

Approved 8/9/12

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

July 12, 2012 - 806 Massachusetts Avenue - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: William B. King, *Chair* and Bruce Irving, *Vice Chair*; M. Wyllis Bibbins, Jo M. Solet, *Members*
Shary Page Berg, Joseph Ferrara, *Alternate Members*

Members absent: Robert Crocker, Chandra Harrington, *Members*; Susannah Tobin, *Alternate Member*

Staff present: Charles Sullivan, Sarah Burks

Public present: See attached list.

Chair King called the meeting to order at 6:07 P.M. and made introductions. He designated alternate members Berg and Ferrara to vote on all matters. He explained the consent agenda procedure, reviewed the agenda, and asked if there were any cases that a member of the public, commission, or staff would recommend for approval per the consent agenda for which it would not be necessary to have a full hearing. Cases 2907 and 2912 were recommended for approval per the consent agenda procedures. Mr. King asked if anyone present wanted a full hearing on any-either of those ~~four~~ cases.

Hearing no objections, Mr. Bibbins moved to approve the following, per the procedures of the consent agenda policy, and authorized the staff to review and approve construction details:

Case 2907: 22 Putnam Ave., by 22 Putnam Property LLC. Remove existing and construct new fence.

Case 2912: 1432 Massachusetts Ave., by University Common Real Estate Co., LLP, owner, o/b/o Otto Pizzeria, tenant. Install new entry doors at storefront.

Dr. Solet seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Public Hearings: Landmark Designation Proceedings

Case L-103: 45 Fayerweather St., (1940, Walter Bogner, architect). Fayerweather Trust, Sigmund E. Herzstein, Jr., Tr. c/o Stephen Koster, Esq., Executor.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized the preliminary landmark study report. The home of mathematician Garrett Birkhoff, it was designed in the International style by Walter Bogner, professor of architecture at Harvard's Graduate School of Design. The red brick exterior had been salvaged from a Back Bay home. Mr. Sullivan further described the house and landscape, and the property's significance for its architecture and associations with Birkhoff and Bogner. He reviewed the draft guidelines and recommended that the Commission send the City Council a positive recommendation for designation.

Dr. Solet inquired about the garage. Mr. Sullivan replied that it had been converted to living space in the 1980s.

Todd Stuart of 9R Follen Street noted that he and Diane Beaudoin had been hired as real estate brokers to market the property. While they hoped to find an owner who would appreciate the home's architecture and history, he asked about the possibility of additions as the house was only 2,700 square feet on a large lot. Mr. Sullivan described the review criteria for such an addition and encouraged potential owners to consult with the staff for design feedback and procedural guidance.

Mr. King noted that the sunken garden was a structure, as defined in the ordinance, and was a significant part of the design. He suggested that the guidelines be expanded to include recommended preservation and treatment for the garden structures (foundation walls of a former house on the site).

Philip Cronin of 3 Lincoln Lane commented that it was a very important house and deserved landmark status. Garrett Birkhoff was one of the most eminent mathematicians in the country. The uniqueness of the architecture increased its value. He noted that Lincoln Lane neighbors had always been able to work out zoning issues to mutual satisfaction and without objections to the Board of Zoning Appeal.

Annette LaMond of 7 Riedesel Avenue remarked that Ruth Birkhoff was one of the key persons responsible for the restoration of Black's Nook at Fresh Pond. There was information about her in the archives of the Cambridge Plant and Garden Club, which she could provide.

Mr. King closed public comment and accepted Ms. LaMond's offer for the information. He recommended that more be added to the report about Ms. Birkhoff. He noted that Garrett Birkhoff had contributed to the Cambridge community as well as the Harvard community.

Ms. Berg moved to find the property eligible for landmark designation, for the reasons given in the report and as defined in the ordinance. She further moved to forward the report to the City Council with a favorable recommendation for designation, after making the recommended additions to the report as mentioned previously. Mr. Bibbins seconded the motion, which passed 6-0 without further discussion.

