

DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

June 3, 2021 – Meeting conducted online via Zoom Webinar (878 4416 9175) - 6:00 P.M.

Members present (online): Bruce Irving, *Chair*; Susannah Tobin, *Vice Chair*; Chandra Harrington, Jo Solet, *Members*; Paula Paris, Kyle Sheffield, *Alternate Members*

Members absent: Joseph Ferrara, Elizabeth Lyster, Caroline Shannon, *Members*; Gavin Kleespies, *Alternate Member*

Staff present (online): Charles Sullivan, *Executive Director*, Sarah Burks, *Preservation Planner*, Eric Hill, *Survey Director*

Public present (online): See attached list.

Due to statewide emergency actions limiting the size of public gatherings in response to COVID-19, this meeting was held online with remote participation and was closed to in-person attendance. The public was able to participate online via the Zoom webinar platform.

With a quorum present, Mr. Irving called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M. He explained the online meeting instructions and public hearing procedures then introduced the commissioners and staff. He designated Ms. Paris and Mr. Sheffield to vote on all matters then explained the Consent Agenda procedure. He asked if there were recommendations for approval per those procedures that would delegate review and approval of details to staff. Mr. Sullivan recommended that Cases 4568, 4571, and 4572 be placed on the Consent Agenda.

Case 4568: 140 Brattle St., by Ben Zander. Replace three windows.

Case 4571: 11 Story St., Unit 1, by Rosemary, LLC. Replace fourteen windows.

Case 4572: 795 Massachusetts Ave., City Hall, by City of Cambridge. Alter basement windows, repair entry stairs, replace dormer windows with louvers, refurbish windows.

Mr. Irving asked if anyone present objected to approval of those items without a full hearing. No one raised their hand in the Zoom meeting indicating they had any objections.

Mr. Sheffield moved to approve Case 4568 per the Consent Agenda procedures. Dr. Solet seconded the motion. There was no discussion on the motion, which passed with a 6-0 roll call vote. (Harrington, Paris, Sheffield, Solet, Tobin, Irving)

Ms. Paris moved to approve Case 4571 per the Consent Agenda procedures. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion. There was no discussion on the motion, which passed with a 6-0 roll call vote. (Harrington, Paris, Sheffield, Solet, Tobin, Irving)

Dr. Solet moved to approve Case 4572 per the Consent Agenda procedures. Ms. Paris seconded the motion. There was no discussion on the motion, which passed with a 6-0 roll call vote. (Harrington, Paris, Sheffield, Solet, Tobin, Irving)

Mr. Sullivan explained that the staff would be in touch with the applicants if they had questions about details of those cases prior to issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness.

DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION

Public Hearings: Neighborhood Conservation District Designation Proceedings

University Park and Bay State neighborhoods. Multiple owners. Consider petition of registered voters requesting that the Commission initiate a NCD study for the neighborhood “bordered by Vassal Lane, Walden St., Bay State Rd. Includes Concord Ave. to Bay State, Walden St. to Vassal to Garden St. Fayerweather from Walden to Field to Bay State.”

Mr. Sullivan summarized the staff report about the matter. A petition of 13 registered voters had been received requesting that the Commission initiate a neighborhood conservation district (NCD) study process for the streets on either side of Concord Avenue, from Walden Street to Bay State Road. He shared his screen and showed slides of the area identified in the petition. He said a counter petition had subsequently been circulated and signed by over 100 residents who objected to initiation of a study process. He described the enabling ordinance and the process for studying and establishing a new NCD. He presented a brief history of this part of Cambridge near Fresh Pond on land formerly used for clay extraction by the Bay State Brick Co. After the land had gone into disuse by the brick company the wet open pits contributed to outbreaks of malaria in the city and the lands were filled to improve public safety. Subdivisions were platted in the 1890s and 1910s, but development of the lots was slow until after World War I. He noted that four of the petitioners had since removed their names, but that it was a valid petition when advertised for a hearing.

Wesley Taylor of 337 Walden Street, the lead petitioner, explained that after the recent demolition proposal of 204-206 Fayerweather Street a group of neighbors discussed ways in which to discourage developers from clearing sites in the neighborhood and redeveloping in ways not sympathetic to the historic architecture and development patterns of the area. He noted that after the petition was submitted a lot of misinformation was circulated to residents of the neighborhood. He said he was willing to go with the majority of people in the neighborhood who did not seem to want a study, but he believed there were misunderstandings about what would be allowed or disallowed during such a study.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there had been a petition from this neighborhood before. Mr. Sullivan replied there had not.

