

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

July 12, 2018 - 795 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge City Hall, Sullivan Chamber - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: Bruce Irving, *Chair*; Susannah Tobin, *Vice Chair*; William Barry, Joseph Ferrara, Chandra Harrington, Jo M. Solet, *Members*; Gavin Kleespies, Paula Paris, Kyle Sheffield *Alternates*

Members absent: Robert Crocker

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

Public present: See attached list.

Mr. Irving called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M. He made introductions, reviewed hearing procedures, and described the consent agenda procedure. He recommended the following cases for the consent agenda.

Case 3954: 199 Brattle St., by Galatea Realty Trust c/o Monica Neuman and William Numa. Replace exterior door.

Case 3955: 45 Dunster St., by 45 Dunster LLC. Construct accessible entrance on west side elevation.

Case 3967: 11 Story St. Unit #24, by Shisheng Chou. Replace windows in unit.

No member of the public or commission requested a hearing on these cases.

Mr. Barry moved to approve Case 3954 per the consent agenda procedure. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with alternate Paris voting.

Ms. Tobin moved to approve Case 3955 per the consent agenda procedure. Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with alternate Sheffield voting.

Mr. Ferrara moved to approve Case 3967 per the consent agenda procedure. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with alternate Kleespies voting.

Mr. Irving noted that public comment would be limited to 3 minutes per person.

Public Meeting: Informational Presentation

Harvard Square Kiosk and Plaza, by City of Cambridge. Informational presentation about status of kiosk and plaza design and re-use study.

Kathy Watkins, City Engineer, displayed slides and provided an update on the status of the study for rehabilitation and re-use of the Kiosk and surrounding plaza. She noted the existing steep cross slopes and inaccessibility of the plaza. Re-grading would be necessary to provide an accessible space.

Ted Touloukian, the architect for the Kiosk, showed slides and described the preservation approach, possible uses under discussion by the working group, signs, and required systems. He showed historic images of the Kiosk, noting the original heating grille on the north side. He described remaining original features including the half walls on the north and east sides. The half wall on the south would be restored as would the "Harvard Square" red letters. He described non-original features such as the magazine racks and aluminum storefront glazing that would be removed. He described the original windows, which were painted steel sash with wired safety glass. He described an option of folding glass doors for the former west side openings to the stairs and escalators, in place of the current magazine racks. For the interior, he described half wall casework that could store tables and chairs. The rooftop signs could return and be used to generate income for management. Digital screens inside the Kiosk or within the glazing

were being studied.

Ms. Harrington asked about audio challenges if the plaza/Kiosk were used for performances. Who would maintain the building? Ms. Watkins agreed it was a busy, noisy location. The city would hire an operator and Public Works would still do some of the maintenance, as they do now. Ms. Harrington objected to commercial signage on a rooftop billboard.

Mr. Sheffield noted that connectivity to the plaza was limited due to the orientation of the Kiosk. Could the south wall be opened up? Mr. Touloukian said the south side had grading issues that would make that challenging.

Dr. Solet said the acoustics of HVAC should be studied so that more noise was not being created in an already very noisy location. She spoke favorably about the interior casework and noted that digital screens would need to be available at different heights for accessibility and kids. She suggested trees in the plaza be of a low-maintenance type that don't drop a lot of debris.

Mr. Kleespies urged that the programming not be so complicated that it could not be managed well. It might be better to invest in staffing rather than trying to make it revenue neutral. Ms. Watkins said the Tourism office would provide some staffing. The city was issuing a Request for Information as a first step before an RFP. Mr. Kleespies said he liked the idea of digital signs that could provide a lot of content in multiple languages. He encouraged the city to think big.

Mr. Barry suggested flipping the orientation so that the open side faced east. Mr. Sullivan disagreed and indicated that the landmark report's guidelines called for keeping the half walls on the north, south, and east sides. Mr. Barry said rooftop signs could be energizing. If some of it were commercial, he would not object. The renderings did not show much of a news function for the Kiosk. It was lacking the jam-packed character of Out of Town News.

