

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

August 5, 2021 – Meeting conducted online via Zoom Webinar (835 4253 4269) - 6:00 P.M.

Members present (online): Bruce Irving, *Chair*; Chandra Harrington, Liz Lyster, Caroline Shannon, Jo Solet, *Members*; Gavin Kleespies, Kyle Sheffield, *Alternate Members*

Members absent: Susannah Tobin, *Vice Chair*; Joseph Ferrara, *Member*; Paula Paris, *Alternate Member*

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

Public present (online): See attached list.

This meeting was held online with remote participation and was closed to in-person attendance, consistent with the provisions set forth in the Act Extending Certain COVID-19 Measures Adopted During the State of Emergency, which was signed into law on June 16, 2021. The public was able to participate online via the Zoom webinar platform.

Technical difficulties caused a delayed start to the meeting. With a quorum present, Mr. Irving called the meeting to order at 6:15 P.M. He explained the online meeting instructions and public hearing procedures, then introduced the commissioners and staff. He designated alternates Kleespies and Sheffield to vote on all matters. He then dispensed with the Consent Agenda procedure. He reported that the applicants for **Case 4631: 613-629 Cambridge Street** had requested a continuance to September 2. Ms. Shannon moved to approve the continuance. Mr. Kleespies seconded. The motion passed 7-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Shannon, Solet, Kleespies, Irving, Sheffield, and Lyster)

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 4629: 88 Garden St., by Clayton Vance 88 LLC. Modify fencing and paving, add condenser and basement stair, enlarge window wells, construct rear addition, repair and modify easement-protected interior rooms.

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and described the history of the house designed by Ithiel Town in 1810 for Asa Gray, director of the Harvard Botanical Garden. It had been listed as a National Historic Landmark since 1966 and subject to a preservation restriction donated in 2000. The restriction included some interior features including the finishes in three front rooms and stair hall.

James Rafferty, attorney for the applicants, introduced his clients Rob Ketterson and Kristin Hill and their architect, Catherine Truman. Mr. Rafferty noted that the restriction allows for ordinary maintenance and said the proposed maintenance would not affect the character defining features of the home.

Ms. Truman shared her screen and described the front rooms and the proposed changes to the house including a new stair to the basement under the front hall stairs, new radiators, painting, repair and maintenance of the wood floors, insulation and new plaster of the ceilings. She described proposed changes in the study including removal of a late twentieth-century television wall at the bottom of the winding stairs, reworking of the stairs, and enclosure behind a new TV wall. She noted that the stair was currently open at the top to the main bedroom. She described the condition of the wood floors as splintered and water damaged with old patches and raised nail heads. She proposed replacing the floors

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

throughout with a comparable antique flooring. She showed exterior elevations and floor plans that included enlarged window wells, a new condenser and exterior basement stair, reworking of the rear garden as well as an addition and covered path from the driveway to the back entry.

Mr. Ketterson clarified that they proposed to repair the existing floors, not install all new floors throughout. They intended to source like kind material.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there were any alterations proposed to the second-floor stair hall, which was also protected by the restriction. Ms. Truman answered in the negative.

Ms. Harrington asked questions about the details of the alterations in the study.

Ms. Lyster asked about the existing rear landscape design. Mr. Sullivan said it had been landscaped in 2012 by the previous owners.

Dr. Solet recommended a continuous handrail on the winding stair and possibly a second, lower handrail for the children to improve its safety. She asked if the radiators were protected features and Mr. Sullivan replied in the negative.

Ms. Truman pointed out that the stair had already been reworked by prior owners.

Mr. Kleespies asked about the changes to the window wells at the front elevation. Ms. Truman said they would be made deeper but not for egress purposes. A granite coping would be used at the top.

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

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place asked how much of the floor would be replaced. Mr. Ketterson estimated ten percent.

Marilee Myer of 10 Dana Street asked if the owners had considered donating the gazebo to a park or non-profit. Mr. Ketterson and Ms. Hill indicated that they would be happy to donate it if there was an interested party that wanted it.