Dr. Solet asked if the petition included categories of review proposed for the interim protection period of one year. Mr. Sullivan answered that there were no suggested review criteria in the petition, but if the Commission were to initiate the study it could decide on those interim review criteria.

Ms. Harrington asked if NCDs recognized not just architectural history but also the social history of the city. Mr. Sullivan answered that social history would contribute to the significance of a neighborhood, but the jurisdiction of a district commission was limited to exterior architectural features visible from a public way.

Ms. Paris asked for a description of what an NCDs would regulate and what would be exempt. Mr. Sullivan explained the difference between NCDs and Ch. 40C historic districts. The proposed juris-

DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION

diction of an NCD would be determined during the study process. More exemptions were possible in an NCD than in a historic district. NCDs promote conservation while historic districts promote preservation, just as National Forests are managed for “wise use” while National Parks are highly restrictive.

Dr. Solet noted that special architectural qualities or features could reflect a neighborhood’s cultural and social history.

Mr. Irving asked if members of the public had questions of fact.

Mel Downs of 360 Concord Avenue noted that his elderly mother still lived in the neighborhood and would often refer to houses not by address but by who lived there for a long time. He asked about review of demolition in an NCD and noted that new construction could be more bulky and less detailed.

Martin Benoit of 17 Copley Street asked if the maximum review criteria must be used during a study (everything but color). Mr. Sullivan said that was not the case. The Commission could choose the review criteria to be used during a study. He said staff would recommend using Mid Cambridge or Half Crown-Marsh review criteria if the Commission decides to accept the petition.

Taylor Hayward of 391 Concord Avenue asked how permits are reviewed during a study. He also asked about the experiences of residents of existing districts. Mr. Sullivan explained the staff review all permit applications to determine if an application would require a hearing or if it could be approved by staff administratively. Most permit reviews could be approved within a day or two. Interior work and ordinary maintenance were always exempt. He also noted that several district studies had not resulted in designation and not every petition for a study had been accepted. Only neighborhoods that could show a broad public support for district designation would get accepted by the City Council.

Jessie English of 27 Cpl. Burns Road asked about district boundaries. His street did not fit the description given of typical two-family homes. Mr. Sullivan answered that the boundaries could be made smaller but not larger once a study was begun.

Ben Wakelin of 388 Walden Street asked how district review differed from demolition review of buildings over 50 years old. Mr. Sullivan described the differences; certificates of appropriateness would be required for new construction in a district; demolition review could only delay, not prevent demolition.

Jennifer Nashel of 200 Fayerweather Street asked why another layer of protection was wanted.

Mr. Taylor clarified that the petition wasn’t directed at the 204-206 Fayerweather Street project, but the idea had emerged as that project was being discussed in the neighborhood. The petitioners wanted to conserve the neighborhood, not that particular property.

Charlie Liu of 159 Chilton Street said he lived in a modern house. Was there a city ordinance against modern architecture in the neighborhood?

Mr. Sullivan said there was not. When new construction is approved in an NCD a district commission often prefers that it be designed in a contemporary design rather than a faux historic style.

DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked if a walking tour could be organized before initiating a study. Mr. Sullivan said that was possible.

Nadia Khatchadourian of 17 Copley Street asked about review time and cost. Mr. Sullivan said if a hearing was required it must occur within 45 days. Design costs weren't always higher than to get a building permit but if there were added costs it was balanced with the public benefits of having a district.

Christopher Schmidt asked about jurisdiction over size and other dimensional aspects of a design. How many properties were below zoning allowances now? Mr. Sullivan noted that requirements could be imposed that were more restrictive than zoning. As to the second question, the study area was mostly Residential B, which was fairly restrictive. That question would be addressed if a study was initiated.

Mr. Irving opened the public comment period.

Jodie Siegel of 21 Alpine Street said her block wasn't built until the late 1940s and should be excluded. She noted there might be a false expectation that a district would prevent developers from flipping properties.

TienYi Lee of 4 Ivy Street said she was opposed to the study and was upset that it had come about because of reaction to one project and not because a larger number of neighbors wanted it.

Mr. English said he was against the study because it put an undue burden on homeowners. There were now fewer than ten petitioners. His experience getting permission to put in a driveway was expensive and burdensome.

Keya Dannenbaum of 93 Alpine Street thanked the Commission for its presentation. She did not think an NCD was the right approach for the neighborhood. It would be burdensome on owners and have collateral effects on renters. There were other ways that the history of the neighborhood could be documented.