Mr. Irving supported the choice of open doors. He discouraged the cooling of a wide-open space during summer. A different use every day would be confusing. He opened the public comment period for twenty minutes.

Tom Delbanco of 94 Hammond Street said when he came to Cambridge in the 1950s the Kiosk had an international feeling. It was the way in and out of Cambridge.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place said the Harvard Square Neighborhood Association was engaged in the working group discussions. Versatility of uses was critical. HVAC and water were vital. News was important. The space should be used for history exhibits and demonstrations. Advertising should be balanced with other things. The plaza could be more creative. Another taxi space could be removed. Seasonal gardens could be planted.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street cautioned against a sterile glass box. Would there be lighting under the eaves? She objected to signs on top. The south side should be activated. Don't overprogram it. She objected to big doors that looked like a garage.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place said people liked to use the plaza for performances and rallies. Those uses should be accommodated. He spoke in favor of keeping the news racks on the west side. He said signage was a thorny issue that needed more discussion. Wired glass should be used if it is available. Would there be a sales counter?

Jill Delbanco of 94 Hammond Street encouraged keeping the newsstand and international character. Don't try to make it too multi-purpose. The design should be practical for New England weather. Use caution with advertising.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period and thanked everyone for their succinct and constructive comments.

Public Hearing: Demolition Review

Case D-1485 (continued): 13-15 Vincent St., by Matt Hayes. Demolish existing house (1924).

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the 1924 duplex house. The commission had found the building significant for its architecture and historical associations in June, but had to continue the hearing when it lost its quorum. He noted that the members present at the previous hearing were Dr. Solet, Mr. Ferrara, Mr. Kleespies, and Mr. Irving and that only they would be allowed to vote on this matter.

Milton Yu of Peter Quinn Architects described the proposed replacement building, which consisted of two attached townhouses. He noted the driveway on the right side and a 3' change in grade across the lot. He described the proposed site plan with parking and staggered footprint for the two units. The height of the front unit would be lower than the abutters. It was in a transitional style, taking cues from the historic context but also speaking to the rear unit. The rear unit would be partially blocked from view but was in a more contemporary style. He described the elevations and proposed materials, which included Boral clapboard siding, wood clad Anderson 400 Series windows, asphalt architectural shingles, and a wood trellis on the back unit. He noted the bay window and gable roof fit with the neighborhood context.

Matt Hayes, the owner, explained his design approach with the mixture of traditional and contemporary. He noted a project at the corner of Harvard and Hancock streets where it had been done. The front structure would be contextual to the street but the back unit would be more contemporary. The materials would include clapboards and brick foundation on the front unit and a washed out, wood grain cladding with mitered corners on the rear unit. He described a similar house he had been given permission to demolish and replace on Walden Street. At the time a commission member had commented that the house was like much of West Cambridge housing stock. Mr. Hayes said he would never ask to demolish one of the more ornate and significant older houses on Vincent Street. He noted an Italianate house on Ellsworth that he had restored. He said he had reached out repeatedly to the neighbors on Vincent Street but got no response. Change was hard. He expected some push-back, but he pointed to his good track record.

Dr. Solet asked if the front house was intended to look like it had always been there. Mr. Hayes

said no, it was a contemporary building in a Transitional style with a traditional form. He noted the setbacks would be conforming. Dr. Solet questioned the use of a dormer rather than a higher roof. Mr. Hayes said it was for functionality and to provide head height in a bathroom without exceeding zoning requirements.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the roof deck on the front unit and Mr. Ferrara about the roof pitch. Mr. Hayes replied that the open-roof form had been used by developer David Aposhian and the street had a variety of roof pitches.

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

Ms. Meyer asked about the roof deck, windows, and projecting bay. Mr. Hayes described these features in more detail.

City Councilor Jan Devereaux asked which mature trees would be removed. Mr. Hayes answered that the mature trees in the photo were on the neighbor's property and would not be removed.

Matthew Berlin of 12 Vincent Street commented that two periods (1890s and 1920s) represented the history of the area's development. The proposal would remove a working-class Bungalow of the 1920s and replace it with something out of character for the neighborhood.

Mr. Irving opened the public comment period.

