

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

May 25, 2017 - Henrietta S. Attles Meeting Room, Cambridge Rindge & Latin High School, 459 Broadway, Cambridge, Mass. - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: William King, *Chair*; Bruce Irving, *Vice Chair*; William Barry, Robert Crocker, Chandra Harrington, *Members*; Joseph Ferrara, Kyle Sheffield, *Alternates*

Members absent: Jo Solet, *Member*; Susannah Tobin, *Alternate*

Staff present: Charles Sullivan, *Executive Director*; Samantha Elliott, *Preservation Administrator*

Public present: See attached list.

With a quorum present, Chair King called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M. and explained the hearing procedures.

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 3678 (continued and amended): 1-7 & 9-11 JFK St. and 18-20 Brattle St., by Harvard Collection LLC c/o James J. Rafferty, Esq. Renovate 1-7 JFK St. and 18-20 Brattle St. Demolish building at 9-11 JFK St. (with frontage also on Brattle St.) and construct new infill building, alter storefronts, and construct upper story addition.

Mr. Sullivan gave a brief overview of the project. He showed slides of the structures included in the proposal. He discussed their history as well as previous alterations to the Abbot Building, Corcoran Building, and 18 Brattle St. He noted that the project was last reviewed at the February 2017 Historical Commission hearing. That hearing had been continued to allow the applicant to work out more details on the exterior aspects of the infill building, the detailing of the pavilion, and the exterior restoration of 18 Brattle and the Abbot Building. He asked the commissioners and members of the public to refer to the excerpt from the Harvard Square Conservation District Guidelines that he distributed before the meeting.

James Rafferty, representing the proponent, noted that their presentation would be organized around three areas: the size and setbacks of the pavilion setbacks, the relationship between infill and the adjacent buildings, and the restoration program. He noted that at the December 2016 hearing the Commission voted in principal for the removal of the Corcoran Building. He introduced Lisa Howe, a historic preservation specialist with Building Conservation Associates who had recently joined the team.

William Brown of Regency/Equity One said that Equity had merged with Regency Centers. The team had been refining the interaction between the Abbot Building and the infill. They had reduced the second-floor ceiling heights to gain a lower overall project height and reduced the footprint of the fourth-floor from 9,200 square feet to 8,400 square feet.

David Chilinski, the architect, began his presentation with a video showing the proposed project from the perspective of a person moving through Harvard Square. Then he presented the proposed plans and elevations. He showed how the project related to the context and the vantage points from which the fourth floor would be visible.

Lisa Howe, an historic preservation consultant, said she had been brought on to help formulate a restoration plan for the project. She had met on site with Mr. Sullivan and the architect, after which she re-

viewed files at the Commission office to understand the history of the structures. It was clear that the buildings had been altered over the years, but not much had been taken away from them. She noted that while storefronts had been changed, windows infilled, and signage added, most of the historic fabric remained and original plans were available to use as a starting point. Much of the original limestone was intact. The main issues were soiling, cracking, poor repairs, rotted window surrounds, changes to fenestration, and anchors and attachments that required patching, but all the issues were readily repairable. The restoration plan focused on returning the structure's historic openings, recreating the historic entryway, cleaning and repointing, restoring historic window openings, and patching limestone as needed. Infill limestone could be used for Dutchman repairs as needed.

[Commissioner Ferrara arrived.]

Mr. Chilinski gave a brief overview of the revised proposal. The setback of the pavilion had been increased from 10' to 13' along JFK and Brattle Streets. The setback from the bow of the Abbot Building had increased from 71' to 77' and the overall height reduced by two feet. The elevation of the fourth floor had been lowered to the roof level of 18 Brattle Street by reducing the ceiling heights below. He showed perspectives of the pavilion from various spots around Harvard Square as well as an aerial view. He noted that the amended plans helped make the Abbot Building more prominent and the infill somewhat subservient. The Abbot Building felt more like a standalone building under the current plans. The reveals between the infill and the adjoining buildings would be identical, and would help further differentiate the buildings. The proposed materials for the infill building included gray terra cotta on first floor and brick above. The spandrel glass had been replaced by metal panels. Shadow studies reflected the minimal impact the project would have on the Square.

