MINUTES OF THE MID CAMBRIDGE NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION DISTRICT COMMISSION ARCHITECT'S COMMITTEE MEETING FOR MC-5056 — 6 Maple Avenue

APPROVED AT THE DECEMBER 5, 2016 HEARING

Tuesday, October 4, 2016, 8:30 AM, 6 Maple Avenue, Cambridge

Commission Members present: Nancy Goodwin, *Chair*; Tony Hsiao, *Vice Chair*; Lestra Litchfield, *Member*; Charles Redmon, *Alternate*

Commission Members absent: Sue-Ellen Myers and Monika Pauli, *Members*; and Margaret McMahon, *Alternate*

Staff present: Samantha Paull Elliott

Proponents: John Lodge, Architect, and Jock Herron and Julia Moore, Owners

Members of the Public: Susan Davies, Rick Talcov, Helen Snivley, and Mark Dishop

Ms. Nancy Goodwin, Commission Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:34 AM.

Mr. Jock Herron, an owner, welcomed everyone to the site and stated the intent of the project was to age in the neighborhood and preserve the primary structure. He presented the updated plans. He noted that they had set up stakes in the yard to portray where the proposed addition would be sited. Mr. Herron added that the updated plan eliminated the driveway to the rear of the lot, pushed the building back, lowered the addition, removed the porch, and allowed for more landscaping. He said it decreased visibility from Maple Avenue.

Ms. Samantha Paull Elliott, staff, asked if there was a grade change in the front or only in the back. Ms. Julia Moore, an owner, replied only in the back.

Ms. Goodwin asked what trees were being removed. Mr. Herron pointed out the trees that were being removed, which were only those on the left. He noted that they were trying to preserve as much as possible and would work with an arborist.

Ms. Lestra Litchfield, Commissioner, asked if the main house would remain single family. Mr. Herron replied that it was a primary driver for the proposal, to maintain the integrity of the main single family structure.

Mr. Tony Hsiao, Commissioner, asked where the fence would be located. Mr. Lodge said that it would be at grade from the corner of the house, and out toward Broadway. Ms. Litchfield asked if the yards were being separated. Ms. Moore asked if one large yard was preferred. Ms. Litchfield and Mr. Hsiao noted that the openness of the property and existing outdoor space contributed to the character of the structure and were important to be considered when working on a landscaping plan. Ms. Litchfield suggested a low stone wall to separate space but maintain the open feel. Mr. Hsiao agreed and suggested they look at some of the traditional fieldstone walls in New England to perpetuate the garden feel of the property.

Minutes of the Mid Cambridge Neighborhood Conservation District Commission **ARCHITECT'S COMMITTEE**Meeting held on October 4, 2016

Minutes approved at the December 5, 2016 Hearing

Ms. Goodwin agreed that the openness of the property was unique to the area. And should be preserved if possible. Ms. Litchfield added that it would help to maintain the single family character of the structure.

Mr. Hsiao asked if they had put together a 3-D rendering or model. Mr. Lodge said that it was his goal to have one for the upcoming meeting after the plans were amended and finalized.

Mr. Hsiao noted that the second story portion would be tricky and needed a lot of thought. He noted that the piece wanted to be lighter to maintain the garden feel of the addition and property. Mr. Herron noted that they were open to removing the second story all together. Mr. Hsiao said if they kept it they could look at the materials to tie the addition into the garden to make it feel like a continuation of the garden walls and foundation of the structure. Mr. Charles Redmon, Commissioner, added that they might also consider covering the parking area with a trellis to keep the garden feel and protect the cars from snow.

Mr. Herron and Ms. Moore thanked the group for their suggestions.

Ms. Paull Elliott noted that submission of plans was due on Wednesday the 5th and that the Commission would like to have a draft landscape plan. She continued that the Commission could defer the details of a final review to staff if they felt comfortable with it or the applicant had the option of returning to the Commission for substantial changes.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15am.