Cameron Lane of 16 Vincent Street said the significance was already established. She had nothing against the new owner, but a new building would change the neighborhood. Why couldn't he renovate the existing house? She expressed concern about changing the water table if there were substantial excavation for the new house.

Ms. Meyer spoke favorably about the simplicity of the existing house and unfavorably about the proposed replacement design and materials.

Robert Glass of 11 Vincent Street noted an incorrect address on the plot plan. He recalled his relationship with George Byers. He was open to the idea of rebuilding the house but disapproved of the elevation that would face his home. He wanted to see samples of the proposed materials.

Nancy Ayoub of 74 Orchard Street said her mother lived at 9 Vincent and had not received a letter about the project. She questioned the need to tear down a solid house. She said the association with George Byers, the city's first black fire lieutenant, was important to many in the neighborhood.

Mr. Irving closed public comment.

Mr. Hayes asked to respond to some of the comments. There was a natural evolution of housing stock, which was not always bad. He thought the project would be a good addition to the street. Control of the water on the site was a requirement of the city. The existing house was the smallest on the street and two families would not fit easily into 2200 sf by today's standards. He had personally delivered letters to everyone on the street. He said he respected the contributions of George Byers and investigated getting a memorial marker only to find that there already was one at the firehouse in Lafayette Square.

Mr. Irving noted the receipt of three letters, two in support and one in opposition.

Mr. Kleespies said he was struck at the June hearing by the diversity of the street's residents.

Mr. Ferrara said the combination of old and new development could be successful, but the false façade in this project did not work. It created a rhetorical element to the design. Mr. Hayes said he could remove the false front. Mr. Ferrara suggested lowering the eaves and changing the pitch of the roof without increasing the overall height.

Mr. Irving thanked Mr. Berlin for his comments about the two waves of development in the neighborhood. He said ~~he~~ there might be a new wave starting. He questioned the reason to demolish the existing house, which was in decent shape especially given its associations with a respected member of the community. Mr. Hayes noted the small size and non-conforming setbacks of the existing house, which limited the possibilities for adding to the house. Getting a variance was unlikely. His only option would be to move the building and build a bigger addition. He took pride in his building projects, saw each of them as a work of art, and made a case for how there could be a successful new wave of housing in the city. In answer to Dr. Solet he said he had studied ways to renovate the existing building with its previous owner but couldn't find a way to make it work. Mr. Irving said he would not have an explanation for letting the existing house be demolished. He said the third wave should be to keep the existing and build new behind it.

Ms. Harrington agreed. She said a third wave was not necessary. What was wrong with preserving what we have? There is value in preserving architecture and history.

Mr. Sheffield said he had a good opinion of Mr. Hayes' work in the city. He could set a good example for this type of building's renovation by moving it on the site and using the duality of new and old.

Mr. Irving quoted Orson Welles, "The enemy of art is an absence of limitations," and encouraged Mr. Hayes to move the building, capture subterranean space, and build behind it.

Mr. Barry acknowledged the good intentions for the duality of old and new but said he would rather see a well-designed and fully contemporary design if the project was all new construction.

Mr. Ferrara moved to find the existing building preferably preserved in the context of the proposed replacement. Dr. Solet seconded the motion, which passed 4-0 with Dr. Solet, Mr. Irving, Mr. Ferrara, and Mr. Kleespies voting.

Mr. Sullivan explained the six-month delay. The applicant could return during that time if he had a revised proposal to share. And if the delay were still in place at the 5-month mark, the Commission would have a hearing to determine if a landmark study would be warranted.

Mr. Sheffield asked if a new design would need to be reviewed by only the four members involved in the first two hearings. Ms. Tobin answered that a new design could be a new hearing with all participating.

Mr. Irving called for a short recess at 8:30 and reconvened the meeting at 8:41 P.M.

Case D-1490: 74 Oxford St., by 74 Oxford Street, LLC c/o William Senné. Demolish house (1893).