Kendall Square Landmark Group. Massachusetts Institute of Technology:
Case L-100: Kendall Square Building, 238 Main St. (1917, William Mowll)
Case L-101: Hammett Building, 264 Main St. (1915, Densmore & LeClear)
Case L-102: Suffolk Engraving Building, 292 Main St., (1920, John Spofford)

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized the preliminary landmark designation study report for the three Kendall Square properties. He described the architecture, history, and significance of each building, as well as the general planning issues for the whole group within the larger Kendall Square setting. The buildings represent peoples' livelihoods, occupations, and skills as well as important industries of Cambridge's industrial past. He described the backgrounds of the architects who designed the buildings. The three buildings together constituted an ensemble. With proposals for up to 980,000 additional square feet of lab and office space in the vicinity, these smaller buildings were vulnerable. Community planning discussions were ongoing. The latest design proposal from MIT would preserve all three buildings, lowering the first floor height of the Suffolk building to grade level. He made a correction to the report about the cornice of the Suffolk building, which appeared original. He recommended that the Commission find the properties eligible for landmark designation for the reasons described in the report and as defined in the ordinance, but to continue the hearing and not forward any recommendation to the City Council so as to allow for more time for community planning discussions.

Mr. Bibbins asked if the Kendall Square Building had been constructed after the subway was completed. Mr. Sullivan replied in the affirmative. The subway was the catalyst for the development of Kendall Square.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place asked what it would mean to find the properties eligible for landmark designation, but not actually send them on for designation. Who were the other interested parties men-

tioned in the report? Mr. Sullivan said the finding of eligibility was a way to convey the Commission's opinion about the properties' significance. Such a finding would be combined with a request to MIT to extend the interim protection period. The other interested parties in the Kendall Square planning process were numerous. The Kendall Square Committee consisted of representatives from various groups. The discussions had been going on for over a year with many different voices from the community.

Michael Owu of MIT said his office had been working closely with city staff to discuss planning and design options. The intent was now to keep all three buildings. He agreed to a 60-day continuance and extension of the interim protections for the properties.

Bob Simha of 6 Blanchard Road hoped the Commission would keep in mind the rich range of agendas for Kendall Square. There were some groups advocating for more open space. He noted that MIT intended to erect a 25 story building directly behind the Suffolk and Hammett buildings.

Mr. King closed the public comment period. He said the recommended finding would convey that the Commission was prepared to recommend landmark designation but was willing to wait for some resolution in the community planning process.

Dr. Solet mentioned that there were preservation options other than landmarking. Mr. Sullivan described other tools such as easements or a protocol with MIT such as the Commission had with Harvard. He recommended landmarking, however, because it was direct and predictable.

Dr. Solet moved to confirm the eligibility of the three properties for designation for the reasons set forth in the report, and to accept MIT's offer to extend the interim protections for 60 days. Mr. Irving seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

Public Hearing: Neighborhood Conservation District (NCD) Appeal Proceedings

Case MC-4030: 13 Bigelow St., by Pierre & Marie Humblet. Consider owners' appeal of a decision of the Mid Cambridge NCD Commission.

Ms. Burks showed slides of the property and summarized the case. She noted that the minutes of the Mid Cambridge NCD Commission hearing of May 7 were approved on July 9 and distributed to the Commission for review, along with the complete record of the application for a Certificate of Hardship for alteration of the stone wall and construction of a driveway.

Mr. King said the Commission did not typically substitute its own judgment for that of an NCD commission. Unless the NCD commission had ignored evidence, denied due process, or exceeded its authority, the Historical Commission should respect its decision. He understood that the Humblets were interested in having a conclusion to the available administrative procedures so that they could demonstrate to the Land Court that they had exhausted those options. Personally, he would consider the lack of access and denial of a parking space as a hardship and he hoped that the Land Court would grant that access.

Vincent Panico, attorney for the Humblets, indicated that his clients were stuck in a circular problem, wanting a driveway for parking and not being able to get one approved without resolution in court first. He asked for a decision from the Commission so that he could return to the Land Court with that information.

