

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

December 1, 2016 - 795 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge City Hall, Sullivan Chamber - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: William King, *Chair*; Bruce Irving, *Vice Chair*; Robert Crocker, Chandra Harrington, Jo Solet, *Members*; Kyle Sheffield, *Alternate*

Members absent: William Barry, Shary Berg, *Members*; Joseph Ferrara, Susannah Tobin, *Alternates*

Staff present: Charles Sullivan, *Executive Director*; Sarah Burks, *Preservation Planner*

Public present: See attached list.

Chair King called the meeting to order at 6:05 and reviewed the agenda.

Mr. King reported that the four landmark petitions were received too late to advertise as public hearings and recommended that the Commission acknowledge their receipt and schedule hearings for their consideration for January 5. These were **L-122: 101 Rogers St., Foundry Building; L-123: 207 Cambridge St. and L-124: 227 Cambridge St.; and L-125: 1-7 JFK St., Abbott Building.** Mr. Irving so moved. Dr. Solet seconded, and the motion passed with no further discussion by a vote of 5-0 (Ms. Harrington not yet having arrived).

Mr. King reported the receipt of a survey report from M.I.T. in furtherance of the protocol that was entered into between the Commission and the Institute about a year ago. He recommended that the Commission acknowledge the receipt of the completed report and invite the M.I.T. planning office to deliver their summary at the January 5 meeting. Mr. Irving so moved. Dr. Solet seconded, and the motion passed with no further discussion by a vote of 5-0.

Mr. King described the consent agenda procedure. He asked if there were cases that could be approved without a full discussion. Dr. Solet asked for a hearing on Cases 3708 and 3714. Hearing no objections to placing the following cases on the consent agenda, Mr. King asked for a motion.

Case 3707: 1734 Massachusetts Ave., by Linnaean Corp. Install new window.

Case 3709: 42 Brattle St., by Cambridge Center for Adult Educ. Replace front door.

Mr. Sheffield moved to approve the cases per the consent agenda procedure, delegating approval of construction details to staff. Mr. Crocker seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

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 reported that the case was first heard in September and was continued to October. It was continued again and the applicants had returned with a revised design based on feedback given at the previous hearings. He showed slides and described the three buildings on the site. He showed an image of how the Abbott Building, 1-7 JFK Street, originally looked with windows that extended closer to the sidewalk level. He reported that Richard J. Shaw, the architect who designed the Corcoran's store in 1948, was a Harvard architecture graduate of 1912 and had received the prestigious Harleston Parker Medal four times—for three churches and for the Hatch Memorial Shell on the Esplanade in Boston. Because the

Corcoran's Building (9-11 JFK Street) had formerly been a stable, it was no doubt a difficult design problem to make it a friendly retail environment. Because the applicants' revised design included demolishing Corcoran's, the Commission should take into consideration the architectural history of the building. The third building, 18-20 Brattle Street, had burned down and been rebuilt in 1922 to a design by Newhall & Blevins. He noted that the existing Tess storefront design in this building was used as an example in the district of a creative contemporary architectural storefront design.

[Ms. Harrington arrived]. Mr. King reviewed the hearing procedures and said that public comment would be limited to three minutes per speaker.

James Rafferty, attorney for the owner, introduced his client William Brown of Equity One and architect Mark Eclipse of Prellwitz Chilinski Associates (PCA). He noted that the presentation of the first design proposal was part of the record from September.

Mr. Brown said they had listened to the concerns and comments at the past two meetings. Clear that the glass addition was too modern and not desired. So they went back to the drawing board for the Corcoran's Building and now proposed a new infill building. He emphasized that every business would have an exterior entry and presence, unlike a mall. The cornice of the top floor had been raised and the ridge lowered to minimize shadows.

Mr. Eclipse presented slides. He showed Harvard Square context, noting other brick buildings with a different base material. The aim for the infill building was to be both contextual and modern. The top floor was pushed back off the Abbott Building. The mechanical area was moved over and would be less visible. The skylight had been eliminated. The corner store of the Abbott Building would have 1100 square feet of retail space on the ground floor as well as serving as the entry point for the second floor retail space. The corner of the top floor had been pulled back away from Brattle Square. The height of the top floor would be 17' above the roof plane of the Abbott Building (lowered from 24' in the initial design). He showed new renderings from several vantage points. The new infill building was separated from the historic buildings by recessed connecting slots. The cornice was a modern interpretation of a sun shade. The first floor would have zinc panels and brick cladding above. The retail spaces were rendered, though the exact number of stores was not yet known. He said they had responded to comments requesting that the three buildings each be distinct in their design. He explained the shadow studies pointing out existing and new shadows at different times of the year. Mr. Rafferty added that the decision to demolish the Corcoran's Building wasn't arrived at casually; they had studied different options for keeping it.