Mr. Irving called for public comment.

Ms. Meyer said the proposed alterations were carefully planned out.

Prof. Blier recommended preserving as much of the existing flooring as possible and agreed with Dr. Solet's suggestions for the stairs.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Ms. Harrington asked the director for his thoughts on the proposed changes to the study stairs. Mr. Sullivan said the stair dated to about 1925 and had been changed circa 2000, re-using some older components. He said his concern about fully enclosing the stairs was that it would change the volume of the study, a very significant room in the house with its original cabinetry along one wall.

Mr. Kleespies commented on the historical significance of Asa Gray to the natural sciences.

Mr. Sheffield moved that the Commission find the application appropriate for the changes to the interior and exterior and delegating approval of construction details to staff. Ms. Lyster seconded the mo-

tion. Mr. Sullivan asked the Commission for their sense of the proposed new study stair. Mr. Sheffield indicated that the new enclosed stair was not incongruous with the interior of the rest of the house. Messrs. Kleespies, Irving and Ms. Shannon agreed. Dr. Solet said she could not comment without seeing it in person.

The motion passed with all members voting in the affirmative in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Shannon, Solet, Kleespies, Irving, Sheffield, and Lyster)

Case 4630: 103 Spring St., by Nancy Elbag, Maureen Ford & Timothy Ford. Construct addition at the front of the house.

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and showed slides of the property. Ms. Burks shared her screen and displayed the proposed plans for construction of an addition on the front of the existing house.

Timothy Ford, a co-owner and builder, described the two-story addition with a covered porch. He noted that his father had fallen and broken his hip. He said the house would remain a single-family dwelling and would blend in the neighborhood.

Mr. Irving noted that three letters of support had been received from nearby neighbors.

Dr. Solet asked if the door would be wood. Mr. Ford answered that he had seen a similar door on his neighbor's house. It would be fiberglass for stability (non-warping) and they would add side lights.

Ms. Harrington asked if the neighbors had provided any feedback about the addition and location of windows. Mr. Ford said the window locations were similar to the location on the existing front bump out. He noted that the old asphalt siding would be replaced with vinyl siding and composite trim.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the size of the new addition compared to the old bump out. Mr. Ford described the existing bump out and the new addition would be about four feet forward of that, but two-story and full width.

Mr. Irving asked for public questions of facts and comments.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place expressed concern for the vinyl siding for environmental and health reasons and asked how much it would cost to use an alternative material. Mr. Ford said he was not sure and thought the vinyl would be a recyclable material. Mr. Irving noted that the health effects of the material's manufacturing process were outside the Commission's purview.

Prof. Blier suggested the owner consider cedar shingles. Would the pavers be permeable? Mr. Ford replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Lyster agreed an alternative siding material would be worth considering.

Mr. Sheffield suggested fiber cement with fly ash, which was a durable recycled material and non-toxic.

Dr. Solet suggested a wood door. Mr. Ford said he had considered it but they tend to warp and require constant maintenance due to the quality of modern wood.

Ms. Shannon moved to approve a certificate of appropriateness for the application, as submitted.

Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, which passed six votes in favor in a roll call vote (Harrington, Lyster, Shannon, Sheffield, Kleespies, Irving) and one abstention (Solet).

Mr. Irving called for a five-minute recess, then reconvened the meeting at 7:50 P.M.

Case 4632: 57 JFK St., by Crimson Galeria LP, Raj Dhanda, Mgr. Construct 4-story addition to the existing Crimson Galeria building.

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and showed slides of the property. He reviewed the history of previous proposals for additional floors above the existing retail building. A three-story addition had been approved in 2016. Seismic bracing of the structure had been completed to prepare the building for the addition. The Commission had also approved changes to the existing storefronts and filling in the corner at JFK and Winthrop where the existing ramp was located.

Raj Dhanda, the property owner, introduced his project and the architect of the current design proposal, Haril Pandya of Nelson Architects.