Mr. Irving described the demolition review process.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the double house built in 1893. He described the neighborhood context and history of ownership. The house was similar to one on Walker Street designed by the same architect, Alberto Haynes. This house had been aluminum sided but was recoverable and of some architectural merit. One side of the house had been divided up and used as a rooming house in the mid-twentieth century. He recommended finding the building significant for the reasons in the staff report.

There were no questions of fact from the Commission or the public on the matter of significance. Mr. Irving asked for public comment on the significance of the building.

Joel Bard, representing a number of people from the neighborhood, said they had read the staff memo and endorsed Mr. Sullivan's recommendation of significance. The building was architecturally harmonious. He noted a letter from Lesley University that had been sent to the Commission and noted that Lesley had done a great job of restoring nearby buildings.

Fred Meyer noted that the neighborhood remained undeveloped for 200 years after European settlement. It was a pine swamp and the first development did not begin until 1846. This neighborhood only had one wave of development.

Susan Carter of 41 Holden Street noted that she had sought and received two variances for her two houses and appreciated Cambridge's mindset for preservation of older houses.

Mr. Irving closed public comment regarding significance.

Ms. Tobin moved to find the house significant as defined in the ordinance and for the reasons stated in the staff report. Mr. Barry seconded the motion, which passed 7-0 with Ms. Paris voting.

Bill Senné, the applicant, said he contacted CHC staff when he purchased the building and discussed saving it. He had determined that the building contained ten legal units based on the number of kitchens. He had designed a ten-unit rehab of the existing building but the unit count was not affirmed by the Inspectional Services Department because some of the units had shared baths. The current proposal was his back-up plan and consisted of five single-family units, one double and three free-standing.

Mark Boyes-Watson, the architect, showed slides of the surrounding context, noting that Oxford Street was varied in its form. He showed a site plan and perspective views of the proposal. Each building was two stories and approximately 26 feet tall. All the cars would be hidden from view, parked in the interior of the lot and accessed by one driveway. He noted that Wendell Street had buildings with larger than required front setbacks. The two proposed front buildings would be closer to the street. The proposal would allow for light and views between the houses.

Ms. Harrington asked why the existing building could not be renovated for the allowed five units. Mr. Senné replied that such a project did not make good economic sense.

Ms. Paris asked for a rationale for why this proposal of four buildings fit into the neighborhood

context. Mr. Boyes-Watson said he had done few demolition projects in his career, but sometimes when a building is removed there is a logic in having the new building being contemporary to the current time.

Mr. Kleespies noted that there was a similar development on Brookline Street on the site of a former garage. Mr. Senné said he had been a partner in the development. The similarities in style were probably due to the zoning regulations.

The Commission asked about other configurations. Mr. Senné said he had looked at all the possibilities. Mr. Boyes-Watson said it was challenging to design it so that all units had access to the ground.

Dr. Solet asked why the setbacks were not as deep as the abutters. Mr. Senné said it would be hard to accommodate the parking with bigger setbacks.

Fred Meyer asked if the developer had talked to the neighbors about a variance for consistent setbacks. Mr. Senné said he had talked to Mr. Meyer about a variance for the existing building, but it was very difficult to get a variance approved. He distributed photos of several Lesley University Buildings nearby that had been restored.

Marilee Meyer asked about setbacks, bays, and materials. She noted that her building had units ranging in size from 350 sf to 950 sf and people are clamoring to get in.

Danielle Jankowitz of 47 Wendell Street asked about the trees and stacked units. Mr. Boyes-Watson said townhouse units were more in demand because people wanted private outdoor space.

Karen Engels asked how the new buildings were of a piece with the neighborhood. Mr. Boyes-Watson said they were clearly different from the older houses.

Ms. Blier suggested a small hotel or other type of rental unit. Or affordable units. Mr. Senné said only residential use was allowed by right.

Beverly Reifman noted another project by this developer and architect at the corner of Gorham and Wendell. She said she couldn't look at that and believe that they cared about the neighborhood.

Mr. Irving asked if there were other public comments.

Mr. Bard said there were a number of people present who would be willing to stand rather than speak to show their objection to the proposed new buildings and preference for preservation of the existing building. He read a proposal to find the existing building preferably preserved. (Nearly everyone present stood in support of the statement). Mr. Bard said the neighbors were open to supporting a variance. He shared a photo of his own house before and after renovations.

