The Lechmere National Bank building of 1917 is historically significant for its important associations with the economic history of Cambridge and the prominent business and political leaders who founded and led the bank, including Otis S. Brown and Fred B. Wheeler, the bank’s second and third presidents.

The building is also architecturally significant as an important example of Neo-Classical commercial architecture in East Cambridge. Landmark designation will protect the exterior architectural features of the building, guide the owners in appropriate restoration methods during the building’s conversion for a new commercial use, and ensure the appropriateness of the proposed development of the site. The designation incorporates plans for a new retail addition which can be constructed without further review.

Sarah Burks
Cambridge Historical Commission
December 21, 2017
I. Location and Status

A. Address and Zoning

The Lechmere National Bank building at 225 Cambridge Street (#227 in the Assessor’s database) occupies a 17,963 square foot lot (Map 20 Lot 75) on the northeast corner of Cambridge and Third streets. The property is located in a Business A zoning district along Cambridge Street, which abuts a C-1 residential district on Gore Street. The Business A district allows residential or business uses, with a 1.0 FAR and 35 foot height limit for business use. The development parcel includes a second lot (Map 20 Lot 98) at 207-209 Cambridge Street that measures 5,016 square feet and is occupied by a frame mixed use building and concrete block garages.

Assessors map, Dec. 2017. The premises to be designated, Map 20 Lot 75, is outlined in red. Cambridge GIS.

Cambridge Zoning Map
North side of Cambridge Street looking east. Bank building is at the corner of Third Street in the center of this view.

B. Ownership and Occupancy

In June 2015 Mark Lechmere LLC purchased both 207-209 and 225 Cambridge Street for a combined purchase price of $10,175,000. The deeds were recorded in the Middlesex South Registry of deeds in Book 65660, Pages 163 and 168 on July 1, 2015. The bank building is built to the sidewalk on Cambridge and Third streets. A large parking lot is situated behind the bank and to the east is a driveway. The bank lot had curb cuts on Third and Gore streets. The building was occupied until recently by Citizens Bank. The FY18 combined assessed value for both lots and the existing buildings, according to the online assessor’s database is $3.09M.

C. Area Description

The Lechmere National Bank building fronts on Cambridge Street, the busy commercial artery of East Cambridge. Third Street is a major north-south connection between Monsignor O’Brien Highway and Kendall Square. This is a high-traffic intersection, while Gore Street, on the property’s northern border, is a largely residential street with more local traffic.

The bank sits opposite the imposing Middlesex County Registry of Deeds and Probate Court building that takes up the full frontage of Cambridge Street between Second and Third streets. Built in 1896, the first floor of this monumental red brick building is set high above the street. The Registry’s columned temple front may have inspired the classical form of the Lechmere National Bank building, though on a much smaller, more human scale.

The north side of Cambridge between Third and Sciarappa streets consists of an uninterrupted stretch of commercial buildings and terminates with the St. Francis of Assisi church. In contrast, the block between Second and Third streets has many “missing teeth” where nineteenth century commercial buildings were demolished for parking lots. Many of these demolitions occurred in the 1960s and 1970s.
Cambridge St. looking west. 207 Cambridge St. (Gould House and Bakery of 1857) at center and 227 Cambridge St. (Lechmere National Bank) marked with arrow at left.
D. Context of this Designation Report

Applications to demolish the one-story former Lechmere National Bank building and the three-story Gould House and Bakery at 207-209 Cambridge Street were received on January 11, 2016. The combined lots were proposed for redevelopment with a single commercial building for a CVS store and a related parking lot. The applicants requested a continuance and submitted a revised proposal in April 2016 that would have incorporated the bank’s south and west walls into the new building. The Cambridge Historical Commission found both buildings to be significant and preferably preserved in the context of the proposal, thereby initiating a six-month delay of demolition.