Mr. King asked for questions from commissioners.

Mr. Sheffield asked for an explanation of the upper story brickwork details on the infill building. Mr. Chilinski replied that the idea was to do a slight recess every fourth course. Mr. Sheffield asked about the projecting metal elements. Mr. Chilinski replied that these decorative and screening elements were intended to help deal with the southern exposure of the JFK Street elevation, but were not present on the Brattle Street side.

Mr. King asked Ms. Howe to elaborate on the restoration of 18 Brattle Street. Ms. Howe replied that the brick and limestone needed only limited repointing and cleaning. The windows would be restored or replaced while the trim would be restored.

Mr. Barry asked Mr. Chilinski to describe any specific objectives he might have had in pulling back and reducing the height of the pavilion, other than trying to achieve a general reduction. Mr. Chilinski replied that the changes were intended to reduce the visual impact from major vantage points, especially from Brattle Street, with the goal of balancing the scale and working to make it invisible from most viewpoints. Mr. Brown added that one limiting factor was the need to maintain the windows of the Abbot building, so

the floor levels there would be at the sill of the second floor and the header of the third. Mr. Sheffield inquired further about that relationship, and Mr. Brown replied that the windows would have tempered glass.

Mr. Barry asked how the retail tenancy would be divided. Mr. Brown replied that merchandising had not been finalized and they were still working out the details beyond having the corner entry, an entry at 18 Brattle Street, a secondary office entry for the Abbot Building, plus 3-9 additional retail storefronts dependent upon space needs and the merchandising study.

Mr. King opened the hearing for questions of fact from members of the public.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked if the applicants had considered using the third floor of the Abbot building as a mezzanine rather than taking the floor out. She asked Ms. Howe how deep they were going to dig back to find the original pilasters. She also asked if there had been plans to include the Corcoran Building rather than demolish it. Mr. Rafferty noted that the Commission voted in December to support the Corcoran Building's demolition. Mr. King recalled that there had been a fair amount of discussion on the matter, and the Commission had concluded that the project could be better off if it started with a new infill building rather than constructing an addition to the Corcoran Building.

With respect to the mezzanine, Mr. Brown said that the present floor-to-floor heights were not viable for retail. He said their goal was to restore the exterior as closely to its 1909 state as possible.

Adrienne Landsman asked if the architect could show a slide. She noted that the elevation that reflected a view from JFK Street with the Corcoran Building on the left was actually the east elevation. She asked if the developer had taken into account the many retail vacancies in the square, the aggregate square footage of vacancies, what rents were unpaid and how they could appeal to retailers who had vacated available space in the square. Mr. Brown replied that they had done the research.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place asked about the apparent banners on a rendering. Mr. Chilinski replied that they were a mockup, reflecting potential signage for second floor retail. He asked why the addition looked like it extended over the edge of the Abbot Building in one of the elevations. Mr. Chilinski replied that it was a rendering issue due to the angle of the building being rendered in two dimensions. He asked if the rooftop seating would be recessed, and if the green portion of the rooftop would be accessible to the public. Mr. Chilinski replied that the green roof was intended to help with storm water management. There would be planters and railings to keep the public away from the space. The outdoor seating would be the same level as the interior restaurant space and the green roof would be elevated approximately two feet above that level. He asked about the additional height of the rooftop addition above the Abbot Building. Mr. Chilinski replied that it was approximately 14 feet. He questioned why the applicant could not commit to any particular number of storefronts beyond the minimum. Mr. Brown replied that there would be at least three but probably three to five; they had not completed their merchandizing study.