Ms. Meyer said the existing building had great quality and proportions. The proposal presented was not detailed enough to be considered, and the rendering was misleading. Square houses were the flavor of the week.

Mr. Delbanco agreed that incomplete plans were not acceptable. The house at the corner of Hammond and Gorham had popped up without warning. Time was needed to find a win-win solution.

Lynne Reiss of 76 Oxford Street said this was an important corner in the neighborhood and the

existing house fit it beautifully. The proposal for new buildings did not fit at all. It was too close to Oxford Street and too close to her own building. She expressed concern about fire access to the back buildings. She would prefer to work together to keep the existing building.

Paul Levenson said the neighborhood was willing to work with the developer to find a solution.

Richard Goldstein shared photos of the similar house on Walker Street. He said the new corner house at 39 Hammond Street was an eyesore.

Mr. Irving closed public comment.

Mr. Sheffield noted a contextual change along Oxford Street, which transitions from large academic buildings to large houses on the centers of their lots. The proposal does the opposite by putting cars in the open area at the center of the lot. He encouraged the developer to work with the neighbors and indicated that their support could be powerful before the BZA. He looked forward to seeing a new design direction when the applicant returns.

Mr. Senné asked the Commission to vote on the delay so that he could start working with the neighbors on a solution.

Mr. Barry moved to find the existing building preferably preserved in the context of the proposed replacement buildings. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion. Mr. Irving designated Mr. Sheffield to vote on the matter. Dr. Solet read the last paragraph of the letter received from Lesley University and gave her support for the motion. Without further discussion, the Commission voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

[Mr. Kleespies left the meeting].

Public Hearing: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 3968: 14 Story St., by President & Fellows of Harvard College. Replace entrance door and sidelights.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the butt glass door with no jambs. He noted the International Style features including how the pavement extended from the outside into the lobby.

Diane Gray, of Harvard University Planning, summarized the application to replace the glazed door and sidelights.

The architect, George Schnee, noted that this entrance at 14 Story Street was part of the Flansburgh building and not part of The Architects Collaborative (TAC) building at 8-12 Story Street. There were problems with the entry's thermal performance, weight of the 3/8" thick glass, and the auto opener was not operating properly. He proposed putting the door operator in the spandrel panel above the door and leaving the canopy.

Dr. Solet commented that the new door seemed more suited to the building to the left (8-12). The architect said the building to the right of the door was the Flansburgh building.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the new door would match the mullions of the larger glass windows and the architect replied in the affirmative.

There were no questions or comments, and Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Mr. Ferrara moved to find the proposed change appropriate and to approve the application. Mr. Irving designated Ms. Paris to vote. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.

Case 3969: 24 Dunster St., by President & Fellows of Harvard College, owner, o/b/o Saloniki Greek restaurant, tenant. Install non-conforming signage.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the location of the new restaurant in the Smith Campus Center (formerly Holyoke Center).

Mr. Eric Papachristos of the Saloniki Greek restaurant explained that the signs were larger than allowed by right in the zoning code but were designed to fit the existing dimensions between the concrete fins and be visible beyond those fins.

Dr. Solet asked how the signs would be illuminated. The architect, Neli Ialamov, said the lights would be on a dimmer so they could be adjusted to an appropriate level. Samantha Eisenbud, another architect, explained that the sign was more than 30" in height because of the proportions of the logo. Dr. Solet asked if the store had another location. Mr. Papachristos said yes, at 181 Massachusetts Avenue.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion, which passed 7-0 with Mr. Sheffield voting as alternate.

Case 3970: 56 Magazine St., by Christian Mission Pentecostal Tabernacle of Cambridge. Replace select windows and entry doors; replace cladding materials; repair or replace trim.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and explained that there was a lot of deferred maintenance on the building. The Pentecostal Tabernacle had already done work on the stained glass windows and the interior but were now addressing the exterior. The sill of the window in the stone tower was at grade level. The basement windows needed to be replaced. The front doors were rusting through. The wood exterior cladding would be replaced and the columns in the belfry restored.