After consulting the language of the ordinance, Mr. Bibbins moved to make a determination not to reverse the determination of the Mid Cambridge NCD Commission with respect to the Humblets' application for a Certificate of Hardship, heard on May 7. Mr. Ferrara seconded the motion, which passed 5-1 with Dr. Solet opposed.

Mr. Panico asked if there was a procedural bar preventing his clients from returning to the Mid Cambridge NCD Commission. Mr. Sullivan replied that there was no such restriction.

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 2828 (amendment): 6 Longfellow Pk., by Jonathan & Maggie Seelig. Amend previous approval to include alterations to windows and door sizes and locations and replacement of all windows.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the property.

Steven Hart, the architect, reviewed the proposed amendments to the design, including changing some window openings and replacing all the windows with new windows by the Millwork Door & Window Company. He compared the most recently approved elevations with the new proposal dated June 20, 2012. The windows on the south side of the house would be changed to doors to access the porch.

Mr. Ferrara asked how the porch was currently accessed. Mr. Hart replied that one had to either use the oversized windows or go around the house.

Mr. Irving asked why all the windows were proposed for replacement. Mr. Hart replied that they were single-paned, required storms, were deteriorated, and contained lead paint. The owners desired a crisp fit and finish with thermal panes and no storms. He did not think the windows were original to the 1901 house. They would be replicated with thermal glazing and some resulting change in the depth of the muntins. The 7/8" width of the muntins would remain the same, as would the dimensions of the sash and sills.

Mr. Sullivan expressed concern that full window replacement could result in skinning of the house down to the sheathing and replacement with all new siding. What would be left of the original? Mr. Hart agreed that full replacement would trigger the need to replace the clapboards. All the trim details would be restored on the front part of the house, including the rake, trim, cornerboards, and water table. Greg Mr. Martin, of the Millwork Door & Window Company, said that just the sash could be replaced, saving the window frame, etc. The storm windows detracted from the appearance of the windows.

Mr. Irving explained the goal to protect historic building material wherever possible. All the issues named could be addressed by qualified window repair contractor. Storm windows served to protect the original windows. He commended the quality of the proposed window by Millwork Door & Window Company, but he was not convinced that it was necessary to replace the windows, especially at the front where they were most visible.

Dr. Solet asked if the sample sash was typical of existing conditions. Mr. Hart replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Berg asked about the longevity of the new windows. Mr. Martin said the manufacturer warranted the insulated glass for 10 years.

Mr. Sullivan said there was not enough information provided to indicate that the existing windows needed to be replaced. The windows on the front and side elevations of the front block of the house should be preserved.

Mr. Irving said he would be happy to have a site visit, but he was already familiar with the house and the windows were eminently salvageable. He noted that the new windows to be added on the 2nd floor of the south elevation were previously approved to be single glazed with storms, to match the existing adjacent windows.

Mr. Hart told Dr. Solet that the shutters would be replicated if they could not be re-used.

There being no comments or questions from the public, Mr. King closed the public comment period and reiterated that it was the policy of the Commission to maintain original fabric where possible.

Mr. Ferrara said that he had no objections to the proposed changes to locations and sizes of windows. Ms. Berg asked if the Millwork Door & Window Co. windows were preferred to the Marvin's previously proposed for the rear of the house. Mr. Irving said the new product was an upgrade.

Dr. Solet asked if new and old windows would be adjacent. Mr. Irving indicated that they would not.

Mr. Irving moved to approve the changes depicted in the bubbles on the proposed elevations and to approve the Millwork Door & Window Company's door and windows in those locations and instead of the previously described Marvin Architect Series, at the discretion of the applicants, but to deny the replacement of historic wood windows on the north, west and south elevations of the main part of the house on the grounds that there was insufficient evidence that they could not be repaired and that replacement otherwise was incongruous to the stated policy of the Commission. He further moved to delegate to the staff approval of the extent and construction details of the replacement of clapboards and trim on the front block of the house. Mr. Ferrara seconded the motion, which passed 6-0 without further discussion.