Tom Dannenbaum of 93 Alpine Street said NCD guidelines encourage applicants to bring expensive consultants and professionals into the process. He opposed a district study.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place said her research indicated that districts had a neutral effect on property values. She lived in the Half Crown-Marsh NCD and found the meetings were often a way for neighbors to come together and build community.

Mr. Downes said that when people had lived in the same neighborhood for most of their lives it was natural for them to want to have the opportunity to share their thoughts on changes to the area.

Marie Saccoccio of 55 Otis Street suggested tabling the matter and allowing time for neighborhood meetings to discuss the details of a study process and the desires of the neighborhood. She said the neighborhood was worthy of designation as a district.

David Miller of 4 Ivy Street spoke in opposition to a study. It would make it more challenging for owners to do maintenance on their homes.

DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION

Mr. Benoit opposed a study. The existing situation was working fine. Only four demolition requests had been made in ten years. The neighborhood had middle class housing affordable for families. Historic preservation would make the cost of repairs prohibitive. It would add cost and more hurdles.

Nancy Beams of 2 Ivy Street said she opposed a study. She was already able to work cooperatively with her neighbors.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period and turned to the commission for deliberation.

Dr. Solet said she enjoyed the plentitude of free advice from architectural and preservation experts that came with living in a historic district. She wondered if residents were underestimating the threat of new development in the neighborhood. Going before a district commission shouldn't be considered a burden. Specialty contractors weren't usually needed.

Ms. Harrington said she was torn. She would like the neighborhood's architectural and social history recognized but the petition touched on issues that could not be addressed by an NCD such as gentrification and long term residents being pushed out by rising costs. She said she had participated on an NCD study committee and found it very enjoyable.

Mr. Sullivan recommended the Commission decline to accept the petition. It was untimely in the sense that time had not been taken to build community understanding and support. The interim protections seemed disproportionate to the current development threats facing the neighborhood. He also noted that staff and commissioner resources were already stretched due to another study under way in East Cambridge and other projects that staff were supporting.

Mr. Sheffield moved that the Commission decline to accept the petition to initiate a study. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion. The motion passed 3 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions. (Sheffield, Tobin, Irving voted in favor; Solet opposed; Harrington and Paris abstained)

Mr. Irving called a recess at 8:05 and brought the meeting back to order at 8:12 P.M.

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 4570: 159 Charles St., by BREML Partners, LLC. Full renovation of rear house; raise roof; add dormers; alter fenestration; add balcony over covered entry.

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen, showed slides of the property.

Survey Director Eric Hill described the history and architecture of 155 Charles Street, which was located at the rear of 159 Charles Street. Both buildings were on one lot and had one owner. The house has a raised brick basement and was located very close to the side and rear lot lines.

Bryan McLaughlin, the applicant, said his family had grown since buying the house. The proposed changes would create bedrooms in the back and a play yard behind the front house.

Stephen Hiserodt of Boyes Watson Architects shared his screen and pointed out the back house was very close to two abutting buildings. It was a very dense neighborhood with most properties having an FAR of about 1.25. The proposed dormer addition would result in less than a 1% FAR increase. The

DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION

project would also include closing an area under the front porch and expanding the basement living space. New windows could only be located on the front elevation due to zoning and building code restrictions.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Dr. Solet asked if the windows would be triple-paned for noise reduction. Mr. Hiserodt answered that the windows would be double paned with good noise reduction.

Ms. Harrington asked about the rear house's relationship to the front house. Mr. McLaughlin said the front building had two units and the back unit had one.

Mr. Hill noted that the rear house was only minimally visible from the public way and did not retain its original architectural integrity. The proposed alterations would not have a negative impact on the property or the streetscape.

Ms. Harrington moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as proposed for the reasons stated by staff. Ms. Paris seconded the motion, which passed without further discussion 6-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Paris, Sheffield, Solet, Tobin, Irving)

Case 4573: 36 JFK St, 81 Mt. Auburn St., 33 Dunster St., by Trinity Realty I, LLC. Demolish The Garage Building, except for 2-story facades of the 1860s stable building at corner of Mt. Auburn and Dunster streets. Construct a new 6-story above grade mixed use building.

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and showed slides of the three buildings that make up The Garage property. He reviewed the history of the buildings and discussed their significance.

