Burdoo House through a one-story mudroom.

Mr. Clifford noted the difficult nature of receiving a specific statement from a commission and then having members of that commission contradict the statement, then stated that the Board had received a recommendation from the Historical Commission that the Board can use as they see fit in terms of deciding the Board's discretion under the Zoning By-law. Mr. Clifford then stated that the Board cannot decide whether the Historical Commission made a mistake and further stated that the Board will treat comments from the Historical Commission members as public comment, not as an official communication from the Historical Commission.

Mr. Barnert noted that Mr. Curtin intends to save the front and right side of the Bridge/Burdoo House and stated that Mr. Curtin will use the back side as a garage. Mr. Barnert asked Mr. Curtin why he had made the mudroom connector to the new structure wide and stated that a narrower mudroom connector would allow Mr. Curtin to preserve more of the left side of the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Curtin stated that the mudroom connector will contribute to the historic nature of the Bridge/Burdoo House and that the mudroom connector will help make the new structure look subordinate to the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Clifford then asked if the mudroom connector would come with the Bridge/Burdoo House or if Mr. Curtin would build a new mudroom, to which Mr. Curtin stated that he would build a new one. Mr. Barnert asked if Mr. Curtin could make the width of the mudroom connector narrower, to which Mr. Curtin stated that he could. Mr. Barnert stated that a narrow width would allow Mr. Curtin to preserve more of the appearance of the left side of the Bridge/Burdoo House, to which Mr. Curtin stated that only the end of Outlook Dr. would see it and that it would not have a significant impact on the public facing area. Mr. Barnert then asked about putting the Bridge/Burdoo House on 451 Marrett Rd. and creating a condo complex with each house owned by different people, rather than doing a subdivision. Mr. Jonathan Silverstein, 80 Reed St., applicant's counsel with his office located in Concord, MA, stated that case law determined that zoning does not regulate ownership but rather regulates use. Mr. Silverstein then stated that generally, homeowners would prefer to have their own house on their own lot rather than a condo. Mr. Silverstein then asked why the Board would prefer that the project take place as a two-unit condominium and noted that a condominium would result in a lower tax revenue for the Town. Mr. Barnert stated that he just wanted to ask the question, then asked if the Board or the Planning Board had the ability to subdivide. Mr. Clifford stated that the Planning Board did. Mr. Cooper then asked if the project only required zoning relief because of the subdivision to create an unlawful lot, to which Mr. Silverstein stated that they would still need zoning use relief because a single lot cannot have two principal residences. Mr. Cooper then clarified that they had requested zoning relief to subdivide the property, which Mr. Silverstein confirmed that they seek dimensional zoning relief, and that the condo option would require use zoning relief. Mr. Barnert then stated that the Board could allow two units on one lot under section 6.2 of the Zoning Bylaw, and Mr. Silverstein stated that the Board can grant dimensional relief under the same provision.

Ms. Krieger asked how one would access the new construction and asked about the location of the driveway. Mr. Curtin showed an image that depicts his existing house with a driveway located on the east side of the property. Mr. Curtin highlighted that the plan shows fire truck access and that the driveway will lead to the proposed Bridge/Bridge House. Mr. Curtin then stated that many properties have shared driveways in his neighborhood.

Mr. Clifford stated that the Board had had a lot of trouble with the Hosmer House particularly because the Board did not have a precise definition of what was going to be preserved as the historic structure. Mr. Clifford then asked Mr. Curtin what specifically he plans to save. Mr. Curtin explained that he had brought two historic preservation carpenters and a historian to the site for a visit and that they all agreed that the timber frame, paneled wall, and some doors constituted the only elements that remained of the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Curtin also stated that he had

explained that to the Historical Commission. Mr. Curtin then explained that he hopes to use the paneled wall and doors in both the new construction and old construction so that both structures will be recorded as historic structures. Mr. Clifford then clarified that Mr. Curtin will save the timber frame, which Mr. Curtin confirmed.