Mr. King asked about the interior floor levels. Mr. Brown said 18-20 Brattle's floors would be unchanged. The Abbott Building and the infill building would have contiguous floor levels.

Dr. Solet asked about the floor-to-floor heights. Mr. Brown estimated that the ground floor would be 17', the second floor 22', the third floor 12' and the fourth floor 16'.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the applicant would retain the Tess storefront. Mr. Brown said that the

drawings showed it staying and they would market it that way, but he was unsure if a future tenant would want to redesign it. Mr. Sheffield asked about the brick material of the infill building. Mr. Brown said there would be different bricks on each building, but it would probably be more like the brick of the Abbott Building. Mr. Sheffield asked about the 16' height of the top floor. Mr. Brown said that was at the peak, tapering down to 14' at the cornice. That was the height needed for an interior clear height of 10-11'. It had been lowered from 24' to 16'.

Mr. King opened the floor to questions of fact from the public.

Brad Bellows 87 Howard Street asked about the oblique shape of the top floor and if it would appear to be on the Abbott Building from some angles. Mr. Eclipse said it was a true elevation depiction.

James Williamson of 1700 Jackson Place asked if the studies that kept the Corcoran's Building had the same top floor. Mr. Brown replied affirmatively. Only the preferred design was presented to avoid design by committee and for clarity of what was proposed. Mr. Williamson asked about the rationale for the top floor. Mr. Brown answered that a wide mix of spaces were desired for the development.

Susan Miller Havens of 221 Mt. Auburn Street asked if a nighttime light study had been prepared. Mr. Brown said it had not because the glass addition had been replaced by a punched window design. It could be provided when the program for the top floor was settled.

Michael Brandon of 27 Seven Pines Avenue asked if the applicant would be required to return if the storefront designs changed. Mr. King agreed that the Commission could place conditions on an approval. Mr. Brandon asked about the rooftop patio on the Abbott Building. What were the areas rendered as green? Mr. Eclipse answered that they were green roofs for rain water management. Plantings hold water and let it filter slowly into the storm system. The green roof areas would not be accessible. Mr. Brandon asked about the banners, would they be branding signs? Mr. King said any signs that did not conform to zoning regulations would have to come to the Historical Commission for approval. Mr. Brandon asked about awnings. Mr. Brown said they might be of that style, but not of the color in the rendering.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place asked why the Abbott Building's existing office entry on JFK Street would not be used for access to the second floor retail. Mr. Brown replied that was a less advantageous entry. Prof. Blier asked about the economics of the chosen plan. Why eliminate the corner retail space? Mr. Brown said the corner entry would have two levels of retail providing value to that tenant space. Prof. Blier asked if the restoration of the Abbott Building storefront would return the now missing pedestals on either side of the columns. The contrasting colors of the materials ~~was~~were important for clarity. Mr. King said the question to the Commission was whether the proposed changes were appropriate. Prof. Blier said those changes would not be allowed if the building was a landmark or in a historic district. Mr. Sullivan said that was not correct. With a landmark or historic district or NCD, changes can be approved if determined to be appropriate. No designation would freeze a building to a particular point

in time. Prof. Blier asked if there were any buildings more significant than the Abbott Building. Mr. Sullivan said the Abbott Building was one of many important buildings in Harvard Square. Prof. Blier asked for a night view and a rendering with people on the roof patio. Mr. King asked if there would be railings, walls, or parapets. Mr. Brown answered that there would be a somewhat transparent railing.

Heather Hoffman of 213 Hurley Street asked if the demolition changed the number of permits needed. Mr. Sullivan said the proposal still needed a Certificate of Appropriateness. Demolition delay review only applied outside of a district. The project would also need a Planning Board special permit.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked about the slots around the infill building. Mr. Eclipse explained that the 8' wide slots were set back from the front face by 4' to help the buildings read as separate masses. They could also be used as points of egress, allowing outswinging doors onto the sidewalk. Ms. Meyer asked the size of the floor plate in the Abbott Building and 18-20 Brattle. Mr. Brown answered they were about 5500 sf and 3600 sf, respectively. Ms. Meyer asked if the pavilion (top) floor could be eliminated if the floor heights in the other buildings were not as high. She asked how the landmark petition would factor into the review process. Mr. King answered that landmark study and possible designation would offer no further protection than the existing NCD review process. Many details still needed to be reviewed by the Commission and other boards. She asked how the proposal related to the City Council order to evaluate the effectiveness of the Harvard Square Conservation District. She referenced the decision to approve what she considered an ugly building at 16-18 Eliot Street. Mr. Sullivan noted that the Commission had an application before it and a regulatory time clock in which to review it. A landmark study, if started, would not put a moratorium on the project. The report to the City Council was in progress. Ms. Meyer asked if the applicant had considered keeping the brick walls at the back of the Abbott Building. She objected to gutting all three buildings. Mr. Brown answered that they would be keeping the corner details including quoins and cornice returns on the Abbott Building, as recommended by staff.