The applicants spent several months meeting with members of the community, primarily through a subcommittee of the East Cambridge Planning Team. In December 2016 they returned with a new design by Prellwitz Chilinski Associates for a mixed-use proposal with first floor retail and 46 units of housing on three upper floors. In the context of this design, the Historical Commission found 207 Cambridge Street to be no longer preferably preserved. At the same hearing, the Commission considered whether to initiate a landmark study, that being the fifth month of the six-month demolition delay. The Commission initiated a landmark study for the bank building (to be preserved in the new proposal) for the purpose of ensuring an appropriate exterior restoration. The Commission declined to initiate a landmark study for 207 Cambridge Street. Citizens’ landmark petitions for both buildings were filed on November 22, 2016 but the Commission’s own hearing in December preceded the January hearings on the petitions.

The mixed-use development proposal had the support of the East Cambridge Planning Team, but another group of neighbors objected to the density of the building and the below-grade parking to be accessed from Gore Street. The necessary zoning petition expired and the applicants returned to the Historical Commission in August 2017 with another design.

The new design by BKA Architects of Boston and Brockton preserves the bank and demolishes the Gould House and Bakery. A one-story addition would be constructed around the bank, which would become part of the selling space for the proposed tenant, a CVS store. The Cambridge Street façade of the addition was designed in such a way that it would appear to be four contiguous buildings, each with its own storefront and cornice, but only the bank building would incorporate an active entrance on Cambridge Street. In the context of this design, the Historical Commission found 207-209 Cambridge Street to be not preferably preserved. Permitting for the project is in progress and selective interior demolition of the bank and demolition of the 1961 addition at the rear could begin early in 2018.
July 2017 design by BKA Architects. In August 2017 the CHC found 207 Cambridge Street “not preferably preserved” in the context of this proposal.

II. Description

A. Architectural Description

This one story, 30’ high cast stone building has frontage of 27 feet on Cambridge Street and 71 feet on Third Street. The bank entry is flanked by monumental Doric columns and pilasters. The base course and door trim are polished Deer Isle granite. A large three-part wood transom is centered over the doors. The classical temple design continues on the west side facing Third Street with four full-height divided-light windows providing light to the banking hall. The east wall, which was once a party wall with another bank building, is windowless. A projecting cornice with a dentil band is topped by a two-course paneled parapet. The bank was designed by architect Thomas M. James and built for Lechmere National Bank in 1917-18. James also designed the East Cambridge Savings Bank at 292 Cambridge Street in 1931. A low addition constructed on the rear (north) wall in 1961 served a drive-in teller and provided an entrance from the parking lot. This addition was designed by architects Voltz & Kimberley.
South (front) and east elevations, February 2017.

North (rear) elevation, November 2017. Rear addition (1961) is to be removed.
B. Physical Condition

The bank is in good condition with the exception of water damage to the parapet and cornice, which is most evident on the west side. The cast stone, called “composite granite” in the contemporary newspaper descriptions, has badly weathered in some areas, but not in a way that impacts the structural stability of the building. The original incised signs above the entry and along Third Street have been covered with later sign boards.

West elevation, November 2017. Cornice deterioration from water damage is evident.

South (front) elevation, November 2017.
C. Interior

Originally furnished in mahogany and marble, the bank interior was remodeled in 1941 with a new counter, screen, and resilient flooring. Several subsequent remodeling projects resulted in several layers of floor tile and carpet and new teller windows. The coffered ceiling, cornice trim, and wooden clock above the street entrance appear to be original. The bank’s vault also remains in place at the moment, but will be removed as part of the CVS store conversion.

Landmark designation does not provide protection of interior features.

Bank vault.  
Clock over entry doors (top right) and vault (middle).

Bank interior from mezzanine, looking toward entrance.
III. History and Significance of the Property

In the 17th and 18th centuries, the present neighborhood of East Cambridge was just a small upland surrounded by two rivers and extensive salt marshes that completely isolated it from the rest of Cambridge. Although the first house was constructed there as early as the 1630s when it was known as Graves Neck and most of the land was owned in the 18th century by a wealthy Tory Richard Lechmere and known as Lechmere Point, no development took place, and the area was chiefly valued for its salt hay. All that changed after the Revolution when land speculator Andrew Craigie purchased over 300 acres between 1795 and 1808, completed a bridge in 1809 linking the upland directly to Boston, and organized the Lechmere Point Corporation in 1810 to lay out and sell building lots.