Elizabeth Pyle, attorney at Hill Law, 6 Beacon St. Boston, stated that Hill Law represents Mr. Brent Radcliffe, 11 Outlook Dr., and Ms. Elizabeth Radcliffe, 11 Outlook Dr., direct abutters to the rear of 451 Marrett Rd who reside next to the proposed Lot B and proposed new construction. Ms. Pyle clarified that the letters submitted by Hill Law would be included as part of the record, which Ms. Anjoorian confirmed. Ms. Pyle then stated that she requests that the Board deny the special permit. Ms. Pyle explained that she did not believe that the Board can make the appropriate inquiry for its required findings under Section 6.2.5.3 of the Zoning Bylaw unless the owner of the Bridge/Burdoo House is added as a co applicant to the special permit application. Ms. Pyle then explained that Section 6.2.5.3 of the Zoning Bylaw states that to issue a special permit, the Board must make a required finding that for the relocation of buildings, structures, and elements to another location, no other preservation measures are practical or reasonable on the existing site. Mr. Pyle then asked how the Board can determine that no other preservation measures are practical or reasonable on the existing site of the Bridge/Burdoo House at 419 Marrett without an investigation into the proposed construction project at 419 Marrett Rd and through an alternatives analysis for preserving the Bridge/Burdoo House in its current location. Ms. Pyle then stated that in the letter received from Mr. Silverstein stated that Mr. Curtin does not own the Bridge/Burdoo House and that Mr. Curtin does not own 419 Marrett, and therefore Mr. Curtin does not have control over the decisions made with respect to that property. Ms. Pyle then stated that she believed that the Board should make an inquiry of the owner of the Bridge/Burdoo House as to whether no other preservation measures are practical or reasonable for the existing site. Ms. Pyle stated that she believed that the owner of the Bridge/Burdoo House needs to come before the Board as a co-applicant and explained what they did to try to preserve the Bridge/Burdoo House in its current location and that the Board needs to make an inquiry about whether no other preservation measures are practical or reasonable. Ms. Pyle then stated that she believed that the applicant's position appears to be that under Section 6.2 of the Zoning Bylaw, preservation on the original site is neither practical nor reasonable if the owner cannot realize a maximum profit that is at least equivalent to what the owner would make by demolishing or removing the historic structure. Ms. Pyle then stated that she believed that Mr. Curtin had interpreted the section wrong because the Bylaw does not contain any economic language when evaluating reasonable or practical preservation incentives. Ms. Pyle then explained that she believed that Section 6.2 of the Zoning Bylaw allows for dimensional and use waiver to accommodate the relocation of historic structure, not to allow for the construction of a new house adjacent to the historic structure which would violate the lot area and frontage requirements. Finally, Ms. Pyle stated that the proposed shared driveway would violate the Zoning Bylaw's use restrictions. Ms. Pyle stated that section 3.1.1 of the Zoning Bylaw prohibits any uses that are not expressly allowed and stated that shared driveways are not allowed in the RS zoning district. Ms. Pyle then stated that any shared driveways in the neighborhood may be pre-existing non-conforming but that the use is now not allowed. Ms. Pyle further explained that the driveway is not allowed as an accessory use since it's not accessory to the principal use of Lot A. Ms. Pyle then explained a common law zoning principle called infectious invalidity, that means that if a newly created lot conforms to zoning, such as through a special permit, but in doing so causes a new nonconformity elsewhere, that nonconformity renders the application invalid. Ms. Pyle then stated that she believed that the shared driveway would cause this.