Mr. Pandya said he was excited for the opportunity to design the project. He discussed the context of the site, with a variety of building heights. He noted that three types of shadows should be considered when looking at the proposal: existing building shadows, existing tree shadows, and new building shadows. He presented the massing studies that the team had done, noting a three-story datum line with upper step backs. They had pushed the mass back further from the park and added a light well to light the residential units at the back of the upper floors. The top units would be two-story lofts. He described the proposed materials in warm bronze colors. He presented architectural renderings of the project at day and evening. He showed the locations and mass of rooftop mechanicals. He pointed out the alley between 57 JFK and 96 Winthrop Street and discussed the provisions for interior trash storage and daily trash removal from commercial and residential floors. He displayed the shadow studies, noting that the areas marked in blue indicated the shadow from the proposed new addition.

Raj concluded the presentation by saying that he had purchased the property in 1998 and it was his hope and desire to make this a magnificent building in the Square. He noted that Winthrop Park was often in shadow now by the existing buildings and by the tree canopies.

Ms. Harrington asked why the applicant had decided to change from his previous approved plans. Mr. Dhanda answered that the demand for office space had gone down dramatically since then and that he really wanted to bring additional residential opportunities to Harvard Square.

Ms. Lyster asked if green roofs were planned and indicated her encouragement of them. Mr. Pandya said it was a sustainable design and did include a green roof system. Ms. Lyster noted that the residential entry would block the view of the door to 96 Winthrop Street. She asked if that entry bay could be pushed back from the corner. Mr. Pandya said they were studying it, but were challenged by certain dimensional limitations for the elevator lobby and accessibility. Peter Habib, also of Nelson Architects, noted that the entrance bay used glass at the corner, which helped provide visibility through to 96 Winthrop

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

Street. Mr. Dhanda noted that a new restaurant tenant would be located at 96 Winthrop Street. Improvements had been made including accessibility to the building. It would all work nicely with 57 JFK.

Ms. Shannon asked questions about the structure of 57 JFK, wall sections, the metal panel system over the existing concrete facades, and the spandrel panels at the third floor. Mr. Pandya explained that there was a 3-foot space for structural and mechanical systems between the second-floor ceiling and the third floor. The spandrel would provide the appearance of lifting the second-floor ceiling, but it would not actually change.

Dr. Solet thanked the architects for a comprehensive presentation. She asked what would provide some consistency of appearance of the lit interior residential units at night. Mr. Pandya said they would use a standard interior window covering throughout the residential units. There would be a standard for lighting and interior design. Mr. Dhanda said the lease or building management would provide some control over the appearance. He noted the automatic shades that are used at 1075 Mass. Ave., which prevent bright light emitting from interior spaces at night. Dr. Solet noted the public's interest in trash disposal and control of the side alley.

Mr. Kleespies asked about inclusionary housing requirements. Mr. Dhanda said twenty percent of the residential space would be affordable, as per the city ordinance.

Mr. Irving asked for public questions of fact.

Michael Janes of 50 JFK Street asked about the difference between the prior approved office addition and this proposal. Mr. Dhanda said the office addition was set back further and had a smaller FAR.

Mr. Williamson asked if the Commission had no purview of the use of the buildings. Mr. Sullivan replied in the affirmative. Mr. Williamson asked why the new proposal was taller than 2016. Mr. Dhanda said the top lofts had a mezzanine. Mr. Williamson asked the height of the porch at the Grendel's. Mr. Pandya said that building was about 50' high overall but he did not know the porch height. Mr. Williamson asked how the residences would activate the park. Mr. Dhanda said the residences would use the park, restaurants, and shops after people who work in offices around the Square leave. Mr. Pandya said he did not mean to imply that the park wasn't already active, but just that the new residents would increase that.

Heather Hoffman of 213 Hurley Street asked about the impacts of loss of light on the plants and trees in the park. Mr. Pandya said there would be no additional shadows in the late spring to early fall. Mr. Dhanda said the trees were in great health and the addition would not have a negative impact.