City Councillor Jan Deveraux of 255 Lake View Avenue asked if the entry to the Abbot Building,

where Curious George currently existed, would be recessed from the sidewalk or filled in. Mr. Brown replied that the intent was to return to the 1909 plan with doors between the columns, and inner doors swinging into a vestibule. Ms. Deveraux asked if the public would still be able to take shelter from inclement weather, and if the doors would impact crosswalk circulation. Mr. Chilinski replied that existing overhang would be lost, but pedestrians would be able to shelter inside the vestibule if needed.

Susan Miller-Havens of [18 Brattle Street](#) and 221 Mt. Auburn Street asked about the height and material of the roof deck barrier. Mr. Chilinski replied that the green roof area would be completely inaccessible to the public and they would work with Inspectional Services on the required height of the barrier, which he thought would be 42". The barrier would be a mixture of planters and a fence, composed [of](#) a combination of materials. Mr. Miller-Havens asked if there was a requirement to have anything at the edges of the building. Mr. Chilinski replied there was not. It was not their intent to use the entire roof for public space, to prevent it from being part of the public's visual experience of the building.

Ken Taylor of 23 Berkeley Street said that the evening view of the Abbot Building appeared to show ceilings where there were none. Mr. Chilinski said that a person on the street would see a ceiling through the third floor windows, but not through the second.

Dr. Harvey Baughman of 19 [Harvey Bay](#) Street said that the simulated drive through the Square was unrealistic as it was a busy area and one could not drive down Massachusetts Avenue as shown in the presentation. Mr. King noted that this section of the hearing was for questions of fact. Mr. Baughman asked what would be done to mitigate traffic. Mr. King replied that traffic was not within the Commission's purview.

Abra Berkowitz of 253½ Broadway said she appreciated the video and asked if they had put together perspectives from other areas like the Yard or residential areas. Mr. Chilinski said they had not. Ms. Berkowitz asked if they had considered using the basement as retail space as it was a prime retail location. Mr. Brown replied that the basement had low ceilings and no natural light; it would be partially infilled and the rest used for mechanicals.

Nancy Gold of Weston said the district guidelines encouraged ground-level small-scale storefronts. It did not seem that three to five storefronts would qualify, as currently there were 10 storefronts in those spaces with some as small as 400 square feet. She referred to Ms. Howe's testimony and asked if construction would impact the limestone. She also asked when the provisional decision was made on demolishing the Corcoran Building. Mr. Chilinski replied that the team would be performing studies to better understand the condition of the masonry. He noted that the new structure would have a poured concrete slab and be supported by columns, and would not impact the Abbot Building façade. Ms. Howe clarified that the cracks in the limestone were mostly related to attachments and were not reflective of movement or settlement. Mr. Brown said that he hoped to have multiple sizes of tenants. Mr. King added that the submission included two leasing plan options. Mr. Rafferty responded that the Corcoran Building demolition had been approved

at the December meeting of the Commission after the development team asked for directions on the matter, as it was a significant modification of their original proposal. Mr. King produced the minutes of that hearing and read the motion.

Laura Donahue of 90 Putnam Avenue asked how much pile driving would be required to support the new structure. Mr. Brown replied that the plan was to build a new foundation with spread footings so as to not impose any new loads on adjacent buildings. The footings would be pre-drilled and poured, not driven. Pilings, if any would be micropiles that were rotated in rather than hammered.

Elena Saporta of 102 Ellery Street asked if going back to large expanses of glass at the street level was typical of the time period and a faithful restoration. Ms. Howe replied that the plan included reverting back to the original openings from the 1909 plans. Ms. Saporta asked if locations for the elevator lobby other than at the corner had been explored. Mr. Brown clarified that the space would not be a lobby but rather an entrance for the second-floor retail.

Michael Brandon of 27 Seven Pines Avenue asked if there were plans to reopen the bricked-over windows on the side elevation of 18 Brattle Street. Mr. Chilinski replied that it was not likely as reopening them would invoke building code and fire safety requirements. He said they could look at it but it was dependent upon a number of factors. Mr. Brandon asked what materials were proposed for the rooftop pavilion. Mr. Chilinski referred to a rendering, noting that as proposed it would have a mixture of metal and glass with a standing-seam metal roof. The goal was to have it disappear into the sky.