Case 2908: 153 Brattle St., by Tom & Jeanne Hagerty. Demolish garage; construct new underground garage; related work to driveway and retaining walls.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the existing conditions and design of the house. He noted that the Commission had met on site recently and was familiar with the property.

Guy Grassi, the architect, presented a proposal for an underground garage. He distributed renderings and a site plan to demonstrate the before and after conditions. The existing garage would be removed and a driveway installed that would start sloping down at the rear point of the existing garage. Stone retaining walls would be built along the sides of the ramp. He described the proposed paving and wall materials as well as plantings that would obscure the view of the slope except from a straight-on view from the gate. The existing retaining wall would be rebuilt. A planter would place the garage door in shadow. The public's view of the west side of the house would be improved by removing the garage. The plinth would also be visible from the side. There would be 2' of planting medium on top of the garage to accommodate plants and shrubs. The granite steps would be reinstalled in the same location.

Dr. Solet said it was an interesting design and a creative solution. Would the retaining walls be stone veneer? Mr. Grassi replied that the veneer would be 8 or 9" deep and would match the stone of the existing wall. The mortar could be set back to provide the appearance of a dry-laid wall. Dr. Solet asked about snow removal and backing out. Mr. Grassi indicated the different ways snow could be removed. There would be room in the garage to turn the cars around.

John Gilmore of 47 Reservoir Street noted that the existing fence and gate was not solid and would not fully obscure the view of the sloped driveway and garage door. The ramp would be a very visible feature. The design was incongruous to the historic district and would detract from the public's enjoyment of the house and property from the public way. It would be a bad precedent.

Ann Kania of 175 Brattle Street asked if the house would be accessed from inside the garage. Mr. Grassi replied in the affirmative.

Annette LaMond of 7 Redeisel Avenue asked if parking on the driveway was proposed. Mr. Grassi replied in the negative. Ms. LaMond said the house and the existing parking arrangements were a known quantity to the Hagertys when they bought the property.

Elizabeth Bierer said the ramped driveway at 1 Follen Place was set way back behind the neighboring houses. It would be an error to change the pastoral setting for this home.

Mr. King noted the receipt of letters in opposition to the proposal from Mr. or Ms. LaMond, Pullman, Edgerly, Koerner, and Gilmore.

Ms. Berg said this proposal would be too disruptive to the historic landscape. The new plantings on top of the garage would not look as natural as described. Much of the existing plant material would die.

Mr. Irving said he did not consider the proposed design appropriate to the property. The negative volume would be incongruous. He regretted that the idea for an underground garage had been planted during the discussion of the previous case. He was not able to support it.

Mr. King said that although he liked the idea of opening up the view of the side of the house, the ramped driveway would be incongruous to its setting.

Mr. Bibbins said the attempts to conceal the ramp with lots of materials only drew attention to it. It would be better if done as calmly as possible.

Dr. Solet agreed the concept could be improved, but a 7' drop was not much over the available length of driveway. It would not be cavernous. It was beneficial to viewing the landscape structures and the side of the house. Unlike the previous proposal, this driveway would not cut through the terrace, but would dip below it.

Mr. Sullivan observed that the proposal was before the Commission because of a member's suggestion at the last hearing. He encouraged the applicant to apply after he had seen an early version.

Mr. Irving moved to deny the application on the basis that excavation of the front yard of the house for a sloped driveway and underground garage would be incongruous to the historic district. Ms. Berg seconded. The Commission motion to deny was adopted by a vote of 4-2, with Dr. Solet and Mr. Bibbins opposition.

Case 2911: 7 Follen St., by Florence Darwin. Replace and alter two windows and the roof of existing sunroom.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and explained that the summer vegetation and fence obscured structures in the back of the property. The sunroom structure had been approved by the Commission in 1989.