Ian Denhardt of Boston asked how the storefronts would be detailed. Mr. Brown explained that the general organization of storefronts on each building were delineated. Mr. Sullivan said the designs were still at the schematic level and many details remained to be fleshed out including storefronts, materials, signs, etc. If approved as schematics these details would come back to the Commission for approval.

Nancy Gold of Weston said there was no posting of the meeting on the buildings until Monday afternoon. Mr. Sullivan said there were a number of notification methods and requirements. The Commission could deliberate if adequate notice was provided.

Emily Talcott of 3 West Place asked about the design of the west elevation of the pavilion facing the interior of the block. Mr. Eclipse said it would be clad with metal panels. There were no windows except at the corners so there would be no light spill in that direction.

Pebble Gifford of 15 Hilliard Street asked the area of added retail space. Mr. Brown answered that there would be 9500 sf more than existing. The addition was within the allowable FAR. She asked

the distance that the pavilion floor was set back. Mr. Eclipse answered that it was set back 50' from the corner and 10' back from JFK and Brattle streets. Ms. Gifford asked if the 10' setback areas were accessible patio space and he said they were not. She asked the size of the patio. Mr. Brown said it was about 1600 sf. Ms. Gifford commented that use of the patio could be disruptive to the Square's character.

Carole Perrault of 9 Dana Street commented that it was not sustainable design to have tall ceilings and to demolish an old building. She asked if the acquisition of Equity One would change the plans for the building. Mr. Brown said that Equity One was merging with Regency, a family owned company out of Jacksonville, Florida. He said he did not anticipate any changes to the project at this time.

Marie Saccoccio of 55 Otis Street asked if the pavilion would have rooftop lighting. Mr. Brown said he would commit to having no external flood lights and would work to limit light pollution.

Abra Berkowitz of Broadway asked for further explanation of the shadow studies. Mr. Brown said the fourth floor was considerably shortened. The red area in the shadow studies was the new shadow created by the project. The shadows would not reach Palmer Street at all.

John Freniere of 172 Larch Road asked about changes that might result when reviewed by other boards. Mr. Sullivan explained that if the design changed considerably from what the Commission might approve, it would have to come back.

Mr. King closed the question period and asked for public comment.

Pat Curren of 380 Broadway expressed concern about the small businesses being driven out by high rents and displacement during construction. She wanted a real community of retailers, not huge corporate flagships that were empty of life.

Mo Lotman of 41 Hawthorn Street complimented the architect on the design of the exterior. He expressed concern about the interiors and the small businesses that would be pushed out. The same thing happened at the Read Block where the exterior was preserved but the small tenants were kicked out. Now it had Starbucks and CVS.

Ian Denhardt said the project had gotten a huge public response. The notice of the meeting wasn't up on the building for the required time. More people had been at the other hearings.

Kenneth Taylor of 23 Berkeley Street said he thought there had been a good review process. The design had improved but he still had a problem with the massing. There should be a hierarchy, which could be done by setting the facades of the infill building back about 10'. The concession could be to not build out to the limit. He offered the idea that Palmer Street could be extended south for a new pedestrian passageway through the block.

Marilee Meyer said the square was becoming homogenized. The Commission's charge was to preserve and protect significant buildings and it could impose additional dimensional requirements stricter than zoning. The top floor should be pushed further back. The developers did not understand the signifi-

cance and potential of Harvard Square buildings. Much more information was needed. It would be disrespectful to the public to delegate details to the staff.

Suzanne Blier said it was important to pay close attention to historic structures. Demolition would be a huge disruption. The pavilion story was grim. The project would change the whole nature of Harvard Square. She supported the idea of a through-block passageway. Over 5,000 people signed the Curious George Store petition. It would be a shame to lose the store for a fancy staircase.

Brad Bellows thanked the proponents for their response to the design feedback. They showed a good faith effort and the proposal was vastly improved. It was more compatible with the scale of the Square by moving the penthouse back. The façade of the infill building had depth. He opposed the cutting out of the third floor of the Abbott Building to create a double height space. He suggested making the penthouse symmetrical as seen from further back in the Square. As a gray box with punched windows, the penthouse was clunky. He recommended it be more glassy.