Carole O'Hare of 172 Magazine Street asked why they had not done the calculations to figure out if they could reopen the windows on the west side elevation of 18 Brattle Street. Mr. Chilinski replied that there were more factors than just building setbacks and fire safety; they had not yet done a structural analysis and seismic analysis. He noted that reopening the windows would impact the structural stiffness of the exterior wall. Ms. O'Hare asked if they could reinforce the building behind the windows so that the openings could be restored. Mr. Brown clarified that if there were glazing currently then the rating would not apply and bracing could be added behind, but when windows were reopened it became a different evaluation. Mr. Sullivan added that when the structure was originally constructed for a bookbinding company in 1894 it had been designed for maximum natural daylight. When it was rebuilt as an office building after a fire in 1922, electricity made natural light less necessary. The infilled windows were part of the history of the building, and it might not be appropriate to reopen them.

Caroline James, a resident of Somerville, asked the height of the mechanicals on the roof, which she believed would be visible from Harvard Yard. Mr. Brown replied that the mechanicals would be located in a well, within the 16 feet height of the pavilion. She asked what the impact of the pavilion would be. Mr. Brown replied it would be similar to or lower than the height of the existing stair headhouse. She asked about the program for the rooftop. Mr. Brown replied it would be a restaurant, not an event space. She asked about the decision to keep the Tess façade. Mr. Brown said the Commission considered it significant

and that if they had multiple tenants for the space they would build a vestibule inside. She asked why it was not also being restored to 1909. Mr. Chilinski replied that the structure had been previously altered from its original use and rebuilt in the 1920s. The storefront was by a notable architect who had worked on multiple projects around the square. Mr. King noted that over the years since the establishment of the Harvard Square Conservation District ~~and the~~ Commission had worked with tenants and landlords to accommodate new entrances and openings for tenants.

Mr. King stated the three-minute rule and opened the hearing to comments from the public.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place narrated a Powerpoint presentation. If the team was proposing to base their design for the Abbot Building on the 1909 plans, why were they not going back to the full 1909 detailing and uses? She asked if they could pull the addition back so that the copper cornice returns would remain intact. The project included removing more than 25% of the structure, which, she felt, meant it should have to go through the demolition review process. It was a critical building and she asked if the Commission wanted to put its name on the demolition of a structure with only façade elements retained. She asked if the project still had to go before the Planning or Zoning Boards for its height and other elements. She felt the additional height impacted the character of Harvard Square, which was predominantly comprised of two- and three-story structures. She feared it would become an exemplar for future projects. She said it would be visible from multiple points around the Square, from residential areas, and from Harvard Yard. The 250-seat restaurant felt more like an event space. She asked if this was the best use of the limited space in Harvard Square and if it would add to the vitality of the area. She strongly recommended the applicant use the basement space with sidewalk-level windows, and try to stay within the 60' height limit. She suggested they look at moving the rooftop terrace to the other side of the building, facing Mt. Auburn Street and the river. She commended them for restoring the façade to the 1909 plans but hoped they would look carefully at the proposal.

The Commission recessed from 7:56 to 8:05 PM.

Marilee Meyer expressed concern about the alteration of the 18 Brattle Street storefront. If multiple tenants needed to occupy it would compromise the symmetry and importance of the design. She noted that in regard to the original glass on the Abbot Building, not all glass was the same. The Abbot Building entry would lose some of its gravitas as it disappeared behind the glass. She expressed concern over the visibility of the rooftop structure from Brattle Square, stating that the buildings used as precedents to support the project were deemed mistakes and eyesores. The Commission should consider construction mitigation; while the project would be reviewed by BZA, the CHC set the groundwork for the project. The Abbot Building entry would be sterilized and homogenized, representing a loss of character at the epicenter of the Square.

Adrian Landsman asked if the Commission was serving the needs of residents and visitors from around the world. The Curious George store welcomed kids and contributed to refugees internationally.