Douglas Ruther, the architect, noted that #7 was located to the rear of #5. The two windows to be altered were located on the left side of the building on either side of the door. Mr. Sullivan noted that the windows were not visible from any public way.

Mr. Ruther described the proposed changes to the sunroom. The glass roof was leaky and would be changed to a rubber roof with a 6-sided cupola. Ms. Burks asked what the change in height of the roof would be. Mr. Ruther answered that the top of the new roof would be lower than the peak of the existing roof. Mr. Sullivan said there was a public sightline across the yard of #9, but the change to the sunroom was minimal.

Dr. Solet moved that the application be approved with a Certificate of Nonapplicability for the windows and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the sunroom. Mr. Bibbins seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

Case 2914: 126 Brattle St., by Brown & Brattle Realty Trust. Overall exterior renovation of house including repairs, alterations, and painting.

Mr. Sullivan presented views of the house, now obscured by dense plantings, and a photo of ca. 1965 that showed its original appearance.. The house was designed by Ralph Adams Cram.

Charles Myer, the architect, described the restoration of the house and the proposed alterations. The plantings would be trimmed back significantly. The roof over the entry door would become copper. The address numerals in the door would be replaced with bottle-bottom glass. The glass with the numerals would be saved and stored. A bank of casement windows with energy panels and leaded glass would be added on the east elevation. The added shed dormer on the south elevation would be modified to restore the corners of the roof. The utilities would be buried and the house painted. He described a proposed trellis to hide the side of the garage. A landscape plan was not yet complete, but they would return to the commission with that at a later date.

Dr. Solet asked if the house would be stripped of its shingles. Mr. Myer replied that it was anticipated that about 15% of the shingles would be replaced.

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

Mr. Irving moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as submitted, subject to staff approval of construction details including but not limited to the front door, paint color, and trellis. Mr. Ferrara seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Public Hearing: Demolition Review

Case D-1271: 18 White St., by Porter Square Properties, LLC. Demolish building (1872).

Ms. Burks showed slides and summarized her memo about the architecture and history of the 1872 Italianate house. It was one of three built by a family of carpenters on White Street and had been occupied by a local businessman and a postal clerk and their families. The houses were of the same scale and side-hall configuration. They were the last residential structures on the Cambridge portion of White Street, which had once been entirely residential. The north side of the street had been cleared in the 1950s for the Porter Square Shopping Center.

Peter Quinn, the architect, described the zoning that allowed construction at a height of 50'. The lot was larger than those of the adjacent houses and abutted the parking structure and loading area of the Porter Square Galleria. The proposed 5-story building would consist of 8 residential units, 8 parking spaces, and an elevator. It

would require a large-project review by the planning staff, but did not need zoning relief from the BZA or Planning Board. The building would be constructed with materials such as fiber-cement panels, steel, spandrel glass, and wood siding.

Dr. Solet asked about the location of mechanical equipment. Mr. Quinn answered that there would be a small basement under the stair well and the air conditioning units would be located on the roof.

Beverly Lee of 22 White Street said the 5-story building would block her light and would be much taller than anything else in the area. She noted that the street was one-way beyond the entrance to the parking lot of the Porter Square Shopping Center, but that residents frequently drove the wrong way. That would likely occur at 18 White Street as well, which would be dangerous.

John Howard of 8 Cogswell Avenue, president of the Porter Square Neighbors Association, said the plan reminded him of the unpopular building at the corner of Beech Street and Massachusetts Avenue.

Lucy Lee of 22 White Street said the three houses shared a common appearance and history. It would be unfortunate if something couldn't be done that would incorporate the existing building.

Susan Hunziker of 80 Forest Street did not agree with the proponents that the new building would restore a residential quality to the street. She shared Beverly Lee's concerns about traffic safety. She urged the Commission to consider the value of the existing house. It was small but had meaningful integrity.