City Councilor Jan Devereux asked if the architects had considered making the JFK Street façade of the infill building different from the Brattle Street façade. The JFK façade was very massive in combination with the Abbott Building and the adjacent building to the south. It looked like an ocean liner. She supported the suggestion to set the infill building back. The pavilion looked under-designed. She commented on the ability for adaptive re-use to stabilize neighborhoods. There were no incentives to keep old buildings or discourage demolition, which was a lost opportunity.

James Williamson asked the Commission not to overlook the question about notice. The proposed addition was not appropriately scaled. The large floorplates on the upper floors was driving the design. It was not consistent with the guidelines or what was valued in Harvard Square. He said the design failed because of the pavilion. The grills at the cornice and between floors were inappropriate.

Michael Brandon thanked the Commission for its patience. He commended the petitioner for a greatly improved design. Further improvements could be achieved. The infill building could be recessed more. He encouraged the Commission to ask for more detail and additional renderings of the shop fronts. He suggested the hearing be continued to make sure there was adequate on-site notice.

Carole Perrault said the design was highly incongruous because it did not preserve or enhance the unique functional environment and visual form of the District. It would not preserve a significant structure and its setting. The Commission should resist and restrain environmental influences that are adverse to the purpose of the District. The design was not compatible with the historic setting. The project had not shown that it would mitigate the impact of the development on adjacent properties. The design did not discourage homogeneity.

Pebble Gifford said there were too many banks in the Square. It would be better to have small shops in order to keep it an interesting and funky place.

Mr. King closed the public comment period. He summarized the extensive correspondence.

Ms. Harrington asked what was left of the old stable. Mr. Sullivan answered that the web of framing for the stable was still visible inside the building.

Mr. Sheffield wondered if there any insulation on the roof of the stable. It was a volume that likely wasn't performing up to the energy code.

Dr. Solet asked about the protections granted to storefronts like the Art Nouveau storefront on Mass. Ave. Mr. Sullivan said those four storefronts weren't landmarks, but were specifically called out in the Harvard Square Conservation District order for a different type of storefront review because they retained their original design details. The Abbott Building's storefronts were not called out in that way because they had been altered. Because this was an overall development project and not an individual storefront alteration, the Commission could review all the details and the storefronts in these buildings were not exempt from design review by the Commission in this case.

Mr. Sheffield said the schematic design was an important milestone in the development of a design. One must first get there, then get into further details. If you have a good concept then you know how those details will get carried out. The pavilion (top floor) was still an element of concern but he looked forward to seeing further study on it. Sustainability was important and he hoped the Planning Board would suggest this be one of the first LEED certified project in Harvard Square. Stepping back the slots around the infill building was a good idea. He supported small store sizes.

Mr. Crocker commented that the design was vastly improved. Keeping the funkiness of the Square comes down to having small shops. Big tenants don't do that. He knew Tony Dow well. Mr. Dow had run the property very well for the family trust and would have been pleased to see what was happening as long as it kept ~~keep~~ the Harvard Square feeling of the project.

Mr. Sullivan read from the Harvard Square Conservation District order including the primary and secondary goals of the district, the guidelines for demolition and for alterations and additions.

Dr. Solet said the furthest the Commission could go at this point was an approval in principle. She said she could support, in principle, the demolition of the Corcoran's Building and construction of an infill building, but the details would have to be reviewed at a continued hearing.

Ms. Harrington asked for a summary of the significance of the Corcoran's Building. Mr. Sullivan reviewed the history of the building, which began as a stable in the 1870s or 1880s, was adaptively re-used ca. 1900 for stores, and refaced and remodeled in 1948 for Corcoran's Department Store. It represented a layering of history. He described John McNamee's influence on the buildings, John Corcoran's contributions to the community, and the architect Richard J. Shaw's changes to the building in the Modern period. Mr. Sullivan said the schematic design was of a comparable level of detail to what the Commission sees in demolition review cases, but because this building was in an NCD it would have to come back and get approval for further levels of design development.

Mr. Irving likened the Corcoran's Building to a frame with a few layers of skin on it. What was

important was the subsidiary relationship it had to the Abbott Building, allowing the corner building to stand out on a grander scale. He said he could support demolition of the Corcoran's Building if what replaces it is more respectful to what is around it. The infill building needs to be more modest and recessive. He said the revised design was much better than the initial version.

Mr. Sheffield ~~said~~ asked how many times one could adaptively re-use a building. How much life did it have left? How could it function properly? There was a yield point. At some point you get an end result that would not perform well.