Real estate was about deals and trading, and she said that residents needed to demand something in exchange. Mr. King interjected when her three minutes expired, stating that the Commission did not have jurisdiction over the use of properties.

Susan Miller-Havens said that as an artist she looked at details. The copper cornice of the Abbot Building was extraordinary. She asked why the drawings cut off part of it. Mr. Chilinski replied that the cornice would be preserved in its entirety and that they would work with staff to include enough of a recess to maintain it. Mr. King commended the team on their intended efforts to preserve the cornice.

Mark Bobrowski, an attorney in Concord, Massachusetts representing the Harvard Square Defense Fund, offered a legal perspective to Ms. Blier's point. He read from a letter he had submitted to the Commission which said that the work on the Abbot Building met the definition of demolition, and recommended that the project be reviewed under the demolition delay review process. He stated that the secondary goals numbers three through nine would be hard to meet with the project as proposed.

Mr. King said that the demolition delay ordinance did not apply to a property that was landmarked or within a designated district. He added that the Inspectional Services Division did not have a codified definition of demolition.

Sergio Quadros of 72 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, echoed the comments of Ms. Blier and the Our Harvard Square Group. Harvard Square was a landmark that was both tangible and intangible. The building should keep its iconic character and show how preservation can be paired with net zero goals. He requested that the Commission delay a decision to consider the uses necessary to the local inhabitants, the promotion of local businesses in the basement space, and the character of Cambridge.

Michael Brandon said he understood that Ms. Blier had questioned whether historical materials should be used on the pavilion, and he asked what the Commission felt about that. He expressed appreciation for the applicant making indentations to clearly differentiate the three separate buildings. He hoped the infill project could be lower in height than the Abbot Building and more closely mimic existing conditions, and that the minimum number of storefronts could be increased. He urged the Commission to work out the details of storefronts and signage before giving a final approval.

Marjorie Hilton of 141 Upland Road said she was concerned that the project would look like a strip mall and that it was not what she had envisioned as the future of Harvard Square.

Abra Berkowitz expressed concern over the metal cladding on the outside of the building because it did not seem to fit in with other buildings in the District. She requested that the applicants look into other materials such as brick for the pavilion. She expressed concern over the applicant not compiling views from more locations, including residential areas. She supported utilization of the basement for retail spaces.

James Williamson said that most of those present were against the proposal. He expressed concern over the fetish for the 1909 plan, and questioned the number of storefronts. He was concerned about the pavilion's height and scale. There was not enough information for the project to be understood in totality.

Ken Taylor said the rooftop addition would be clearly visible from the Loeb Drama Center and that it was critical to assess its impact. He did not object to the Corcoran Building demolition but wondered why they were maximizing the infill potential as it seemed too big. He echoed Ms. Meyer's comments about the original entrance. He hoped that the Commission would require historic lighting.

Tim Shaw of 147 Mt. Auburn Street felt the project gave a Disney feel to the Square. He was concerned that the rents would be too high for most businesses. He also expressed concern about the years of construction that the Square would face for the project.

Councillor Deveraux agreed with the public comments. She had spoken with members of the public who were unable to attend the hearing because of other events; only the diehards could be present that night. The word around town and on social media was that the project ~~was~~ did not have a lot of support. Two things really defined the block: the flatiron character and the Curious George storefront. She felt that the 1909 storefront did not resonate with the public; some thought it was a bizarre plan. She wondered why the 1980 Tess storefront was important. She wondered about how the roof would be used and that people might be tempted to go out on the prow and "do the Titanic thing." Many of the concerns brought up at the hearing were decisions that other bodies had jurisdiction over. She said that the Reed Block, where only the facade was preserved and everything behind it was demolished, was something no one wanted to repeat.

Frank Kramer, a resident of 7 Avon Street and former owner of the Harvard Bookstore, said that the proposal didn't seem as though it was preserving the character of the Square.

Ms. James asked if the columns were being moved back. She also echoed what Our Harvard Square stated, hoping to work with the developers and continue the hearing.