James Rafferty, attorney for the applicant, agreed it was a complex and interesting history. Many people could recall the 1970s transformation of the buildings into a retail mall known as The Garage. He noted that the mall had been started by the previous owner and sold to John DiGiovanni's father. Interior changes had been made over the years in order to maintain retail vitality but the whole interior urban mall concept had lost favor in recent years. Accessibility within the building was very limited due to the changes in grade around the site, different building floor levels, and a complex construction history. The proposed project would also be reviewed by the Planning Board as a major project special permit application. As with the Abbot block, the Commission may want to review the project at the schematic level and then let the Harvard Square Advisory Committee and Planning Board take a turn before a final review.

John Di Giovanni of Trinity Properties said his family had owned, managed, and maintained the buildings for forty years. It had been a much-loved property in Harvard Square. The 1980s through the 2000s were highly successful years, but then it began to disengage from the life of the Square. They had been studying it carefully and were pleased to present a proposal for the redevelopment of the site.

Jason Jewhurst of Bruner/Cott Architects shared his screen and described the location, the main street facades, and the overall dimensions. The building had always provided services to occupants of the Square from horse stables to a parking garage to retail establishments. There was no visual connection between the outside and the interior shops. It was not handicapped accessible. The plan was hard to navi-

DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION

gate and odd spaces were difficult to use. The ramps and multiple levels made the buildings difficult to renovate. Though the entrances to two stores at the street level were accessible, the main entrances to the mall were not. He reviewed the Harvard Square Conservation District goals and described how they would be met by the new proposal for a mixed-use retail and office building. He displayed the proposed plans and elevations. The height would be from 56 to 80 feet. He described bricked-up openings on Dunster Street that would be re-opened and the restoration of the original gable of the stable building. He noted that four terraces would help break up the mass and provide usable outdoor spaces for office tenants. He described the proposed materials and shared images on the screen. The building would fill the site to the property lines on all sides. The first floor and some basement space would be for retail use and floors 2-6 would be business use. He displayed the sun and shadow diagrams of the proposed building. Lighting concepts were being planned for future review.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the proponents had considered demolition of the corner stable building. Mr. Jewhurst replied that they did not consider complete demolition but had studied various options. There was still plenty of detail remaining on the building facades that told a story they didn't want to lose. Mr. Sheffield asked about the setbacks. Mr. Jewhurst said the character of each street was different and they had decided on the scale they thought was appropriate to each street. Zoning requires setbacks in height. Density was appropriate on Dunster Street where the experience of the building is at the street level. Several massing models were tested. Mr. Jewhurst said preservation of the stable was consistent with sustainability goals and the embodied carbon it represented.

Mr. DiGiovanni said the district guidelines encouraged the preservation of significant buildings such as the stable. The terraces would bring a human scale to the building. The site and the Square needed increased density to support the retail businesses.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the corner view of Dunster Street and the alley. Mr. Jewhurst said the materials would continue around the corner.

Dr. Solet asked about the mechanical screening at the top of the building. Would that be a visual screen only or would it also provide acoustical benefits? Mr. Jewhurst replied that they hadn't gotten to that level of detail yet. Dr. Solet asked about the duration of the construction. Mr. DiGiovanni answered that it was estimated to take 18-24 months. Having site access on three sides would be beneficial.

Mr. Irving asked for questions of fact from the public.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place asked if there would be retail on other levels or only the first floor. Mr. DiGiovanni said he wasn't sure, but he hoped to have an entertainment venue in the lower level. Mr. Williamson asked why six stories was warranted. Mr. DiGiovanni said density and human traffic was needed to support the retail and restaurants in the Square. The building was also adjacent to the ten-story Smith Center. The terraces would be leased to office tenants.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place said she appreciated the thorough presentation and agreed it was time to rethink The Garage. She asked if it would go to the Advisory Committee. Mr. Rafferty replied in the affirmative. Ms. Blier asked if they had considered a more contemporary style for the floors above the stable. The brick and terracotta might visually compete with each other. Mr. Jewhurst said it was a good question. The materials could be in conversation with each other, but the upper floors would read as decidedly new. Ms. Blier said they should also consider material qualities such as sheen and reflectivity. She said she would love to see space in the lower level that would be available for community .

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked if the lighting would be embedded in the wall material (as at 10 Church Street) or would it be light cast onto the building? Mr. Jewhurst said they had thought about the quality and amount of lighting but had not selected fixtures yet. Ms. Meyer asked how deep were the retail bays? Would the arches be entrances or windows? Would there be recessed glazing to allow for shadow detail? Would the gable of the stable be proud of the new building? Mr. Jewhurst said the glazing would be recessed and the gable would be slightly proud of the walls above it. Ms. Meyer said she appreciated the step-backs so each side had a unique streetscape elevation.