Mr. Brandon urged the Commission to find the house significant and preferably preserved and to impose a delay so as to allow time to explore alternative designs. These three houses, and those on the Somerville end of the street, helped to preserve the original character of the street, which was diminishing over time. The proposed building would negatively impact the street and would be incompatible for the block. It would not meet the purposes of the zoning overlay district. He thought it would require a special permit from the Planning Board because of the stilts and parking at the first floor.

Sean Hope, the attorney for the applicant, described the Business C zoning regulations. He noted that the project did not need a Certificate of Appropriateness. This was the only one of the three lots that would allow this type of project with no variance or special permit. It needed only a large project review. The other two Italianate houses would remain to mark the transition from Massachusetts Avenue to smaller scale buildings.

Ben Rogan, the applicant, indicated that he looked forward to working with the Commission staff, Planning staff, and neighborhood groups about the details of the project. He would try to be responsive to their ideas. The residents of the new units would benefit from proximity of the MBTA in the same way that the original residents of White Street benefitted from proximity to the train station.

Dr. Solet asked Mr. Rogan if he had considered other options that would make use of the existing building. Mr. Rogan said that the building was very run-down when he and his partners purchased it. It was occupied by homeless people and had considerable water damage. They had made significant improvements, but it would not make for a workable or efficient plan to add on to it.

Mr. Irving moved to find the house significant for the reasons stated in the staff report and as defined in the ordinance. Dr. Solet seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Ms. Berg moved to find the building preferably preserved in the context of the proposed replacement, and as defined in the ordinance. Dr. Solet seconded, and the motion passed 5-1, with Mr. Irving opposed.

Determination of Procedure: Demolition Review

Hear testimony from Steven Samuel of 7 Blanchard Road regarding permitting and construction issues relative to 8 Blanchard Road demolition review (Case D-1249).

Mr. King reported that he had received a letter from Steven Samuel of 7 Blanchard Road raising concerns about the new building being constructed at 8 Blanchard Road.

Mr. Sullivan provided some background. The previous house had been razed without a demolition permit. ISD stopped the work, and the Commission reviewed the matter at a series of public hearings. The owner modified the design to make it more compatible with its context, and finally satisfied the Commission that it would be in the public interest to allow construction to proceed. On the Commission's recommendation ISD had lifted the stop work order in February. The staff noted that the construction drawings they reviewed in March differed in some respects from the schematic plans the Commission approved in February, but concluded that none of the differences reflected issues that had engaged the Commission during its hearings. Once construction began Mr. Samuel conveyed his objections to the staff, which placed him on the agenda for the current meeting.

Mr. King noted he had not been present at the February meeting.

Edwin Englander, counsel for Mr. Samuel, reviewed the language of the demolition delay ordinance. He said the Commission did not have the discretion to waive a two-year delay of demolition, though he was aware that it had done so in the past. He requested an immediate stop-work order and an opportunity to place the matter on the August agenda so that they could discuss the problems that had come up with the owner of #8.

Mr. King noted that the Commission did not grant permits or order that work be stopped. Those actions were made by Inspectional Services department. The Commissions made findings and recommendations.

Mr. Englander said that per the enforcement clause, 2.78.120A, the Commission could take action necessary to ensure compliance. He took that to mean that the Commission had authority to grant a stop-work order.

Mr. Samuel said that he had supported the Kouyoumjians' request for retroactive demolition approval in December and overlooked reasons not to support the request. He accepted the design reviewed by the Commission in February, which placed the replacement building on the pre-existing foundation and would therefore have been 15.5' away from his own house at #7. He had understood the approved height to have been 28'-9". The Commission staff had signed off on permit plans that reversed the location of the porch on the rear elevation, putting it closer to #7. Changes had also been made to the dimensions of the foundation. The height approved was 32'-6". The catchment basins were constructed on the side of the Kouyoumjians' property closest to his own. The project rarely had a police detail. Cars and trucks routinely blocked traffic and obstructed the sidewalk. There had been changes to the grade of the building. The height would exceed 32'-6". Work hours exceeded those permitted, and the safety fence was not intact. The owner was his own contractor. The neighbor at #9 Blanchard Road told him that the construction crew had removed part of her fence and relocated the boundary markers. He asked for reinstatement of the two-year moratorium.