Sam Doran, 174 East St., began his public comment by thanking the Board for the time to speak and by thanking Mr. Cooper and Mr. Barnert for their insightful questioning. Mr. Doran then stated that he would like to offer some perspective on the preservation of the sixth oldest house in Lexington. Mr. Doran stated that Mr. Curtin had cited preservation incentive and emphasized the importance of preservation. Mr. Doran then explained that he took part in the subcommittee of the 250th Commission that focused on documenting the historic homes in Lexington and that during his time on the committee, he found that many of the Minuteman's homes had faced ruin or destruction in recent years. Mr. Doran then stated that he believed that Mr. Curtin's explanation of the history of the Bridge/Burdoo House came from the report that he wrote as a part of the committee. Mr. Doran explained that his report hinged on the interest and cooperation of homeowners, most of whom enthusiastically responded and took pride in owning the historical homes. Mr. Doran then stated that the only property owner that he could not reach was the owner of the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Doran stated that in his research, he found that only twenty-four (24) houses built in 1775 or prior remain in Lexington and noted that the Town of Concord had preserved seventy-five (75) homes in conditions that he deemed as outstanding. Mr. Doran then stated that he believed that projects like these have contributed to the loss of the structural history from 1775. Mr. Doran stated that as a member of the Lexington Historical Society, some of the examples of historic houses that Mr. Curtin had discussed still have some of the original woodwork remaining, not replicas of the original house. Mr. Doran explained that he had learned more about the project, and talked with a member of the Historical Commission, where he previously served, who stated that they regretted their vote. Mr. Doran then stated that the Bridge/Burdoo House had remained in its location for many years without risk and stated that he believed that the proposed plans do not preserve the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Doran also stated that he believed that the proposed plans would not allow a resident, homeowner, passerby, or student to experience the Bridge/Burdoo House as a true physical reminder of Eli Burdoo or Jonathan Bridge. Mr. Doran continued by stating that with twenty-four (24) historic structures remaining, preserving that part of Lexington's history remains vital. Mr. Doran then stated that he believed harm occurs to those preservation efforts when preservation cloaks facilitate stripping, gutting, and ripping a building apart. Mr. Doran then stated that he believed that alternative plans exist. Mr. Doran expressed his disapproval that the Bridge/Burdoo House face demolition if the Board does not approve this plan, something that he experienced often with developers during his time on the Historical Commission. Mr. Doran stated that we would like to see the Bridge/Burdoo House preserved and emphasized Ms. Pyle's point about how hearing from the owner of the Bridge/Burdoo House about the feasibility of preserving it. Mr. Doran then stated that while the legal notice for the hearing had referred to proposed preservation, Mr. Doran stated that he did not believe that the proposed three (3) car garage would preserve the Bridge/Burdoo House and stated that he hoped for another way to preserve the Bridge/Burdoo House.

Ms. Amy Griffin, 3177 Hidden Creek Drive, Chico, California, stated that she had submitted a formal statement on 419 Marrett Rd. Ms. Griffin stated that she as the trustee of Curtin Realty Trust, she owns 419 Marrett Rd., and then read the statement that she had submitted to the Board. Ms. Griffin noted that when her father owned the Bridge/Burdoo House, the additions added to the Bridge/Burdoo House did not preserve the historic quality of it. Ms. Griffin stated that Owen's proposal will create a truer replica of the Bridge/Burdoo House and that Owen had spent an exhaustive amount of time trying to come up with a way of doing that. Ms. Griffin concluded by stating that no one from the Town had come to her with a proposal.

Ms. Elizabeth Radcliffe, 11 Outlook Dr., with her husband Mr. Brent Radcliffe, 11 Outlook Dr., stated that her attorney, Ms. Pyle, spoke earlier. Ms. Radcliffe stated that they love their home's location and that they oppose the application. Ms. Radcliffe stated that they directly about 451