Brad Bellows of 87 Howard Street asked if the existing building had a steel frame with concrete panels affixed to that frame. Mr. Pandya confirmed that type of construction. He indicated they were studying whether the existing concrete panels could be removed and replaced with metal or if they would over-clad the existing panels. He said the existing tenant spaces on the lower floors could not be reduced, so they were limited in what they could do with the footprint of the first floor. Mr. Bellows said the

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

pitched roofs of buildings surrounding the park changed the perceived height at the park edge to 35', not 50'. Mr. Pandya noted that 57 JFK was not on the park as were the Grendel's and Pete's buildings.

Chris Mackin of 48 JFK Street asked about the trash removal strategy. What was the Commission's role in that matter? Mr. Sullivan noted that the Commission had purview over the view of the architectural features from a public way, but operational methods for management of trash removal were not subject to Commission review. Mr. Dhanda explained that the trash management would be handled differently from present. The tenant trash would be stored inside the building, not in the alley. Daily trash pick-up would continue for commercial and new residential units. Recent construction activity in the building and alley had caused some trash storage on the sidewalk, but that would not be the norm.

Prof. Blier asked about floor plates and sizes of residential units. How would the existing floors and upper floors tie together in appearance? Mr. Pandya said the floors were being unified with materiality, rhythm of the façade, etc. He said the details of the design such as reveals, shadow lines, step backs of the metal panels, etc. would come later in the design's development. Mr. Dhanda noted that the building did not extend to the property line, so perhaps depth could be modulated by bringing elements forward.

Mr. Janes asked about accessibility to blue sky and impacts of the addition on neighboring residents. Mr. Pandya said those issues were being considered.

Mr. Irving opened the public comment period.

Philip Borden of 93 Winthrop Street said he was an abutting property owner and a member of the Winthrop Park Trust. He expressed concerns about the building mass, height, shadow on the park, trash management, pick up and drop off traffic impacts on Winthrop Street, and lighting.

Mr. Bellows said the Winthrop Park redevelopment of the 1990s was a great urban design with the lower Grendel's and Pete's buildings fronting on the park and the larger new building constructed behind. He said the massing of 57 JFK needed improvement.

Ms. Meyer said less was more. The tall buildings in the context analysis had more green space. Winthrop was an intimate bottleneck. The building would be there longer than any current tenants and design should take precedents over tenant issues.

Mr. Janes said he was concerned about the massing, privacy issues, light pollution, and access to blue sky. The project should look more like the 2016 design.

Prof. Blier said she had submitted a report from the Harvard Square Neighborhood Association summarizing their comments. She urged the Commission to require further design work and continue.

Mr. Mackin said he lived on the first floor of 48 JFK Street and was concerned by loss of access to blue sky. He said he would like to see one and two-bedroom units rather than studios because the residential tenants of larger units tend to stay longer. He said he had lived in the Square for many years.

Mr. Williamson said it would be an atrocity to have this enormous building there. The importance

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

of Winthrop Park's history to the city could not be over emphasized. The current scale of the building was unacceptable. The shadow impacts were greater than the 2016 design. It was absurd to suggest the park needed activating.

Carole Perrault of Belmont (formerly of Cambridge) said the mass, scale, and metal cladding would be better suited to Kendall Square.

Ms. Hoffman said the effects of loss of sky on a neighborhood could be terrible.

Pebble Gifford of Hilliard Street commented with technical assistance from Prof. Blier. She said she was saddened by the current proposal after having worked with Raj in 2016. Winthrop Park was one of the most important historic sites in the country. She begged for sensitivity in the design relative to the park.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the primary and secondary goals of the Harvard Square district.

Ms. Harrington said that at present there were more minuses than pluses based on the goals of the district. The building was too massive and overwhelmed the site as currently designed.

Ms. Lyster encouraged sustainability features such as a green roof. The apartment walls did not need to be all glass. 57 JFK and 96 Winthrop needed more separation.