The Lechmere Point Corporation’s street plan was accepted in 1811. This contained two adjacent grids connected at the bridgehead and stretched from what is now Second Street to Sixth Street and Charles Street to the Miller’s River; a few additional streets were planned to the west and south but these ran through impassible marsh. Blocks on the main north-south grid were uniformly 200’ x 400’ and were divided into 50’ x 100’ lots, although the lots along the main thoroughfare of Cambridge Street were only 25’ x 100’. Lots were sold at auction only to proprietors to resell or develop.

The northeast corner of Cambridge and Third streets was known in the late nineteenth century as Hovey’s Corner due to the location of Horatio Hovey’s grocery store in the same location that the bank is today. The grocery was a frame building built in 1876. Adjacent to the grocery was a 3-story bank building of 1864 and a 3-story Odd Fellows hall.

North side of Cambridge Street, corner of Third in an 1875 stereopticon view. Hovey’s grocery store is at left. The Cambridge National Bank is shown with round arched windows. The Odd Fellows hall at center has a mansard roof, and 207-209 Cambridge Street (Gould House and Bakery) is at the far right.
The “missing teeth” in the block today, between the bank and 207-209 Cambridge Street, include the three-story brick building constructed for the Cambridge National Bank in 1864 at 221 Cambridge Street and a three-story Mansard social hall built for the International Order of Odd Fellows in 1862 at 215-217 Cambridge Street. These two buildings were demolished in 1971 and another four-story brick building of 1889 at 203 Cambridge was demolished in 1976. When these buildings were replaced by parking lots, the block lost its grandeur and the remaining buildings were left without their commercial context.

Susan Maycock provided a detailed history of the financial institutions of East Cambridge in the Historical Commission’s 1988 publication, *East Cambridge*. An excerpt is provided below.

Commercial buildings in East Cambridge are relatively modest in comparison with its civic structures. Its population was too small, and downtown Boston too close, for the area to develop a significant business district. Of the commercial buildings along Cambridge Street, only the banks exploited the architectural potential of their sites.

Since the 1850s, the banks have all been within a few hundred yards of each other on Cambridge Street. … In the 1850s, two banks were founded in quick succession. The Lechmere Bank, chartered in 1853, occupied a new building on the southwest corner of Cambridge and Second streets. The following year, the East Cambridge Savings Bank was incorporated and occupied rooms in the Lechmere Bank building.

That two banks existed where there had been none may seem curious, but they served different purposes and different clienteles. The Lechmere Bank was a profit-making commercial institution that made business loans to its customers, while the savings bank was a nonprofit institution that invested its depositors’ money in order to pay them interest.
In 1865, the Lechmere Bank was reorganized as the Lechmere National Bank under the National Bank Act of 1864, which created a banking system whereby commercial banks were incorporated under charters granted by the federal government. The idea was to provide a uniform national currency; under the old system, each bank had issued its own notes. Savings banks, on the other hand, were chartered by the commonwealth to encourage thrift among people of modest means.

The [first] Lechmere Bank building was erected in 1853 by Ephraim Buttrick and Lorenzo Marrett, who were also members of the savings bank’s first board. This circumstance may explain how the banks came to share the same building, as they did until 1872. In 1866, the Lechmere Bank purchased the structure from Buttrick and Marrett. Of pressed brick trimmed in brownstone, the building set the conservative tone that other East Cambridge banks followed in later decades …

In 1895, when Middlesex County acquired the site for the present Registry of Deeds, the [original Lechmere] bank was moved to the southeast corner of the same intersection and turned so its original Cambridge Street façade faced Second Street. It was demolished in 1965.