Marrett Rd. and that she and her husband had deliberately purchased their home at a dead-end street. Ms. Radcliffe explained that privacy, quiet enjoyment, and the wooded land constituted the main reasons for that decision. Ms. Radcliffe also explained that they relied on the Town's Zoning Bylaw and reasonably expected that neighboring parcels would remain as conforming lots with one home. Ms. Radcliffe then stated that this proposal changed their expectations and that the proposal would encroach on their privacy. Ms. Radcliffe also stated that the proposal appears to include extensive tree removal along the proposed location of the Bridge/Burdoo House and along the Old Res parking lot. Ms. Radcliffe further stated that the proposed tree removal would cut what currently serves as a natural buffer between their house and Marrett Rd. Ms. Radcliffe then explained that while they appreciate the desire to preserve historic structures, they do not approve of proposals that require zoning exceptions and the loss of trees. Ms. Radcliffe then stated that she believed that questions remain about what exactly Mr. Curtin plans to preserve and suggested that if Mr. Curtin plans to use the Bridge/Burdoo House as a garage, she believed that Mr. Curtin does not need to subdivide the lot and could add it to his existing home. Ms. Radcliffe concluded by asking the Board to deny the special permit.

Martha Sevigny, 12 Tufts Rd., the realtor who had marketed 419 Marrett Rd., explained that per her conversations with Ms. Griffin, Ms. Griffin preferred to sell the property to someone who would preserve the Bridge/Burdoo House. Ms. Sevigny stated that she had marketed the property to developers with that goal and stated that she had done site visits with several. Ms. Sevigny stated that she did not receive one viable offer from anyone willing to save the Bridge/Burdoo House. Ms. Sevigny stated that as of September 19th, 2026, the house will get demolished if the project does not move forward. Ms. Sevigny then stated that she believed that Mr. Curtin had presented a more feasibly possibility for the Bridge/Burdoo House. Ms. Sevigny noted that as the owner of 451 Marrett Rd., Mr. Curtin has the right to demolish his house and rebuild a new house, by right, two feet closer to the Radcliffe's property than his proposal.

Mr. Silverstein addressed some of the public comments and stated that Mr. Curtin had done a lot of work on the project because he cares about and takes great interest in preserving the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Silverstein stated that the plan had come together after the Historical Commission vote and that Mr. Curtin had worked with an architect to prepare the plans. Mr. Silverstein addressed Ms. Pyle's comment about preserving the Bridge/Burdoo House on its existing site and stated that that cannot happen. Mr. Silverstein noted that as soon as the Planning Board issues the site plan review for 419 Marrett Rd the demolish delay will expire and the Bridge/Burdoo House will get demolished. Mr. Silverstein then addressed what elements of the Bridge/Burdoo House Mr. Curtin will preserve and stated that the Bridge/Burdoo House does not have its original windows, roof, and siding. Mr. Silverstein then stated that Mr. Curtin will preserve and refurbish the bones of the Bridge/Burdoo House and will reconstruct a house that looks more like the original Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Silverstein also stated that the project does not center around preserving the non-existent original Bridge/Burdoo House but rather centers around the proposed project or a complete demolition. Mr. Silverstein further stated that the Board must decide which they prefer and reiterated that the Bridge/Burdoo House cannot remain on its current site. Mr. Silverstein then addressed Hill Law's arguments that the Board does not have the authority to approve the special permit, which Mr. Silverstein stated that he believed that the Board does have the discretion to make the decision on projects like these.

Mr. Curtin addressed whether the owner of 419 Marrett Rd. needed to attend the hearing and stated that a bureaucratic mix-up had occurred. Mr. Curtin explained that the property owner had filed and presented in front of the Historical Commission. Mr. Curtin then explained that he had done most of the historic research and had obtained a letter of permission from the Trust to represent the Trust. Mr. Curtin then stated that he does not own the Bridge/Burdoo House and