Dr. Solet said she was one of the people who asked for the new construction to speak to the old buildings. But perhaps it had swung too far in that direction and they were too close in scale, creating the cruise ship effect described by Councilor Devereux. The new building needed to have its own life. Mr. Sheffield cautioned that it should not diminish the individuality of the Abbott Building. Mr. Irving said the first design was too recessive (transparent glass) in an attempt to let the Abbott Building be the star, but this design was too strong.

Mr. King said he was prepared to see the Corcoran's Building go if the new building would enhance Harvard Square. The district order encourages innovative and creative storefront design. The existing storefronts at the Corcoran's Building were interesting but not irreplaceable. He commented that the hearing was well attended, but he was troubled by the procedural issue of notice on the building.

Mr. Rafferty said there were three attempts to post the notice. The first posting was taken down.

Ms. Harrington supported the idea to keep the infill building a subsidiary building.

Mr. Irving noted that the double height second floor had an outside expression in the new floor area of the top floor. It pushes the lost square footage to the roof. The pavilion should be smaller, but it could be a delightful space. He said he was not concerned with use of the rooftop patio.

Mr. King asked if the proponents were willing to continue the hearing again. Mr. Rafferty asked for some resolution on the matter of demolition of the Corcoran's Building.

Mr. Sullivan offered guidance on wording and conditions of a motion. Mr. Irving then moved to approve, in principle, the design direction to demolish the Corcoran's Building and to construct a new infill building, subject to distinguishing the massing and materials of the infill and the Abbott Building, reduction of the mass and creation of symmetry for the top floor pavilion, consideration of more detail of storefront arrangements, signs, etc., and to continue the hearing with the added guidance that both street sides of the new infill building do not have to match each other. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 6-0 with no further discussion.

Mr. King called for a short recess. The meeting reconvened at 10:28 P.M.

Case 3708: 126 Mt. Auburn St., by President & Fellows of Harvard College. Install HVAC.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the building, a 1980s replica of 8 Ellery Street which was built over the below-grade parking garage for the University Place condos.

Diane Gray of Harvard Planning and Project Management indicated the proposed location of two condensers to the left of the windows on the east elevation. Alternative locations were studied but all had conflicts. The tenant of the building was the Crimson Summer Academy. The existing equipment was located in the parking garage and did not work properly in that location. Additionally, Harvard did not own the parking garage. The vendor had been asked to supply quiet units.

Dr. Solet said she did not see specifications for the equipment in the submittal. How loud were the units; how close would they be to the building; did they cycle on and off; how much space did they require for air flow; if screened, would the screen have acoustical baffling? She cautioned against putting the units too close to the wall of the building and not to simply screen with a wood fence and no baffling. Ms. Gray answered that they would cycle on and off. Dr. Solet said there was not enough information in the proposal for her to support it. She suggested the location be reconsidered. Ms. Gray indicated that the other locations did not work due to conflicting uses for the space. The units would not work in the garage.

Mr. King asked for questions or comments from the public. There being none, he closed the public comment period. He apologized for the lateness of the hour to the public and applicants.

Dr. Solet moved to continue the hearing, with the consent of the applicant having been indicated. Mr. Irving seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Case 3710: 25 Central Square, by Central Property Management, LLC. Restore masonry and modify front window and door.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the building, originally built by the White Tower hamburger chain. It was constructed in 1932 with glazed bricks, then by 1938 was covered in porcelain enamel panels that were fastened directly into the brick, thereby damaging it. The panels were removed a number of years ago, but the brick still needed restoration. Other condition problems including rust jacking lintels causing horizontal cracks. The proposal was to take the brick down to the level of the lintels and then rebuild it to match.

Hubert Murray of PRA Architects showed samples of the glazed bricks he had found to match. The sign would be replaced and the leaks fixed. He showed a sample goose-neck light fixture, which was the closest match to the original lights that he could find. The stems would be 36" instead of 48" and low energy 19 watt LED bulbs would be used. He described a modification from the original design to use an operable window on the front as in the 1938 design so that it could be used as a pass through for take-out. A 1938 type door was also proposed.

Dr. Solet asked if the take-out window would have a sill. Mr. Murray answered that it would not. There would be a ledge on the inside. She asked about light levels from the new lights. Mr. Murray said a lighting designer was being consulted to prevent light spillage. Mr. Sheffield said the shorter stems would help focus the light on the building but the designer should pay attention to the Kelvin temperature and resulting light color of the LED bulbs.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked if the architect had looked into other manufacturers to match the green bricks. Mr. Murray said the bricks he had found were very, very close.