Mr. Sullivan said the ISD Commissioner had confirmed that the work conformed to zoning requirements and to the plans on file and that there were no grounds for stopping work.

Mr. King said the Commission could convey to the ISD Commissioners that a serious complaint had been received from the abutter suggesting that the terms of lifting the moratorium had been violated.

Mr. Brandon said it was good public policy to require strict conformance so as to prevent future skirting of the ordinance.

Mr. Irving moved to instruct the staff to tell the ISD Commissioner of the Commission's great concern about Mr. Samuel's complaint and to request that the matter be reviewed again by the building department. If the complaint had merit, the work should be stopped. Ms. Berg seconded the motion, which passed 6-0. Mr. King indicated that the August agenda should include an update on the matter and a public hearing, if appropriate.

Open Meeting Law

Consider draft response to Open Meeting Law complaint re: 111 Clifton Street demolition review matter.

Mr. King reported that the Law Department had prepared a draft of a response letter to the Open Meeting Law complaint filed by Rick Snedeker about the project at 111 Clifton Street.

Mr. Brandon asked if copies of the draft response were available for the public. Mr. King said it would be available as soon as it was finalized, signed and issued.

Mr. Irving moved to instruct the staff to sign the letter and forward it to the Law Department for issuance. Ms. Berg seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Preservation Grants

PG 12-8: 237 Allston St., by Just-A-Start. New storm windows.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the house and summarized the new application for \$4,900 for the installation of storm windows. The Commission had previously declined to provide a grant for replacement windows.

Mr. Irving moved to approve the requested grant. Dr. Solet seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

IPG 12-5: 134 Norfolk Street, by St. Mary's Church. Repoint masonry

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and reported on the previous grants to St. Mary's Church. The requested grant of \$53,000 was to rebuild the rust-jacked steel lintels of the building occupied by the Prospect Hill Academy.

Mr. Irving moved to grant \$50,000 toward the project. Ms. Berg seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Minutes

Mr. Irving moved to approve the February minutes as submitted. Ms. Berg seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes of Messrs. Bibbins, Irving, and Ferrara, and Ms. Berg. Dr. Solet and Mr. King, who had not been present at the February meeting, abstained.

Mr. King requested that the June minutes be tabled until the August meeting.

New Business: Determination of Procedure: Landmark Designation Proceeding

Grace Methodist Church, 56 Magazine St. Petition of registered voters to initiate a landmark designation study.

Mr. King recommended that consideration of the landmark petition be added to the August agenda. Mr. Irving so moved, Mr. Ferrara seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Bibbins moved to adjourn. Dr. Solet seconded the motion, which passed unanimously at 12:15 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public
Who Signed Attendance Sheet 7/12/12**

Michael Brandon	27 Seven Pines Ave
Todd Stuart	9R Follen St
Diane Beaudoin	9R Follen St
Philip Cronin	3 Lincoln Ln
Annette LaMond	7 Riedesel Ave
Charles Myer	875 Main St
Michael Goldberger	22 Putnam Ave
Michael Owu	238 Main St
Sarah Gallop	11-245, 77 Mass Ave
Thayer Donham	77 Mass Ave, NE49-2100
John Gilmore	47 Reservoir St
Elizabeth Gilmore	47 Reservoir St
Alice Dunn	875 Main St
Stephen Hart	50 Church St, Belmont 02478
Jennifer Lyford	50 Church St, Belmont 02478
O. Robert Simha	6 Blanchard Rd
Ben Rogan	18 White St
Lucy Lee	22 White St
Beverly Lee	22 White St
John Howard	8 Cogswell Ave
Michael Brandon	27 Seven Pines Ave
Susan Hunziker	80 Orchard St
Elizabeth Bierer	5 Follen St
Roy Bercaw	85 Prescott St

Town is Cambridge unless otherwise indicated.