does not control whether the Bridge/Burdoo House sells or not. Mr. Curtin then showed an aerial image of his neighbor's house and highlighted that his neighbor has a shared driveway that leads to her accessory dwelling unit. Mr. Curtin then shared that when he moved into his house, he expected to live next to a rural lot, which got paved, and that he once lived next to a small cape that he could not see over his fence. Mr. Curtin apologized to Mr. Doran for appearing disingenuous and stated that he had learned a lot from the Historical Society. Mr. Curtin further apologized to Mr. Doran for not reaching out and stated that he does not own the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Curtin then explained that he had done the research on the Bridge/Burdoo House since he can either save the Bridge/Burdoo House or let it face demolition. Mr. Curtin then clarified that when he brought up examples of historic houses, he meant that the historic houses have many replica elements and stated that he hopes that someone can restore the interior of the Bridge/Burdoo House back to its original condition in the future. Mr. Curtin reiterated that the Bridge/Burdoo House currently has some unoriginal features and stated that the experts that he brought to the Bridge/Burdoo House had determined that one paneled wall, some doors, and a timber frame constitute the only historic elements that remain. Mr. Curtin stated that he plans to restore the whole timber and that the reconstructed Bridge/Burdoo House will stand as a beautiful monument. Mr. Curtin stated that he respects his neighbors and regretted that they have this conflict. Mr. Curtin then stated that he will not remove any trees on Town-owned land and stated that he hopes that someone will remove them in the future so that the public can view the monument. Mr. Curtin then showed an image of the Radcliffe's home and stated that the fence in the photo marked the property line between his land and theirs. Mr. Curtin then stated that he could use his land to offer additional screening and stated that he had offered that to the Radcliffe's. Mr. Curtin then stated that he has evergreens on his property near the Town land that he does not plan to remove. Mr. Curtin noted the horrible nature of the sightlines between his property and the Radcliffe's and stated that he had worked with his architect to use high windows so that direct sightlines do not exist between his property and the Radcliffe's. Mr. Curtin concluded by thanking the Board for the opportunity to present.

No further questions from the Board.

No further comments or questions from the Public.

No further questions from the Board.

At 9:07 p.m., Mr. Clifford moved to close the Hearing.

At 9:08 p.m., multiple Board Members second Mr. Clifford.

At 9:08 p.m., the Board closed the hearing. (a roll call vote took place: Ralph D. Clifford – Yes, Nyles N. Barnert – Yes, Jeanne K. Krieger – Yes, Scott E. Cooper – Yes, and Patricia S. Nelson – Yes).

Mr. Clifford stated that Board will have to make specific findings if they grant the permit and that the Board should give their thoughts to see if they have a common stance on the project.

Ms. Nelson stated that she would approve the project but would do so with some reluctance and noted that not much remains of the original Bridge/Burdoo House.

Mr. Cooper stated that he felt conflicted about the project since while he favors historic preservation, the facts and the circumstances of the project seem difficult to him. Mr. Cooper noted that the Board could grant relief for the project due to the potential historic nature of the

Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Cooper also stated that if Mr. Curtin had come before the Board with the same project for just a brand-new house, Mr. Curtin would still need the same relief, but Mr. Cooper stated that he would not grant it since the project would result in a non-conforming lot. Mr. Cooper noted that he might feel different about the project if Mr. Curtin used the Bridge/Burdoo House as the primary residence and built an ancillary garage but stated that the proposed project entails a new house with the Bridge/Burdoo House as the garage. Mr. Cooper then stated that he does not know what remains of the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Cooper further stated that he appreciated the time and effort that Mr. Curtin had put into the project and stated that he believed that the result would produce historic timbers with a reproduced house in the front. Mr. Cooper concluded by stating that he does not know if he will approve the proposal.

Ms. Krieger stated expressed her inclination project but that she would like the assurance that the historic reproduction will be there in perpetuity. Ms. Krieger stated that the Board will approve some timbers and the exterior as presented, but that the Board does not have the reassurance that Mr. Curtin will maintain that. Ms. Krieger stated that she does not mind putting the new house next to the historic reproduction but that she would want the assurance that the proposal will continue to be known and represented as a historic structure.

Mr. Barnert stated that he agreed with Ms. Krieger and stated that with the Hosmer House, the Board put a condition on the special permit that the project must remain as they approved it. Mr. Barnert then asked if the Board could do the same thing with this project and put a condition on the special permit that the project cannot change.