In 1872, the Lechmere and East Cambridge Savings banks parted company. The savings bank purchased the estate of Dr. Anson Hooker (a former trustee and charter member of the corporation), on Cambridge Street between Second and Third streets, and operated a banking room on the first floor of his former house. The savings bank acquired its present site at 292 Cambridge Street and erected its first building exclusively for bank use in 1894.

Cambridge Street looking east in 1934. The bank is pictured on far left.
The Lechmere Bank moved to 337 Cambridge Street in 1895, when its original building was taken by the county, and in 1904 moved to 221 Cambridge Street, the site of the Cambridge National Bank, [with which it merged] that year. In 1917, the bank hired the Boston architect Thomas M. James to design a new building on the adjoining lot at 225 Cambridge Street.

James provided a structure of cast stone in imitation of white limestone, with monumental Doric columns. This Roman temple is the very image of conservative dignity that banks on almost every Main Street sought to emulate in the 1920s. In 1936, Lechmere merged with the National Bank of Malden and the Everett Bank & Trust to form the Middlesex County National Bank, which in turn evolved into BayBank/Middlesex [and eventually into Citizens Bank, the most recent occupant].

Not to be outdone, the East Cambridge Savings Bank hired James in 1931 to design a new headquarters on the site of its Neoclassical building, diagonally across the street from the Lechmere Bank. This building was far more original than James’ earlier work. A granite cube pierced by arched windows on three sides houses the main banking room… The building greatly benefited from James’ collaboration with the New York sculptor Paul Fjelde, who designed the elaborate exterior carving as well as the paired bronze doors.

Thomas M. James (1875-1942) was born in Cambridge and trained under Boston architect Samuel J. Brown. He opened his first office in 1897 and practiced with several different partners until 1909, when he became a sole practitioner. The firm of Thomas M. James Co., architects and engineers, continued after his death, and was last listed in the Boston directories in the 1960s. James specialized in banks and office buildings, and executed important commissions in Boston, New York City, Arlington, Fall River, Framingham, Lexington, Lowell, Lynn, Newburyport, and Springfield, Mass., New London, Conn., and Fort Wayne, Indiana, among others. With a partner, he designed the Schubert Theater in Boston (1910). Locally, his firm executed 12 commissions in Cambridge in 1901-1931, plus a branch building for the East Cambridge Savings Bank in Inman Square in 1965.

The individuals involved in founding the bank were successful East Cambridge businessmen. Lewis Hall (1817-1897) was born in East Cambridge in 1817. His family operated the Jesse Hall & Sons lumber company. In 1860 he founded Flint & Hall wholesale lumber company. Upon the incorporation of Cambridge as a city in 1846, Hall was elected to the first class of the Board of Aldermen. He helped to organize the Lechmere National Bank and became its first president, a post he retained for 45 years.

Ephraim Buttrick (1793-1874) was born in Concord and graduated Harvard College in 1819. He was admitted to the Middlesex County Bar Association in 1823. He shared a seat on the first Board of Aldermen with Lewis Hall in 1846. He resided in East Cambridge until 1851 when he built a house at 2 Divinity Avenue. That house has been moved twice and is now located at 6 Prescott Street. Buttrick’s net worth of $100,000 made him one of the richest men in the state in 1851 when a pamphlet identifying the 1,496 richest men was published by A. Forbes and J. W. Greene.
Lorenzo Marrett (1816-1887) was born in Standish, Maine and graduated from Bowdoin College in 1838. He practiced law with a specialty in the administration of estates. He joined the Board of Aldermen in 1849 and was active in local and state politics. At the time of his death, he was residing in a house at 24 Highland Avenue.

Otis S. Brown (1845-1929) was president of the bank in 1917 when it erected the new building at 225 Cambridge Street. Brown was born in Billerica and was a veteran of the Civil War. He moved to Cambridge in 1865. He established a hay and grain business on Bridge Street, the Otis S. Brown Co. He resided in East Cambridge until 1886 when he bought the Gov. Eustis house at 1725 Massachusetts Avenue. He succeeded Lewis Hall as bank president in 1897 and served until his retirement in 1926.