Ms. Shannon said the massing alternatives had been helpful to see. She said she was skeptical about the third-floor alignment. The design of upper and lower floors was unified as rendered. It would be hard to tell where the old ends and new begins.

Dr. Solet said she was sympathetic to the attempt to create more housing. She recommended against the double floor loft units as a way of lowering the height and reducing the massing. She spoke about the acoustical impacts of glass both inside and outside the building. Winthrop Street and the park were some of the oldest spaces in the city. The Winthrop wall had not been mentioned but was also an historic structure adjacent to the site. She remarked on the 20th-century significance of 96 Winthrop Street. Historical significance did not end in 1630 or 1775. The district showed the evolution of Harvard Square and this is a nice design with affordable housing and sustainable design. Change was always weird and difficult to adjust to.

Mr. Sheffield said it was a challenging project. He liked the erosion of the third-floor façade on Winthrop Street. The step backs do not have to be equivalent on JFK and Winthrop. The lightwell might be wasted space. If the plan is rearranged, you may be able to get more step back from Winthrop Street. Provide more buffer space between 96 Winthrop and the addition. Develop a strategy to move the residential elevator into the existing footprint.

Mr. Irving observed that many speakers were abutters. He said he thought the massing was successful but if there is flexibility on the mezzanine it could be lower. He encouraged a continuance of the

hearing to allow for further design and discussion.

Mr. Dhanda said the 2014-2016 permitting process was grueling. He said he could scrap this project and build the approved 2016 design, but the existing design was far more successful. Having eight affordable units in Harvard Square would be great. The residential units were very needed. He said he didn't want to go through six more hearings. Any building could be deemed too big with too many shadows. He said he hoped to get some encouragement for the project if he was willing to take the fourth floor off. Otherwise, he would just build the office building.

Mr. Irving said his opinion was that the design was very good. Residential was good. Reducing or removing the top floor is certainly worth considering.

Mr. Dhanda agreed to continue the hearing to September.

Dr. Solet moved to continue the hearing to September 2. Mr. Kleespies seconded. The motion passed 7-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Shannon, Sheffield, Solet, Kleespies, Irving)

[Mr. Sheffield left the meeting].

Mr. Irving called for a five-minute recess and reconvened at 10:20 P.M.

Case 4633: 269-301 Vassar St., by Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Construct landscaped open space, deck and paved areas as the Central Plaza of the new West Campus Graduate Dormitory Project.

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and showed slides of the property. He explained the boundaries of the Fort Washington Historic District, established in 1981 to protect the fort and to maintain the historic view shed toward Boston and the river from future development. He noted that only landscaped open spaces of the MIT West Campus Graduate Dormitory Project lay within the district boundary. The Commission would be reviewing only those portions of the project, not the design of the dormitory buildings.

Jon Alvarez, Director of Planning at MIT, described the project and reviewed the site plan. He said the central plaza between the two dorm buildings would be an appropriate extension of the district.

Tim Peters of Kieran Timberlake Architects said the plaza would provide an enhanced entry to Fort Washington Park from the MIT side. The plaza was 128 feet wide. The angle of the district view shed continues across the railroad tracks. The landscape would consist of lawn, low plantings, and spaces that could be used year-round.

Ms. Lyster asked if the application included any changes to the park itself. Mr. Alvarez replied in the negative.

Dr. Solet complimented the design.

Mr. Kleespies asked if there would be fencing or gates. How would the plaza feel like it was open to the general public? Would there be tables or benches? Mr. Alvarez said that the project team had worked closely with the Cambridgeport Neighborhood Association to design a space that could be used for events, concerts, and the like. He said they hoped they could engage with the neighborhood and draw them into the space.

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

Mr. Peters reviewed additional details of the plan.

Mr. Irving asked for public questions or comments, but there were none. He closed the public comment period.

Dr. Solet asked about lighting. Would the plaza be open 24 hours? Mr. Peters said it would be. The 17' wide circulation path lined by trees would have a mix of pole lights and tree up-lighting.