Mr. Irving asked for public comment.

Catherine Turco of 93 Winthrop Street said she supported the application and agreed that more density was needed to support street-level businesses. The proposal reflected a thoughtful design process.

Ms. Meyer said materials quality should be considered both in the daylight and nighttime. The windows were set close together; it would be good to have wider separation. Overall, it would be a good contribution to the Square.

Mr. Williamson said he did not support the application. It was too large. The stable façade got lost with everything else going on. It did not look like a successful preservation project. He said he did not agree that the Square needed more density. Why could the most successful business in the Square not make it in this location?

Mark Hruby, representing the Signet Society at 46 Dunster Street, expressed concern about the wind effects of the tall building along Dunster Street, a major pedestrian thoroughfare for Harvard students that was already very windy. What kind of construction mitigation would there be at Dunster and Mount Auburn to ensure pedestrian safety? Mr. DiGiovanni offered to meet with Mr. Hruby to understand and respond to his concerns.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Kyle Sheffield questioned the further adaptive re-use of the stable building. It might have outlived its usability and demolition should be considered. The street activity designed for JFK Street could continue onto Dunster Street. The materials were interesting and he would like to see more information about the terracotta panels. The terraces could activate the volumes of the building. The palette was mut-

DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION

ed. He liked the chamfered relief of the windows. What was the comparison of existing retail space to that proposed? How would the design elevate the retail environment? Mr. Irving noted that the last two questions were outside the Commission's scope.

Mr. DiGiovanni said he hoped there would be an entertainment venue in the basement, where the height would be 18 feet. The total number of first-floor retail spaces would be about the same.

Mr. Sullivan said the project checked a lot of boxes in the Harvard Square Conservation District goals. The stable building was worthy of a unique solution, even though it was only the facades that remain now and that would be reused. It represented the first streetcar line in the northeast United States (1854) which led to Harvard Square becoming an important transportation hub in the region. He said he considered preservation of the stable to be a high priority. The Garage complex as an urban mall was not without its own significance from the standpoint of urban planning history but if it could not be successfully renovated as a whole, then at least some part of it could be preserved. He recommended that the application be approved in principle as a signal that the project was moving in the appropriate direction. The Planning Board had expertise in design review of contemporary buildings. If the Commission was ready to give the project provisional approval, it could require that the design come back at a later stage after the Planning Board had reviewed it.

Mr. Sheffield questioned how this approach differed from the Commission's review of the Abbot block. Mr. Sullivan said this design had much more public support at the outset, while the Abbot block design changed significantly after the initial hearings.

Dr. Solet asked about zoning compliance. Mr. Rafferty answered that 80-foot height and higher density was allowed with a special permit from the Planning Board. An approval in principle would acknowledge that the proposed demolition and restoration aspects of the application were appropriate.

Ms. Harrington moved to approve the application in principle on the condition that the applicants return to the Commission after the Planning Board review to request final approval of a certificate of appropriateness, and that the applicant consult further with staff about the masonry restoration of the stable. Dr. Solet seconded the motion, which passed 6-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Paris, Sheffield, Solet, Tobin, Irving)

Preservation Grants

Case IPG 20-5: 137 Allston St., by St. Augustine's A. O. Church. \$15,000 for supplemental grant to provide matching funds.

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and showed slides of the building. He explained that the church was asking for a supplemental grant to help meet the matching requirements of a grant offered by the Massachusetts Cultural Commission. The money would still be used for building restoration and possibly accessibility improvements.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the \$15,000 supplemental grant. Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion.

DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION

The motion passed 6-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Paris, Sheffield, Solet, Tobin, Irving)

Case PG 21-6: 171-173 Columbia St., by Just-A-Start. \$90,000 for exterior restoration and window replacement.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the fire-damaged building. It needed to be gutted and stripped. Just-A-Start had requested \$90,000 for the exterior restoration. The applicant proposed a European style casement window that, when closed, replicated the pattern of a double-hung window with a 2-over-2 muntin pattern and a thicker meeting rail. The casements provided higher efficiency and seemed to be the trend for rehab projects these days. He had seen a sample recently and was not opposed to its use here.

Ms. Paris asked if Just-A-Start had owned the building for a while. Mr. Sullivan replied that they had. The Commission had given the building a grant about fifteen years ago. Ms. Paris asked about the fire and the framing of the building. Mr. Sullivan said the fire was limited to the top floor but smoke and water damage was throughout the building. Ms. Paris moved to approve the grant of \$90,000. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion.