The third president was Fred B. Wheeler. Wheeler was a graduate of the Boston English High School and immediately entered the banking industry as an employee of the Cambridge National Bank in 1890. He began working for the Lechmere National Bank in 1900. He worked his way up the ranks and was named Vice President in 1924. Upon Otis Brown’s retirement in 1926, he was promoted to President.

Ten years after moving into its new bank building, Lechmere National Bank celebrated its 75th anniversary and issued a bronze paperweight in commemoration. The paperweight shows a view of East Cambridge ca. 1853 with an inset of the 1917 building at the top of the scene.

The Old Colony Trust Company of Boston acquired the Lechmere National Bank in May 1929. The bank survived the early part of the depression, and in 1932 acquired a branch in Inman Square when it took over the Inman Trust Company. In 1935 Old Colony merged the Lechmere National Bank with the Everett Bank & Trust Co. of Everett and the Second National Bank of Malden to form the Middlesex County National Bank, which by the 1960s was the tenth largest bank in Massachusetts.
The Middlesex County National Bank and the Boston development firm of Cabot, Cabot & Forbes Co. announced plans in 1967 to build two office towers on the corners of Cambridge Street and Second and Third Streets, but neighborhood opposition squashed the zoning petition required for the proposal and the bank sold one of the corners to the city for a fire station. One similar tower was eventually built for the bank in Burlington on Route 128. The Middlesex Bank was swept up in the bank merger movement of the 1980s and the building was most recently occupied by Citizens Bank.
IV. Relationship to Criteria

A. Criteria for Landmark Designation

The enabling ordinance for landmark designation states:

The Historical Commission by majority vote may recommend for designation as a landmark any property within the City being or containing a place, structure, feature or object which it determines to be either (1) importantly associated with one or more historic persons or events, or with the broad architectural, aesthetic, cultural, political, economic or social history of the City or the Commonwealth or (2) historically or architecturally significant (in terms of its period, style, method of construction or association with a famous architect or builder) either by itself or in the context of a group of structures . . . (City Code, Article III, Chapter 2.78.180.A)

B. Relationship of Property to Criteria

The Lechmere National Bank building is historically significant under Criterion 1 for its important associations with the economic history of Cambridge and the prominent business and political leaders who founded and led the bank including Otis S. Brown and Fred B. Wheeler, the bank’s second and third presidents.

The building is also architecturally significant under Criterion 2 as an important example of a Neoclassical commercial architecture in East Cambridge. Landmark designation will protect the exterior architectural features of the building and guide the owners in appropriate restoration methods during the conversion of the building for use as a CVS.

V. Recommendations

A. Article III, Chapter 2.78.140

The purpose of landmark designation is contained in the enabling ordinance, which is to:

preserve, conserve and protect the beauty and heritage of the City and to improve the quality of its environment through identification, conservation and maintenance of . . . sites and structures which constitute or reflect distinctive features of the architectural, cultural, political, economic or social history of the City; to resist and restrain environmental influences adverse to this purpose; [and] to foster appropriate use and wider public knowledge and appreciation of such . . . structures . . .

B. Preservation Options

Landmark designation or donation of a preservation restriction are the only two options for the permanent long-term protection and preservation of the Lechmere National Bank Building.
C. Staff Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Commission find that the Lechmere National Bank building is eligible for landmark designation as defined in the ordinance for the reasons stated above and should be designated a protected landmark under Article III, Chapter 2.78. The designation should incorporate the addition of a retail store as designed by BKA Architects on plans titled “Floor Plan”, “Exterior Elevations”, and “Site Plan”, dated December 14, 2017, December 14, 2017, and October 20, 2015 (Revised October 20, 2017), respectively. An earlier version of these plans was the basis for the Historical Commission’s August 2017 decision to find 207 Cambridge Street “not preferably preserved.”