Mr. Clifford stated that he feels the same way that Mr. Cooper and Ms. Krieger do. Mr. Clifford stated that he believed that Mr. Curtin will pay a lot of money for very little results since he will save the timber frame. Mr. Clifford noted that the rest of the original Bridge/Burdoo House has already gone and that the current Bridge/Burdoo House has non-historic elements. Mr. Clifford then stated that the Board needs to decide whether the value of saving the timber constitutes enough for the Board to approve the project and noted that the Historical Commission had recommended that saving the timber constitutes enough. Mr. Clifford then stated that this recommendation probably would push him in the direction of approving the proposal. Mr. Clifford noted his concern about the conditions, specifically about maintaining it in perpetuity, and stated that the Board cannot impose that. Mr. Clifford then stated that should Mr. Curtin not comply with the special permit conditions, he will not receive his certificate of occupancy, which will not do good in preserving the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Clifford noted that since Mr. Curtin's project takes place on private property, the Board has a finite amount of control and then stated that he perceived that the other Board members will vote hesitantly in favor of the proposal.

Finding One: The uses or modification of standards and requirements authorized in §6.2.4 are necessary to maintain the historic or architecturally significant building, structure, or element

Mr. Clifford stated that the word "element" helps a lot for this proposal since the timber frame constitutes an element and also stated that he thinks that the proposal fits that. Ms. Krieger then stated that she believed that putting the Bridge/Burdoo House on the back of the property serves as a necessary step to preserve the intended element. Mr. Clifford then stated that he believed that the changes of the Bridge/Burdoo House surviving remain close to zero without the proposal. Mr. Clifford stated that the Board had received testimony from the Trustee of the Trust who owns the Bridge/Burdoo House and stated that the owner of the buildable lot now stands in a position where he could acquire the Bridge/Burdoo House from the Trust. Mr. Clifford noted that if the proposal does not go through, the Bridge/Burdoo House will face demolition.

Finding Two: The proposed renovation, repair, adaptive reuse, or relocation preserves, to the maximum extent feasible, the historical and architectural features of the building, structure, or element

Mr. Clifford again highlighted the use of the word “element” and stated that the proposal plans to preserve the timber frame. Mr. Clifford then asked the Board Members if turning the Bridge/Burdoo House into a garage will preserve the timber. Mr. Clifford then noted that the Board should put a condition on the special permit stating that the owner will have the responsibility to undertake maintain perpetuity of the timber frame. Mr. Clifford further noted that this would include any person who buys the property in the future. Mr. Cooper clarified that the timber frame constitutes the only element of the original Bridge/Burdoo house that remains and that the applicant proposes to reproduce the original Bridge/Burdoo House on the non-garage side. Mr. Cooper then assumed that the non-garage side will have the historic plaque that should indicate the historic significance of the Bridge/Burdoo House. Mr. Clifford stated that the Board will reach that item in Finding Four and stated that he would also like a plaque facing the parking lot. Mr. Clifford then stated that to maintain the timber, Mr. Curtin should build a structure that looks exactly like the Bridge/Burdoo House when the original Bridge/Burdoo House used the timber. Mr. Clifford then noted that if Mr. Curtin does not use the timber frame as a garage, he will have to return to the Board for another special permit.

Finding Three: For relocation of buildings, structures and elements to another location, no other preservation measures are practical or reasonable, on the existing site

Mr. Clifford stated that the Board heard testimony from both the real estate agent and Trustee that if nothing happens before September, the Bridge/Burdoo House will get demolished.

Finding Four: the historical and architectural features of the building, structure, or element will be preserved for the duration of the special permit

Mr. Clifford stated that Mr. Curtin has the responsibility to maintain in perpetuity, the timber frame as a garage and that if he wants to do anything else with it, he will have to come back before the Board and seek a special permit modification. Mr. Clifford noted that special permits last forever. Ms. Krieger clarified that the garage will have the rendering of the original Bridge/Burdoo House, which Mr. Clifford confirmed. Mr. Clifford then told the staff to make sure that the decision clearly states that Mr. Curtin will need to protect the frame inside of a structure that looks like the Bridge/Burdoo House, except for the garage side.