Carol O'Hare asked if they had considered flopping the pavilion to the other side and leaving the Abbot Building alone. She said it reminded her of her ex-husband, a GSD professor had who used to critique students by saying "too much same, same, same."

Mr. King closed the public comment period.

Mr. King said that there were still a number of unanswered questions and observed that the Commission did not have jurisdiction over issues like uses, construction delays, or phasing. Any approval would have to be conditional, and the proponents would have to come back for approval of elements such as the storefronts and the windows at 18 Brattle Street. He noted that many times construction details were delegated to staff for review.

Ms. Harrington said reviewing the project had been difficult. She could understand the public's position, but she saw the hard work the developers had done to accommodate their concerns. She reviewed the guidelines Mr. Sullivan had passed out. She said the project supported secondary goals One ["Preserve historically or architecturally significant buildings as well as those that contribute to the distinctive visual character or historical significance of the District"], Two ["Sustain the vitality of the commercial environment by preserving architecturally-significant or original building fabric where it currently exists. When this is

not possible, support creative, contemporary design for storefront alterations and additions.”], Four [“Build on and sustain the diversity of existing building form, scale and material. . . . Encourage streetwall buildings where that character has been set. Encourage ground-level, small-scale storefronts to preserve the vitality and character of the streets.”], and Eight [“Encourage projects that will maintain a wide diversity of uses serving the needs of surrounding neighborhoods, students, and visitors from around the world.”]. With regard to goal Three [“Support creative, contemporary design for new construction that complements and contributes to its immediate neighbors and the character of the District. Recognize and respect creativity of design during the review process and mitigate the functional impacts of development on adjacent areas.”], she questioned whether or not it met the part about mitigating functional impacts. She said the biggest question to her was whether the project served the needs of the community.

Mr. Irving said that he agreed more or less but wanted to hear about her concerns with goal Eight as the ultimate use was undetermined. Ms. Harrington responded that the Commission did know that there would be retail component with at least 5-6 tenants, which seemed like small scale retail although the night rendering looked like a mall. Mr. Barry added that he thought the functional impact goal related to conditions after the project was in place; Mr. Sullivan confirmed this. Ms. Harrington said that the project then supported that criteria.

Kyle Sheffield said that the presentation reflected a lot of positive updates. The revised parapet condition resolved his concerns about the height of the pavilion and would screen the edge of the green roof. Recessing the mechanicals and dropping the outdoor dining would reduce the sound impact. Preservation of the Abbot cornice returns was important. He responded to Ms. Harrington’s question about preserving the continuity of the streetscape, noting that while the Corcoran Building ~~was~~ would be demolished, the new structure would occupy a similar footprint. He expressed concern about the reflectivity of the material on the pavilion; zinc-coated copper might otherwise be appropriate. His biggest issue was the exterior materials of the infill building; the proposed metal cladding contrasted poorly with the luxurious restoration of the Abbot Building. The change to terra cotta at sidewalk level was good. There were better ways of dealing with solar heat gain than projecting metal shades on an opaque wall. The brick details needed further study. The JFK facade could benefit from distinct definition of storefronts; adding two columns would force the development of multiple storefronts, which would meet the concerns of the public. Many of the public’s concerns could be addressed by architectural alterations. The success and appeal of the Abbot Building derived from the fact that it was a unified composition conceived in one moment, in contrast to Corcoran’s. At some point adaptively reusing a building over and over again becomes detrimental. With respect to Ms. Blier’s ~~comments~~ [proposal to adaptively reuse the Corcorans Building](#), he could not see a way of ~~creating an infill~~ [adaptively reusing that](#) building that would complement the buildings on each side.

Mr. Crocker said he thought the developers had done a good job responding to questions from previous meetings. He was not sure how much further the Commission could go with its review. The project

made a lot of sense. The developers had heard that the public wanted smaller storefronts.