There being no public comment, Mr. King closed the comment period.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the application as presented, delegating construction details to staff. Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Public Hearing: Demolition Review and Landmark Designation Procedures

Case D-1384 & D-1385 (continued and amended): 207 & 227 Cambridge St., by Mark Lechmere LLC. Application to demolish 207 Cambridge St. and preserve 227 Cambridge St. per amended project plans. Consider whether to initiate a landmark designation study of the preferably preserved buildings.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and said that the new design proposal involved demolition of 207 Cambridge Street and preservation of the bank at 227 Cambridge Street. He noted that at the request of the applicant the demolition delay had been extended several times while the applicant worked with the East Cambridge Planning Team to design a mixed-use project for the site; this was technically the fifth month of the demolition delay period, although much more time had passed since the original hearing in April. Mr. King noted that earlier in the meeting the Commission had voted to acknowledge receipt of landmark petitions for both buildings and to schedule a public hearing for them at the Commission's January 5 meeting. He further noted that the current hearing had already been scheduled to consider whether to initiate landmark studies for the preferably-preserved significant buildings.

James Rafferty, attorney for the applicant, reported that the proponents had worked with the neighborhood to explore alternative schemes. The previous proposal to the Historical Commission kept both buildings but wasn't well received by the neighborhood, which preferred not to have a single retail use. A new architect, Prellwitz Chilinski Associates, was hired and held regular meetings with the owner and a working group of the East Cambridge Planning Team. The current proposal amended the demolition application to only demolish 207. The request to demolish 227 had been withdrawn. The new proposal was for multiple smaller scale retail spaces on the first floor and 46 dwelling units on upper floors and below-grade parking. He cited the project as an example of how the demolition delay process can work to slow things down and afford time for the parties to take another look and find an alternative design. The bank would remain a free-standing building and could be adapted for use as a restaurant. The retail pattern of the street was studied and the design would restore the rhythm of the streetscape. There would be no surface parking. He noted that there would be 15-20% affordable housing units because of the inclusionary zoning requirements, which would fulfill a public interest in affordable housing.

Shanyan Li, an architect at Prellwitz Chilinski Associates, made a presentation of the proposed design and noted the many buildings that had been previously demolished for parking. The setback to abutting properties would be 29'. The program included 46 residential units, 10,000 sf of retail in four spaces, 48 parking spaces and 50 bike parking spaces. The massing was broken up into varying widths,

heights, and colors to fit in with the context of Cambridge Street. The height would drop down on the Gore Street side. A trellis over the garage entrance would provide some green planted space.

Mr. Rafferty explained that a zoning petition would be filed to allow for the retail. The building at 207 Cambridge Street would not be removed until the public zoning and permitting process was secured. He asked that 207 be found not preferably preserved within the context of the revised proposal.

Mr. King asked what was to be located on the ground floor on the Gore Street side. Mr. Rafferty answered that it would be amenity space, not residential units.

Kyle Sheffield asked if the heights along Cambridge Street could be more varied. Ms. Li explained that the floors were contiguous, but the parapet heights could be different to give some diversity to the perceived heights. The cornice treatments were also varied.

Mr. King asked for public comment.

Paul Fiore of 98 Otis Street spoke in favor of the proposal. He noted that a large majority of the Planning Team and community had not been in favor of a CVS store and surface parking at the site. The owner worked hard with the Planning Team to come up with this design.

Marie Elena Saccoccio of 55 Otis Street said she was a legal abutter and board member of the Planning Team but would speak for herself. Not one lifelong resident or abutter had approved of the current plan. The elderly owner of 40 and 40R Gore Street was her client. The subterranean parking garage would be very close to the woman's house. Contrary to prior speakers, she said that a lot of local residents had not been opposed to a CVS store. CVS as a company had adaptively used other historic buildings for their stores. The Planning Team vote included participation of members that had not attended any prior meetings on the subject.

Alan Green of 82 Fifth Street said he was also a board member of the Planning Team but would speak only for himself. He projected several slides of the existing building at 207 Cambridge Street and the previous design that would have preserved both buildings. He said the Planning Team had never voted on that design option. The building at 207 could be preserved and he asked the Commission to start a landmark study for it.

Betty Saccoccio of 55 Otis Street asked that the building at 207 Cambridge Street be a preferably preserved building. The excavation of the site would be very close to the elderly abutter. She was not physically able to be present so she was speaking on her behalf.

Paul Kroner of 69 Thorndike Street said that everyone who was interested had the opportunity to be part of the working group. The group had worked hard to make the project more than a soulless big box store. He asked the Commission to consider the greater good.