The former Lechmere National Bank maintains a prominent location on Cambridge Street and contributes to the architectural character of the neighborhood. If implemented by the City Council, landmark designation would incorporate an already-designed addition and allow the Commission to review and approve future publicly-visible exterior alterations with the goal of protecting the historic and architectural integrity of the building and its setting. The designation would not regulate use or alterations to interior features.

VI. Standards and Criteria

Under Article III, the Historical Commission is charged with reviewing any construction, demolition or alteration that affects the exterior architectural features (other than paint color) of a designated landmark. This section of the report describes exterior architectural features that are among the characteristics that led to consideration of the property as a landmark. Except as the order designating or amending the landmark may otherwise provide, the exterior architectural features described in this report should be preserved and/or enhanced in any proposed alteration or construction that affects those features of the landmark. The standards following in paragraphs A and B of this section provide guidelines for the treatment of the landmark described in this report.

A. General Standards and Criteria

Subject to review and approval of exterior architectural features under the terms of this report, the following standards shall apply:

1. Significant historic and architectural features of the landmark should be preserved.
2. Deteriorated architectural features should be repaired rather than replaced.
3. When replacement of architectural features is necessary, it should be based on documentary evidence. Restoration of missing architectural features should be considered when non-original fabric is proposed for alteration or replacement.
4. New materials should, whenever possible, match the original material in physical properties, design, color, texture, and appearance. The use of imitation replacement materials is generally discouraged.
5. The surface cleaning of a landmark should be done by the gentlest possible means. Sandblasting and other cleaning methods that damage exterior architectural features shall not be used.

6. Additions should not destroy significant exterior architectural features and should not be incongruous to the historic aspects, architectural significance, or distinct character of the landmark, neighborhood, and environment.

7. Additions should be designed in a way that, if they were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the landmark would be unimpaired.

B. Suggested Review Guidelines

1. Site Development/Additions

This designation would incorporate a retail store addition as designed by BKA Architects on plans titled “Floor Plan”, “Exterior Elevations”, and “Site Plan”, dated December 14, 2017, December 14, 2017, and October 20, 2015 (Revised October 20, 2017), respectively. Deviations from these plans and future demolition and new construction on the landmarked premises (defined as Map 20, Lot 75) will be subject to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness by the Cambridge Historical Commission.

BKA Architects, “Site Plan”, Oct. 20, 2015, Rev. 10/20/17
In general, new construction on the landmarked premises should be treated as an addition to the Lechmere National Bank building. If the CVS project is not constructed, the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation would provide useful guidance for evaluating a different project:

New additions should be designed and constructed so that the character-defining features of the historic building are not radically changed, obscured, damaged, or destroyed in the process of rehabilitation. New design should always be clearly differentiated so that the addition does not appear to be part of the historic resource.

Recommended practices include:

- Placing functions and services required for the new use in non-character-defining interior spaces rather than installing a new addition.
- Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.
- Locating the attached exterior addition at the rear or on an inconspicuous side of a historic building; and limiting its size and scale in relationship to the historic building.
- Designing new additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.
- Considering the attached exterior addition both in terms of the new use and the appearance of other buildings in the historic district or neighborhood. Design for the new work may be contemporary or may reference design motifs from the historic building. In either case, it should always be clearly differentiated from the historic building and be compatible in terms of mass, materials, relationship of solids to voids, and color.
- Designing additional stories, when required for the new use, that are set back from the wall plane and are as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the street.