Mr. Irving said that Mr. Sheffield had put his finger on some smaller points and he too was curious about the spandrels. He asked if Mr. Sheffield could expand on his concern with them. Mr. Sheffield clarified that metal was a cheap material not in keeping with the quality of other materials; there were other materials that could be utilized. Mr. Irving said the desire for smaller retail had come through loud and clear. The Commission had listened carefully to the public and he was saddened to hear they thought otherwise.

Mr. Barry agreed that the plans had been substantively and meaningfully updated in response to the previous hearings. He had the overwhelming sense that people were not in favor of the project but many of the issues were not things the Commission had jurisdiction over. He agreed with much of what Mr. Sheffield said, especially the use of metal spandrels. There were a number of details still to be worked out. He noted that the number ~~and nature~~ of the tenants was not ~~overseen-regulated~~ by the Commission but could the exterior expression of that could be an important character defining feature, so the addition of columns to visually and architecturally break up the storefronts was within its purview. He felt it had been a responsive design process.

Mr. Ferrara said he appreciated the responsiveness of the proponents. He complimented Ms. Harrington on her methodological approach in reviewing the project against the criteria. The contrast of the new structure in comparison with the Abbot Building was nice, but it could look less monolithic. He commended the designers on their restoration plan. He concurred with other commissioners that breaking up the storefronts similar to the Brattle Street side would be a good move. He agreed with Mr. Sheffield's comment about the spandrel material, but was uncertain of the best course. He commended the applicant on reducing the massing of the infill, but he still had some concerns over the massing of the pavilion and thought it could be pulled further back. Mr. Barry interjected that having different materials on the pavilion was a good thing and he thought pulling it back and changing the material was something the Commission consistently did with additions. Mr. Ferrara added he felt the applicant could provide more relief there.

Mr. King said he was sympathetic to the fact that Harvard Square had changed a lot in the last 50 years, and continued to change. He was not opposed to modernization, but noted the important question was about appropriateness. He said there were two main conversations at the hearings. On one hand were the "diehards" who did not feel the project was appropriate at all, and on the other hand were the commissioners who were seeking to make the project better. It was time to allow other city agencies to weigh in.

Mr. Sullivan described a possible motion based on his sense of the meeting that echoed the "approval in principle" the Commission made in December. His draft stated that:

The Commission supported the Harvard Collection project with respect to its massing, scale, and general exterior design, finding that demolition and replacement of the Corcoran's/Urban Outfitters building conformed to the language of the Harvard Square Conservation District guidelines for demolition, and subject to further Commission review and approval of the entrances of the Abbot Building and 18 Brattle Street; the cornice returns of

the Abbot Building; the walled-up window openings in the west elevation of 18 Brattle Street; the number and design of the storefronts and associated signage; the cladding material of the penthouse; the design and material of the rooftop patio railing; construction materials and details throughout; and exterior restoration details and methods, with the further understanding that the applicant should return when Planning Board review had been substantially completed.

Ms. Harrington asked ~~if~~ about the spandrels. Mr. Sullivan replied that construction materials and details still needed to be clarified. The project would be required to return to the Commission for a final Certificate of Appropriateness, allowing other boards to hear the project and the applicant to return with updated plans reacting to their requirements.

Mr. King said he wanted to be explicit that the Abbot Building was a very significant and contributing building to Harvard Square. It was probably one of the few buildings that would be landmarked if the Conservation District did not exist. The Corcoran Building was not at that level and its demolition to support the whole project was warranted. Mr. Irving said that the latter had been agreed and asked why it was important to state the former. Mr. King said he wanted to make a finding on the Abbot Building's special significance to reassure the community members present.

Mr. Irving said that the importance of the building was manifest in the work the Commission had done to get to this point. He was ready to make a motion similar to what Mr. Sullivan had outlined earlier, but he would include this finding if Mr. King wished.