Mr. Kleespies asked if there was a way to get from inside Fort Washington Park to the new plaza. Mr. Sullivan answered that there was an opening in the fence at the rear of Fort Washington Park. He said the development was long anticipated and he was pleased at MIT's generous 130' wide view corridor, much wider than the 50' width of that portion of the district. The intention was to integrate the Cambridgeport residential neighborhood with the MIT campus. He recommended a certificate of appropriateness for the application, as designed. He suggested there could be some wayfinding signs to address the question of whether the space was open to the public. Dr. Solet so moved. Mr. Kleespies seconded. The motion passed 6-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Shannon, Solet, Kleespies, Irving)

Public Hearing: Demolition Review

Case D-1583: 84 Wadsworth St. / 200 Main St., by Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Demolish Eastgate apartment tower (MIT Building E55, built 1967).

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and showed slides of the property. Eric Hill, Survey Director, described the 29-story reinforced concrete apartment tower. It was square in plan measuring 105' x 105'. Built in 1967, it was the eastern gateway to the MIT campus. Eduardo Catalano had designed two such towers and the Dewey Library as a group, but the second tower was never built. He explained the background of the Brutalist style and how it was considered an appropriate evolution of the campus' architecture from the original stone Beaux Arts buildings. Mr. Sullivan explained that in 2015 when he engaged in a long discussion with MIT about their development proposals for Kendall Square, they had negotiated preservation of three buildings in Kendall Square (238, 264, and 292 Main Street) with the anticipated construction of six new buildings and the demolition of other buildings including Eastgate tower. The proposal had been presented to the Historical Commission and an exchange of letters was made establishing a protocol for review of building projects, similar to what had been arranged with Harvard and the Commission in the 1980s. He said he agreed with Mr. Hill that Eastgate was a significant building but recommended that it be found not preferably preserved in the context of the Kendall developments.

Mr. Irving asked for public questions or comments on significance but there were none. He closed the public comment period.

Mr. Kleespies moved to find the building significant for the reasons stated in the staff memo. Ms. Shannon seconded the motion, which passed 6-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Shannon, Solet, Kleespies, Irving)

Mr. Irving invited MIT to present their design for a replacement building.

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

Maureen McCafferty, Director of Real Estate for MITIMCo., shared her screen and provided additional about the Kendall Square Initiative. The Institute wanted the area to be a destination and a residential center.

Ms. Harrington asked if the shorter building was also proposed for demolition. Ms. McCafferty replied in the negative; only Eastgate (Building E55) would be demolished. The Herman Building with the Dewey Library would remain.

Dr. Solet asked if there was a published walking tour of the area. Mr. Sullivan volunteered to lead a tour. Mr. Kleespies noted the innovation trail of Boston and Cambridge included this area. Ms. McCafferty also recommended the MIT public art walk.

Mr. Irving asked for public questions or comments on significance but there were none. He closed the public comment period.

Dr. Solet said seeing the building go made her feel old.

Mr. Irving noted the high cost to demolish a building of this size. Ms. McCafferty said it was very difficult because of the location over the MBTA subway.

Ms. Lyster moved to find the existing building not preferably preserved within the context of the proposed replacement and the larger Kendall Square Initiative development plan. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 6-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Shannon, Solet, Kleespies, Irving)

Preservation Grants

Case IPG 22-1: 1450 Massachusetts Ave., by First Parish Church. Grant request of \$100,000 for accessibility improvements.

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and showed slides of the property. The Commission had recently approved a certificate of appropriateness for an accessible front entrance to the building. The church was fundraising and requested \$100,000 matching grant toward the project cost. He noted that the current balance in the grant fund was \$162,000 and change. He recommended approval.

Case IPG 22-2: 169 Western Ave. (parsonage), by Western Avenue Baptist Church. Grant request of \$20,000 for new roof of parsonage.

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and showed slides of the property. The church was requesting a grant of \$20,000 for a new roof for the parsonage. Although the Commission had previously given grants for the church building, he recommended a new \$20,000 outright grant for this building. He noted that affordable housing agencies wanted to develop the rear of the lot, where there were currently concrete block garages.