Dr. Solet asked if the Commission had jurisdiction about how far the windows would open for safety and egress. Mr. Sullivan said they would comply to safety requirements of the building code. Mr. Irving noted that such code issues were outside the Commission's jurisdiction. The motion passed 6-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Paris, Sheffield, Solet, Tobin, Irving)

Mr. Irving explained that he had brought up the Commission's jurisdiction several times during the meeting to provide clarity for the Commission and the public on what matters are subject to Commission approval and what was beyond its scope. He had been asked four times since returning to town about what the Commission does and does not review, which meant there was quite a bit of confusion among the public. He also wanted to respect everyone's time by not veering off into side topics of interest but not subject to jurisdiction. All those detours added up to longer meetings.

Mr. Sheffield moved to adjourn. Ms. Paris seconded the motion, which passed 6-0 in a roll call vote.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public
Present on the Zoom Webinar online, June 3, 2021**

Stephanie Harper	
Jason Jewhurst	Bruner / Cott Architects
Allison Crosbie	831 Mass Ave
Bryan McLaughlin	155-159 Charles St
Steve Hiserodt	Boyes Watson Architects
Jim Rafferty	907 Mass Ave
Larry Evans	
John DiGiovanni	50 Church St
Jeff Davis	
Wesley L. Taylor	337 Walden St
Brendon Roy	795 Mass Ave
Rich Earthrowl	11 Story St
Karen Greene	
<hr/>	
Michael Haroz	186 Fayerweather St
John Logiudice	24 Oakland St
Davin Shi	14 Plympton St
Julie Taylor	61 Granville Rd
Christopher Schmidt	17 Laurel St
Bill Dines	69 Otis St
Jason Alves	544 Cambridge St
Zachariah	7 Jasper St
Hugh Russell	1 Corliss Pl
Loren Crowe	8 Museum Way #508
Jennifer Hou	14 Dana St
Marc Levy	3 Potter Park #1
Nathan Wong	1188 Centre St
Patrick Magee	877 Cambridge St
Mary Ellen Doran	48 Spring St
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Pl, Jefferson Park
Catherine Turco	93 Winthrop St
Heather Hoffman	213 Hurley St
Jennifer Nashel	200 Fayerweather St
Betty Saccoccio	55 Otis St
Katire Mazer	214 Garden St
Robert Cunningham	101 Dean St
Eleni Macrakis	280 Franklin St
Alison Field-Juma	363 Concord Ave
Martin Benoit	17 Copley St
Riley Greenstein	41 Litchfield St, Brighton, MA 02135
George Gard	225 Friend St suite 7

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED
OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

LeeAnn Suen	24 Washington Terr #1, Somerville MA 02143
Jodie Siegel	21 Alpine St
Taylor Hayward	391 Concord Ave
Susan Bowers	50 Church Street, 5th Fl.
Maggie Currier	207 Lake View Ave
Jessie English	27 Corporal Burns Rd
Tom DiGiovanni	539 Flume Street, Chico CA 95928
Nadia Khatchadourian	17 Copley St #3
Suzanne Blier	5 Fuller Pl
Nancy Beams	2 Ivy St
Sandi	50 Church St
David Miller	4 Ivy St
TienYi Lee	4 Ivy St
Philip Wellons	651 Green St
Ben Wakelin	388 Walden St
Home Wolfson	280 Franklin St
Tamra	155 Chilton St
Melissa Russo	155 Fayerweather St
Ethan Poh	1440 Beacon St
Janet Domenitz	22 Alpine St
Patty Nolan	City Council, 795 Mass. Ave.
Melvin Downes	360 Concord Ave
Michael Brandon	27 Seven Pines Ave.
John Hawkinson	CambridgeDay.com
George Goverman	1643 Cambridge St 51
David Chilinski	391 Concord Ave # 1
Janet Shur	188 Fayerweather St
Keya Dannenbaum	93 Alpine St
Matt Hayes	17 Ellsworth Ave
Phil Cunningham	101 Dean St Belmont MA 02478
Marie Elena Saccoccio	55 Otis St
Tom Dannenbaum	93 Alpine St
Patrice Liu	159 Chilton St
Shweta Gadgil	Field St
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana St, 404
Mark Hruby	46 Dunster St
Philip	93 Winthrop St, Unit 7
Wendy Covell	405 Walden St
Jason Forney	545 Summer St Arlington
Rima Abousleiman	225 Friend St, Suite 701

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.