Finding Five: Failure to grant the special permit is likely to result in inappropriate use or physical modification or demolition of the building, structure, or element

Mr. Clifford stated that the Bridge/Burdoo House will get demolished if the Board does not do anything.

Finding Six: The use or the modification of standards and requirements will not generate negative impacts to the surrounding area or zoning district or that any negative impacts generated may be feasibly mitigated

Mr. Clifford stated that he does not have any concerns about the trees since the Tree Bylaw will apply to the construction and noted that the Board did not waive the Tree Bylaw. Mr. Clifford stated that Mr. Curtin will have to comply with the Tree Bylaw and that the Board did not grant any setback relief. Mr. Clifford stated that while he understood the neighbor’s concerns that all

neighborhoods have issues and stated that the property has trees that will shield the construction. Mr. Clifford also noted that the construction process requires compliance with the zoning regulations. Mr. Clifford stated that he finds the shared driveway problematic. Mr. Cooper asked if the Planning Board will address the shared driveway for the subdivision. Mr. Clifford stated that Mr. Curtin had included a draft easement in his application and stated that the Planning Board and the Fire Department will both address the shared driveway. Mr. Clifford expressed his confidence that the building inspection process will address some concerns. Mr. Clifford noted that the Planning Board has the authority to subdivide the lot, not the Board.

No further discussion from the Board.

At 9:28 p.m., Mr. Clifford moved to approve the petition.

At 9:28 p.m., Mr. Barnert second Mr. Clifford.

At 9:28 The Board of Appeals voted five (5) in favor, zero (0) opposed, and zero (0) in abstention to grant ONE (1) SPECIAL PERMIT in accordance with the Zoning By-Law (Chapter 135 of the Code of Lexington) section(s) 135-9.4 and 135-6.2 to modify the dimensional controls of §135-4.0 to allow for the preservation and relocation of a historic building to a lot that would have 0 ft. of frontage rather than the required 125 ft. and an area of 15,206 sq. ft. instead of the required 15,500 sq. ft. (a roll call vote took place: Ralph D. Clifford – Yes, Nyles N. Barnert – Yes, Jeanne K. Krieger – Yes, Scott E. Cooper – Yes, and Patricia S. Nelson – Yes).

Meeting Minutes of the Lexington Board of Appeals
Conducted Virtually, Via Zoom
February 12th, 2026, 7:00 p.m.

Board Members: Chair – Ralph D. Clifford, Nyles N. Barnert, and Associate Members Jeanne K. Krieger, Scott E. Cooper, and Patricia S. Nelson

Administrative Staff: Jim Kelly, Building Commissioner, Kiruthika Ramakrishnan, LUHD Office Manager, and EmmaJean Anjoorian, Department Assistant

Other Business:

1. Minutes from the January 22nd, 2026, Meeting

At 9:29 p.m., Mr. Clifford moved to approve the minutes.

At 9:29 p.m., Ms. Krieger second Mr. Clifford.

At 9:29 p.m., the Board of Appeals voted four (4) in favor, zero (0) opposed, and one (1) in abstention to approve the minutes from the January 22nd, 2026, Hearing (a roll call vote took place: Ralph D. Clifford – Yes, Nyles N. Barnert – Yes, Jeanne K. Krieger – Yes, Scott E. Cooper – Abstain, and Patricia S. Nelson – Yes).

At 9:29 p.m., Mr. Clifford moved to adjourn the meeting.

At 9:29 p.m., Mr. Barnert second Mr. Clifford.

At 9:29 p.m., the Board voted to Adjourn (a roll call vote took place: Ralph D. Clifford – Yes, Nyles N. Barnert – Yes, Jeanne K. Krieger – Yes, Scott E. Cooper – Yes, and Patricia S. Nelson – Yes).