Bill Hines of 69 Otis Street spoke in favor of preserving both buildings. He said he was not on the working group but the proposed new building was too big. If they would downsize the building and incorporate 207 Cambridge Street, he would think it would get 100% support from the neighborhood.

Jacob Albert of 136 Fifth Street indicated that he had served on the working group. The project had totally changed from the original CVS proposal. Although he did not usually advocate for demolition he said he would now be willing to part with 207 Cambridge Street for the new project that would benefit the greater good. The design took a forlorn corner and made it an active part of the neighborhood again. It would have a lot of benefits.

A resident of 85 Gore Street said he supported the new design. The existing side of 207 Cambridge was a blank wall and an eyesore. The new project would be an opportunity to shop, dine, and live in the neighborhood. There was not much of the original design left there to preserve.

Heather Hoffman said she had opposed the CVS proposal. The working group made it a much bigger building. It was still too big. The underground parking would be too close to someone's house.

Mr. King closed the comment period.

Ms. Harrington asked if the garage entrance had been considered for Cambridge Street instead of Gore Street. Mr. Rafferty said the Traffic Department had ruled out that option early in the design process. He said he was surprised by Marie Elena Saccoccio's comment in support of the CVS store. Ms. Saccoccio commented that she had emailed the owner about her support and noted that there was an existing curb cut on Cambridge Street.

Dr. Solet noted the lack of larger units (3+ bedrooms) to accommodate families and noted that fewer units would reduce the required parking.

Mr. King observed that the project looked much better and more fully developed. He was sorry that support for the new design was not unanimous. He commended the breaking-up of the mass into the appearance of four buildings. He acknowledged that compromises had been made to preserve the bank. He was prepared to determine that 207 was no longer preferably preserved in the context of the new proposal. Mr. Sullivan suggested maintaining the preferably preserved status, suspending the delay at such time that the zoning and permits were approved for the replacement, and suggested starting a landmark study for the bank building so that details of its restoration and adaptive re-use could be reviewed as the project moves ahead in design development.

Mr. Irving moved to find 207 Cambridge Street not preferably preserved in the context of the proposed design with the condition that the building not be demolished until permissions were obtained for the new project. Mr. Crocker seconded, and the motion passed 5-1. Dr. Solet voted in opposition.

Mr. Irving moved to initiate a landmark designation study for 227 Cambridge Street to ensure that the building would be appropriately renovated. Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Case D-1413: 16 Kennedy Rd., by Jacob Farmer & Jenna Moskowitz. Demolish house (1875).

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the building, a former coachman's house on the Frank A. Kennedy estate. The estate had been divided up into several parcels. He described alterations from the original design, including an addition on the west side, vinyl siding and replacement windows.

Mr. King moved to find the house significant for the reasons in the staff memorandum. Dr. Solet seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Paul Fiore, a principal of Foley Fiore Architects, presented the proposed replacement design. The irregular lot created a limited area for as-of-right construction. They tried to create a house with a traditional form but modern details. The mass was divided into two pieces with a connector. The owners and their neighbors to the north wanted to preserve an open vista to the north of the new house.

Jacob Farmer, an owner, said he did not think the existing building could be preserved. It did not have a full foundation and encroached on the rear lot lines.

Mr. King asked about the proposed standing-seam roof. Mr. Fiore said there were a couple of examples nearby at the Shady Hill School and on Reservoir Street.

Dr. Solet asked why the garage door was placed facing Kennedy Road. Mr. Farmer said the existing parking arrangement required a lot of paving. They wanted to minimize the pavement by positioning the garage near the street. A large tree was another consideration in the decision. Mr. Fiore noted that the trellis would be seen head on, not the garage.

Lennert Braberg of 4 Kennedy Road said he was the owner of the abutting Deck House. He spoke in favor of the demolition application. The new house would have a similar modernity to his own house.

Mr. King closed the public comment period.

Mr. Irving complimented the proponents on the design and moved to find the house not preferably preserved in the context of this replacement and with the direction to staff to convey the Commission's support to the Board of Zoning Appeal. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Case D-1414: 7 R.C. Kelley St., by Kyu Sung Woo. Demolish house (1869).

Ms. Burks showed slides and described the history of the neighborhood and the house. She summarized the staff report and recommendation for finding the workers cottage significant.

Mr. Irving so moved. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Seth Hoffman, an architect at Kyu Sung Woo Architects, presented the design for the proposed replacement building. The home was for Mr. Woo and his wife so that they could comfortably age in place. They currently lived next door. Mr. Hoffman explained that the new house would be somewhat lower than the highest point of the existing house. The lot steps down at the back.