Kerry Coyne, the architect, explained that the foundation had been repaired but the basement windows were failing. She proposed vinyl hopper windows because they were below grade. The front doors were non-original metal doors and rusting badly. The proposed new wood doors would extend all the way up to the dentil band. She noted that the doors in the postcard view had ten panels per door. The new doors would have glazing in the top two panels. There was no handrail at present and she proposed adding a simple iron railing. She showed the existing condition of a window (originally a door) that split the water table. She proposed raising the sill of the window above the water table and infilling below with stone. The window would be aluminum-clad wood. The wood clapboards and shingles above would be replaced. The sourced shingles came in random widths so it would not be exactly like what was there.

Mr. Barry asked why she wanted to change the size of the window. Ms. Coyne answered that it was awkward inside in a stairwell.

Beaver Spooner of Walden Street asked if the church had an accessible entrance. Ms. Coyne

replied in the affirmative.

The Commission discussed options for patching the area below the window and water table. They suggested that Ms. Coyne work with staff on that detail.

Mr. Sullivan said consistently sized shingles could be sourced. Dr. Solet suggested flexibility about the number of glazed panels in the doors for the most safety. Mr. Barry suggested adding a step and reducing the rise of each step.

Ms. Tobin moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project, subject to approval of construction details and materials by staff. Dr. Solet seconded, and the motion passed 7-0 with Ms. Paris voting.

Case 3971: Willard St., by City of Cambridge. Reconstruct sidewalks and curbs, construct raised intersections and curb extensions as part of larger drainage improvement project.

Case 3972: Longfellow Park, by City of Cambridge. Install drainage grates and covers in lawn area, replace granite pavers with accessible granite pavers.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of Willard Street and Longfellow Park. He noted that there was a curb on the east side of Willard Street near Mt. Auburn, but no curbs elsewhere or on Willard Street Place. He noted that the granite pavers in the crosswalks at Brattle Street in Longfellow Park had been added about 30 years ago. The park and the east side of Willard were in the historic district.

Jerry Friedman of Public Works explained that the west side of Willard Street was in the Half Crown-Marsh Neighborhood Conservation District and the east side in the Old Cambridge Historic District. He displayed a site plan showing the extent of work in the drainage improvement project. He explained that there was a chronic problem with storm water flooding on Willard Street. The drainage pipes were too small. He showed slides of the existing conditions and described the proposed changes. The roadway width would remain the same at 27 feet. A raised crosswalk would be added at Dinsmore Court and a raised intersection at Foster Street. Standard city materials would be used including concrete sidewalks, granite curbs, interlocking concrete pavers. He continued by presenting the Longfellow Park plan. The work in the park would include improving the drainage pipes in the upper park, restoring the lawn and installing drainage grates and covers in the lawn. The granite blocks in the crosswalks would be replaced with accessible pavers.

Dr. Solet noted that raised intersections were often not plowed or shoveled fully. Was there a precedent for them in New England? Mr. Friedman answered that yes, a number of them had been constructed in West Cambridge. Dr. Solet said she favored actual curbs and better visibility for people crossing the street. Curb extensions were also problematic in winter in her experience. Mountains of snow have to be climbed over at the corner. Mr. Friedman said they had gotten good feedback from most pedestrians, but he offered to seek advice from the Disabilities Commission.

Ms. Paris cautioned about preserving good access for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Sullivan suggested resetting the existing curb stones between Foster and Mount Auburn streets rather than installing new ones. Otherwise he recommended a certificate of appropriateness for the work, as proposed.

Mr. Sheffield moved to approve a certificate of appropriateness for Longfellow Park as proposed. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion, which passed 7-0 with Mr. Sheffield voting as alternate.

Mr. Sheffield moved to approve the certificate for the Willard Street project on the condition that the existing curbstones be reset. Ms. Paris seconded the motion. Dr. Solet suggested that more research was needed for raised intersections, streets, and curb extensions. Mr. Irving noted that snow removal was outside the jurisdiction of the Commission. Mr. Sheffield said he thought it was the right balance of historic materials and accessible design. The motion passed 6-1 with Ms. Paris voting as alternate and Dr. Solet opposed.