Dr. Solet moved to approve a \$100,000 matching grant for 1450 Mass. Ave. Mr. Kleespies asked if they had resolved the details of the accessible ramp being close to the Old Burying Ground fence. Mr. Sullivan replied in the affirmative. Mr. Kleespies seconded the motion, which passed 6-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Shannon, Solet, Kleespies, Irving)

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

Dr. Solet moved to approve an outright grant (no requirement to match) of \$20,000 for 169 Western Ave. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 6-0. (Harrington, Lyster, Shannon, Solet, Kleespies, Irving)

Minutes

Dr. Solet moved to approve the minutes, as submitted. Mr. Kleespies seconded. The motion passed 6-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Shannon, Solet, Kleespies, Irving)

Ms. Harrington moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Kleespies seconded the motion, which passed unanimously in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Shannon, Solet, Kleespies, Irving)

The meeting adjourned at 11:34 P.M.

Respectfully and exhaustedly submitted,

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public
Present on the Zoom Webinar online, August 5, 2021**

Melissa Stopa	MIT
Rachna Balakrishna	57 JFK St
Jon Alvarez	MIT Planning
Maureen McCaffrey	MITIMCo, One Broadway, Ste 9-200
James Rafferty	907 Mass. Ave.
Stefan Vogelmann	Nelson Architects, 198 Tremont St, 439, Boston
Raj Dhanda	57 JFK St
Catherine Truman	Catherine Truman Architects, 29 Warren St
Rob Ketterson	88 Garden St
Haril Pandya	Nelson Architects, 198 Tremont St, 439, Boston
Peter Habib	Nelson Architects, 198 Tremont St, 439, Boston
Kelley Brown	MIT Planning
Tim Peters	Kieran Timberlake Architects, Philadelphia
Jason Smith	Kieran Timberlake Architects, Philadelphia
Erik Servies	Redgate-RE, 265 Franklin St, Ste 602, Boston
Maureen Ford	97 Spring St
Carole Perrault	29 Lewis Rd, Belmont, MA. 02478
Vasso Mathes	MIT, NW23 100
John DiGiovanni	50 Church St
Timothy Ford	97 Spring St
Shauna Ford	97 Spring St
Nancy Elbag	35 Coolidge Hill Rd

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

Emma Lubin	17 Fairmont Ave, Unit 2
Michael Brandon	27 Seven Pines Ave
Elizabeth Kline	15 Kirkland Rd
Zach	50 Church St
Michael Janes	50 JFK St
David Wyman	7 Garden Ter
Bill Dines	69 Otis St
Christopher Gaffron	1761 Wedgewood Common
Phyllis Pownall	17 Rindgefield St
John Hawkinson	—
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana St, 404
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Pl - Jefferson Park
Marie Elena Saccoccio	55 Otis St
Alexandra Huebner	93 Winthrop St, #5A
Steve Bardige	55 Stearns St
Dana Bullister	155 5th St #1
Jonathan Zittrain	1525 Mass Ave
Bill Manley	HSBA, Two Brattle Sq
Suzanne Blier	5 Fuller Pl
John	22 Lambert St
Michael Owu	One Broadway
Amanda Strong	20 Norman St
Addom Gentner	4 Daybreak Cove
Fabiola Alikpokou	255 Main St
Lauren Harder	111 Grozier Rd
Brad Bellows	87 Howard St
Philip Borden	93 Winthrop St, Unit 7
Heather Hoffman	213 Hurley St
LeAnn Lewis	170 Gore St #103
Maureen Smith	9 Hilliard Pl
Jay Dharia	271 Cambridge St
Christopher Mackin	48 JFK ST. #2
Betty Saccoccio	55 Otis St
Rosemary Noren	599 Cambridge St, Unit 103
Pebble Gifford	15 Hilliard St
Luca Poth	32 High St
Gary Amberik	265 Franklin St, Suite 602

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.