Mr. Irving asked if the existing house was occupied. Mr. Woo replied affirmatively. A previous owner who was an architect had altered the interior of the house and built the steep dormer. Mr. Sheffield asked about the proposed materials. Mr. Woo said there would be wood on the street side with metal cladding on the back and roof. Dr. Solet asked about the eaves and weather issues. Mr. Woo said there was a 3' overhang on the south side, a passive solar strategy. The snow would go down on the north side.

There were no questions or comments from members of the public.

Mr. Sullivan said a rendering would have been helpful. It was difficult to understand the design

with the materials provided. He noted that Mr. Woo was a highly respected architect.

Mr. Irving moved to find the house preferably preserved in the context of the current proposal, but encouraged the applicant to return when the design was further along.

Mr. Woo indicated that his design process was always progressing. He tended to continue to develop a design right up to construction so he would prefer to start the clock than to continue. Mr. Sullivan said it could turn out to be a significant new piece of architecture for Cambridge and encouraged the owner to return with more detail, which might be enough to satisfy the Commission and for them to waive the remainder of the demolition delay.

Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

New Business: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 3714: 3 Church St., by First Parish Cambridge. Install rooftop HVAC units and screen.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the location of the proposed air conditioning units on the roof at the back of the parish house.

Susan Shepherd, a volunteer with the building and grounds committee, said air conditioning was needed for the two new basement tenants. The basement space was used for Youth on Fire and a homeless youth shelter. Because the property was fully built on there were no on-grade locations for the condensers, except near the front doors of the church. They had consulted an engineer about placing the units on the roof at the back with steel beams to support the units. There was an access door for maintenance. The units would be screened with acoustical panels on the Old Burying Ground side of the building. The location, though visible, was far from the street and high up above the ground.

Dr. Solet said she was happy to hear that an acoustical engineer was looking at this because otherwise the office space below would be useless due to noise and vibration. Another abutter had equipment facing the Old Burying Ground that was in violation of the noise ordinance and very unsightly. Ms. Shepherd said she was an industrial hygienist and had the necessary noise measuring equipment.

Mr. King said the proposed location was the best option, given the limitations of the site.

Ms. Harrington moved to approve a Certificate of Hardship, given the lack of other suitable locations, and subject to staff approval of details and the ten day notice procedure. Mr. Irving seconded the motion, which passed 6-0

2 Holyoke Place, Fly Club. Amendment of preservation restriction held by Preservation Massachusetts, Inc. Vote recommendation of action to City Manager and City Council.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the Club had re-written its preservation restriction, held by Preservation Massachusetts, Inc., to include a longer time period and added interior features for protection. The law requires that the City Council vote to approve it and the Law Department had asked for the Historical Commission to make a recommendation to the manager who would forward it to the Council.

Mr. Irving moved to recommend that the City Council approve the preservation restriction. Ms.

Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Minutes

Mr. King recommended that the Commission dispense with the review of the November minutes until the Commission's January meeting.

Mr. Irving moved to adjourn, Mr. Crocker seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 1:33 A.M. on Friday, December 2, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public
Who Signed the Attendance List on December 1, 2016**

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Susan Strang | 60 Fresh Pond Parkway |
| Susan Miller Havens | 221 Mt. Auburn St |
| Laura Donohue | 90 Putnam Ave #1 |
| Carole Perrault | 9 Dana St |
| Nancy Gold | 12 Hubbard Rd, Weston, MA 02493 |
| Howell Jackson | 8 Ash Street Pl |
| Ned VerPlanck | 26 Brattle St |
| Rob Paccione | 137 Mill St, Burlington, MA 01803 |
| Hubert Murray | 204 Erie St |
| Ian Denhardt | 35 Antwerp St, Boston 02135 |
| Diane Gray | 1350 Mass. Ave. |
| Charles O'Brien | 1350 Mass. Ave. |
| Christopher S. Wilson | 177 Erie St #6 |
| Pam Ross | 67 Highland Ave #6 |
| Cathy Koenig | 8 Eliot St |
| Mohamed Khaled Seffo | 25 Central Sq. |
| Jenna Moskowitz | 1 Foster St |
| Jacob Farmer | 1 Foster St |
| John Hawkinson | cambridgeday.com |
| Joshua Fay | Cambridge |
| Alan Greene | 82 Fifth St |
| Heather Hoffman | 213 Hurley St |
| Susan Shepherd | 95 Clifton St |
| Marilee Meyer | 10 Dana Street |
| Jacob Albert | 136 Fifth St |
| Michael Brandon | 27 Seven Pines Ave |
| Paul Kroner | 69 Thorndike St |
| Paul Fiore | 98 Otis/316 Cambridge |
| Lennert Braberg | 4 Kennedy Rd |

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.