Preservation Grants

Case PG 18-3: 207-209 Green St. (Homeowners Rehab, Inc.) \$50,000 to repair slate roof and gutters.

Case PG 18-4: 109 Hampshire St. (Just A Start) \$61,500 for siding on rear house.

Case IPG 18-2: 35 Magazine St., by First Korean Church. Repurpose previously approved grant of \$100,000 to provide a permanent roof on the destroyed belfry.

Case IPG 18-4: 56 Magazine St., by Christian Mission Pentecostal Tabernacle of Cambridge (#3). \$100,000 to repair steeple and restore siding.

Case IPG 18-5: 24-26 Cpl. McTernan St., by Parkview Cooperative. \$50,000 to repair slate roof.

Case IPG 18-6: 42 Brattle St., by Cambridge Center for Adult Education (#8). \$24,000 to replace boiler.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of all the properties related to the grant applications. The balance in the preservation grant account was \$448,000. He described the water penetration in the brick walls due to a failing roof and gutters at Green Street. He recommended a grant of \$50,000. He described the rear unit at 109 Hampshire Street, where finger-jointed siding was used and had failed. The owner had wanted to install vinyl siding for years, but the current application was for cementitious clapboards and Azek porch elements. He recommended a grant of \$61,500. At 35 Magazine Street the belfry had become unstable and had to be removed in emergency work after a storm. The commission had approved a grant of \$100,000 to stabilize and restore the belfry, but now that it was gone he recommended a \$25,000 to cap off the structure with a membrane roof. Dr. Solet asked if the CPA program required insurance. Mr. Sullivan replied in the negative. For 56 Magazine Street, the exterior restoration had been described earlier as part of the application for a certificate. He recommended a grant of \$100,000. At Corporal McTernan Street, the roof was covered with red slate. This was the first application from the Parkview Cooperative, an affordable housing non-profit. He recommended a \$50,000 outright grant and a second \$50,000 on a matching basis. At 42 Brattle Street, the boiler had failed unexpectedly and was necessary to maintain use and viability of the building. The Commission had approved a boiler for the First Baptist Church on

another occasion so there was precedent. He recommended \$24,000. Ms. Harrington moved to approve grants for the all the applications, as recommended by Mr. Sullivan. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion, which passed 7-0 with Mr. Sheffield voting as alternate.

Minutes

The Commission reviewed the April 2018 minutes. Dr. Solet asked if “Architects Committee” should have an apostrophe. Ms. Burks said the committee was composed of architects not belonging to the architects, but if she preferred it with an apostrophe she would be happy to make the change.

Ms. Harrington moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Ms. Paris seconded, and the motion passed 7-0 with Ms. Paris and Mr. Sheffield voting and Mr. Barry recused due to his absence.

Ms. Tobin moved to adjourn. Mr. Sheffield seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public
Who Signed the Attendance List on July 12, 2018**

Nancy Ayoub	74 Orchard St
Mary Ziegler	5 Howland St
Janet Littell	13 Ware St
Virginia Standord	17 Vincent St
Mary Connolly	44 Gorham St
Douglas Kornfeld	33 Crescent St
Rod Ayoub	9 Vincent St
Bob O'Neil	69 Wendell St
Lynne Reiss	76 Oxford St
Patrice Poliser	64 Oxford St
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana St
Beaver Spooner	329 Walden St
Frederick Jao	46 Gorham St
Marilyn Farber	20 Carver St #2
Ed Abrams	80 Wendell St #6
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Pl
William Numa	199 Brattle St
Suzanne Blier	5 Fuller Pl
Cathy Chute	16 Howland St
Hull Fulweiler	16 Howland St
Cynthia Maltbie	62 Gorham St
Lisa Shaw	45 Dunster St
Alison Kennedy	111 Hammond St
Paola Capasso	56 Wendell St
Richard Goldstein	12 Howland St
Penelope Kleespies	105 Hammond St
Cameron Layne	16 Vincent St
M. Ann Ashley	20 Wendell St

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.