The following actions are not recommended by the National Park Service:

- Expanding the size of the historic building by constructing a new addition when the new use could be met by altering non-character-defining interior space.
- Attaching a new addition so that the character-defining features of the historic building are obscured, damaged, or destroyed.
- Designing a new addition so that its size and scale in relation to the historic building are out of proportion, thus diminishing the historic character.
- Duplicating the exact form, material, style, and detailing of the historic building in the new addition so that the new work appears to be part of the historic building.
- Imitating a historic style or period of architecture in new additions, especially for contemporary uses such as drive-in banks or garages.
- Designing and constructing new additions that result in the diminution or loss of the historic character of the resource, including its design, materials, workmanship, location, or setting.
- Using the same wall plane, roof line, cornice height, materials, siding lap or window type to make additions appear to be a part of the historic building.
- Designing new additions such as multi-story greenhouse additions that obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features of the historic building.
- Constructing additional stories so that the historic appearance of the building is radically changed.

(https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation/rehab/new01.htm)

Notwithstanding the National Park Service guidelines for additions, the design by BKA Architects cited above should be incorporated into this designation as an approved plan. In the event that the owner pursues a different development proposal than the one described in these plans, the National Park Service guidelines should apply.

2. Exterior Alterations

The Historical Commission has typically delegated to staff the review and approval of construction details, including masonry restoration, window details, cornice repair, mechanical equipment, utilities, other general construction details, and material samples.

a. Masonry

Exterior materials shall be preserved insofar as practicable, except when approved for replacement. Special care should be taken to protect and maintain the cast stone and granite masonry. Repointing the mortar joints shall be done only as required, and with special care to maintain the strength, color and texture of the mortar and the profile of the joints. The masonry door surround should be preserved in place. The pair of metal entrance doors are modern replacements and may be replaced with one larger door to improve accessibility at the main entrance.

b. Fenestration

The existing windows are modern replacements that retain the historic character of the originals with divided lights. When new replacements are proposed, documentation such as the original building plans (if available) and old photographs should be studied to determine the original pattern of the lights. Preference should be given to restoring the original pattern, if different from the existing.

c. Mechanicals and Utilities

Utilities (heating, air conditioning, ventilation) should be designed for efficiency and to minimize visibility from the public way.

d. Lighting

Facility lighting fixtures should be non-obtrusive and installed in a manner that minimizes new penetrations in the cast stone masonry.

e. Signs
The applied signs at the cornice level should be removed and any existing original signage beneath it restored. New commercial signage can be accomplished with blade signs at the front corner and wall signs elsewhere on the new addition. Internal illumination of signs, if allowed, should be limited to logos and lettering.

3. Interior Features

Although interior features are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Cambridge Historical Commission, the owner is encouraged to preserve the original coffered ceilings and cornice trim as well as the clock if they can be incorporated into the new commercial use. If a drop ceiling is introduced, the owner is encouraged to preserve the original ceiling and cornice in place.

VII. Proposed Order

ORDERED:

That the Lechmere National Bank premises at 225/227 Cambridge Street, be designated as a protected landmark pursuant to Chapter 2.78, Article III, Section 2.78.180 of the Code of the City of Cambridge, as recommended by vote of the Cambridge Historical Commission on ___________, __, 2018. The premises so designated is defined as parcel 75 on Cambridge Assessor’s map 20 and the structure thereon and further as the premises described in deeds recorded in Book 66187, Page 163 at the South Middlesex Registry of Deeds.

This designation is justified by the importance of the Lechmere National Bank in the social and economic development of East Cambridge and by the significant Neo-Classical design by Boston architect Thomas M. James, a noted early 20th-century designer of banks, theaters, and apartment buildings.

The effect of this designation shall be that following the completion of a project described on plans by BKA Architects titled “Floor Plan”, “Exterior Elevations”, and “Site Plan”, dated December 14, 2017, December 14, 2017, and October 20, 2015 (Revised October 20, 2017), respectively, review by the Cambridge Historical Commission and the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness, Hardship or Non-Applicability shall be required before any construction activity can take place within the designated premises or any action can be taken affecting the appearance of the premises, that would in either case be visible from a public way. In making determinations, the Commission shall be guided by the terms of the Final Landmark Designation Report, dated ________, 2018 with respect to the designated premises, by Section VII, Standards and Criteria of said report, and by the applicable sections of Chapter 2.78, Article III, of the Cambridge Municipal Code.