Mr. Sullivan said that it seemed Mr. King wanted to address the provision of the guidelines that demolition would not adversely affect the district. Mr. Sullivan read the guidelines for demolition from the study report:

The Cambridge Historical Commission will issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to an applicant seeking to demolish a structure in the Conservation District if the project, including both the demolished and the replacement buildings, is determined to be "appropriate for or compatible with the preservation or protection of the . . . district." Approval of demolition will be dependent on a finding by the Cambridge Historical Commission that a) the demolition of the structure will not adversely impact the district, subdistrict, or abutting properties in the sense described in secondary goal #1, and b) the replacement project meets the purposes of the Conservation District with respect to secondary goals #3 through #9, where these are applicable.

He thought the statement in the motion "that demolition and replacement of the Corcoran's/Urban Outfitters building conformed to the language of the Harvard Square Conservation District guidelines for demolition" was a sufficient finding. Mr. King agreed.

Mr. Irving moved to adopt the following motion:

The Cambridge Historical Commission approves in principle a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project as presented on May 25, 2017 [shown on plans by Prellwitz Chilinski Associates dated April 11, 2017, and plans of the same date described as revised May 25, 2017] with respect to its massing, scale, and general exterior design, finding that demolition and replacement of the Corcoran's/Urban Outfitters building conforms to the language of the Harvard Square Conservation District guidelines for demolition, and that the proposed

infill replacement building, and the renovations and additions to the other buildings conform to the guidelines for new construction and additions in such district, subject to further Commission review and approval of the following features:

- The entrances of the Abbot Building and 18 Brattle Street;
- The cornice returns of the Abbot Building;
- The walled-up window openings in the west elevation of 18 Brattle Street;
- The number and design of the storefronts and associated signage;
- The cladding material of the penthouse;
- The design and material of the rooftop patio railing;
- Construction materials and details throughout; and
- Exterior restoration details and methods.

And with the further understanding that the applicant should return to the Historical Commission for final approval when Planning Board review has been substantially completed.

Mr. Barry asked if the motion needed to mention the appropriateness of demolition of the Corcoran Building. Mr. King said it did. ~~Mr. Irving accepted the amendment~~

Ms. Harrington seconded, and the motion was adopted by a vote of 6-0. [The vote of Mr. Ferrara, who missed earlier hearings and arrived late, was withdrawn on June 12 and is not represented in this tally].

Mr. Rafferty asked the chair to confirm that the motion constituted an approval subject to a number of conditions and subject to returning for a final Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. King agreed.

Mr. King thanked the public and members of the Commission for attending.

Ms. Harrington moved to adjourn. Mr. Crocker seconded and the motion was approved 7-0 at 9:46 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Samantha Elliott, Preservation Administrator
Charles Sullivan, Executive Director

Members of the Public Who Signed the Attendance List on May 25, 2017

Krista DiIaconi	Regency
John Fitzpatrick	Regency
Tim Shaw	147 Mt. Auburn Street
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana Street
Dan Weller	43 Linnaean Street
William & Miriam Truslow	4 Hawthorn Street
Nancy Gold	12 Hubbard St, Weston
Harvey Baughman	19 Bay Street
Marjorie Hilton	141 Upton Road
Frank Kramer	7 Avon Street
Caroline James	114R Beacon Street, #2, Somerville
Sergio Quadros	72 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston
Joshua Fay	55 Garfield Street
Carol O'Hare	172 Magazine Street
Michael Brandon	27 Seven Pines Avenue
Heather Hoffman	213 Hurley Street
Ned VerPlanck	26 Brattle Street
Elena Saporta	102 Ellery Street
Jan Deveraux	255 Lakeview Avenue
Esther Pullman	10 Ash Street Place
Christopher Pullman	10 Ash Street Place
Conal Doyle	25 Ware Street
Crista Martin	8 Hawthorne Park
Kenneth Taylor	23 Berkeley Street
Sarah Wheaton	344 Huron Avenue
Susan Corcoran	Black Ink – 5 Brattle Street
Laura Donohue	90 Putnam Ave
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Place
Christopher Mackin	48 JFK St, #2
Betsy Croban	1462 Cambridge Street
John Hawkinson	-

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.