

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

October 4, 2018 - 806 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge Senior Center - 6:00 P.M.

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

Members absent: Robert Crocker, *Member*; Gavin Kleespies, Paula Paris, *Alternates*

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

Public present: See attached list.

Mr. Irving called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M. He made introductions, reviewed hearing procedures, and noted that public comment would be limited to three minutes per person.

Public Hearing: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 4000: 110-120 Brookline St. and 108-112 Pacific St., by Ledgemoor, LLC. Exterior renovations of EMF Building including re-opening of original windows, preserving projecting sign, constructing accessible means of egress, re-building CMU walls, recladding select walls, installing new windows, installing pad-mounted transformer.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the building and its various additions. He noted that a landmark petition had been presented at a previous hearing and the Commission had initiated a designation study. The current application was for a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the building, which was currently protected as if it were already designated. He explained that the Commission's jurisdiction did not extend to how the building would be used or interior arrangements. He displayed images of the building's original design from the 1920s with the original small-light factory sash and the storefront addition of 1949. Many of the openings had been closed up. He noted that interior demolition and renovations were underway with a building permit that pre-dated the landmark study.

James Rafferty, attorney for the owner, summarized the application to rehabilitate and restore the building. He noted that there would be noise buffers around the rooftop mechanicals.

Shaun Dempsey of Bruner Cott Architects described the old window openings that would be uncovered and restored. Replica factory sash would be fabricated out of aluminum. The opaque masonry wall on the rear elevation would be re-clad. Also on the rear elevation, old windows would be re-opened and new curtain-wall type windows added. The mural on the Pacific Street side would remain unchanged. The painted sign on Brookline Street would be preserved. A new entry would be created where the loading area was at present. Rooftop mechanicals would be screened.

Mr. Irving asked for questions of fact.

Ms. Harrington asked if any preservation treatment would be applied to the mural. Mr. Rafferty said no work was planned for the mural at present. He added that the projecting sign frame on Brookline Street would remain, but the content of the sign face would be altered for a future tenant.

Dr. Solet asked about the replica factory sash and the screening of mechanicals. Mr. Dempsey explained that the screening would match the cladding panels and would have acoustic material on the

inside. He went on to describe the proposed roof deck and cladding of the CMU rear wall. The cladding would be zinc with an industrial look.

Mr. Sullivan asked if any changes were proposed to the painted EMF signs. Mr. Dempsey replied that they would not be changed. Mr. Irving asked if the painted signs were being protected during the current interior demo work. Mr. Dempsey said they had specified that, but he would check on the status.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the cladding panels had fins or were flat. Mr. Dempsey said the intent was that they not be flat but have some dimension and shadow. Mr. Sheffield asked about coping details. Mr. Dempsey said the masonry would be restored.

Mr. Barry asked if there was documentary evidence for the details of the factory sash and side elevations. Mr. Dempsey replied in the affirmative.

Marie Huber of 100 Pacific Street asked what the glazing on the rear wall would look like. Mr. Dempsey described the curtain wall.

Peter Parise of 119 Brookline Street noted that the highly reflective glass used at 130 Brookline Street had damaged the street trees. Mr. Dempsey said they would take that into consideration. Mr. Parise noted that the proposed roof deck would be 40' from his bathroom window. He said he wanted more screening to maintain his privacy. He asked how tall the HVAC equipment would be. Mr. Dempsey indicated it would be 4-5 feet tall with a higher screen. Mr. Rafferty explained that the roof deck would be set back 20' from the edge of the building.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place noted that because the landmark report had not yet been written, the Commission did not have the review guidelines yet and did not, perhaps, know all the important historical features of the building to protect. Mr. Sullivan explained that the ordinance provided a process for reviewing applications during the study process. The building's architecture was already well documented and understood. Restoring elements of the 1920s original and 1949 storefront addition was a valid restoration approach. Mr. Sheffield noted that the research to come in the study would largely pertain to the cultural significance of the building, not additional architectural information.

Anna Rae of 45 Trowbridge Street asked if there were photos of any damage to the painted signs. Mr. Dempsey said he would look into the matter, but the signs were not to be altered.

Peter Valentine of 37 Brookline Street asked about the proposed use of the building. Mr. Irving said that was not within the purview of the Historical Commission.

A member of the public asked what the justification was for modifying the rear wall. Mr. Dempsey said that side was a plain CMU wall without historical detail or interest. That was where the new design features were being focused.

William Freese asked about sound mitigation of the roof deck.

David Broncazio of 17 Norumbega Street said the 1920 and 1949 dates for the restoration were arbitrary because unrelated to the cultural significance of the building's more recent past.

Mr. Parise asked about a transformer location. Mr. Dempsey said it would be at the ground level, probably at the rear of the Pacific Street lot.

Ms. Harrington asked if the recent cultural significance of the building would be accounted for in the design. Mr. Rafferty answered that there was little evidence of that use on the outside of the building.

Annika Greenleaf of 83 Brookline Street asked what the plans were for the ice storage building. Mr. Dempsey said there were no changes proposed to that building at present.

Mr. Irving asked for public comment and limited each speaker to three minutes.

Mr. Valentine noted that the building had been inhabited by artists for ten years. He said the situation should not be rushed but enhanced to increase the city's greatness. Artists were important to a community. Would the building be a box, or would it have an interesting shape that creates vitality?

Mr. Parise described his family's association with the site. His grandfather, Rico Chicarelli, had delivered ice and oil from the site. Mr. Katz of EMF had sold Mr. Parise his house. Mr. Katz' sister was Pearl Wise, the first woman city councilor under Plan E. The second-floor windows of the building had been where the secretaries' desks were located. The business of the company was transacted there. The 8' storefront addition brought the building into the neighborhood. A lot of neighborhood kids were employed there. The roof deck would be inconsistent with the character of the building, and it could be noisy. He noted that he had worked to quiet the noise of the buses.

Ms. Rae said the Commission should assess the entirety of the building's history and should not allow changes until that work was completed. She said the artists were available to share their history with the Commission staff. She asked that all changes be rejected except preservation of the sign.

Ben Simon asked the Commission to reject all proposals until the study was completed. There was a connection between the musical use of the building and the exterior appearance of the building. The roof deck was out of touch with the historic significance of the building.

Mr. Freese said he had moved to the Constitution Museum building, a preservation success story. The project should be paused until the spring.

Mr. Williamson said the Commission should only approve restoration work that could be documented, but not new work that could be inconsistent with the building.

Margery Cobb of 100 Pacific Street said the artists were very nice, but it was an anonymous looking building. The music could not be heard at all. What went on inside was not evident on the outside.

Dan Totten of 54 Bishop Allen Drive said the project was too broad and would set a bad precedent. He asked the commission to reject the application and wait for the landmark study to conclude. The

roof deck was incongruous.

Ms. Greenleaf said the artist of the mural had not been mentioned. It was a good space for artists because it had previously been industrial. Why have the study if changes were going to be allowed?

Mr. Sheffield said he appreciated the efforts to restore original features of the building from different time periods and to preserve the signage. There were at least two significant chapters in the building's life: the EMF era and the artist/recording studio era. The cladding could be an homage to the music studio era. He recommended that the details of the panels be studied further, suggesting that they could be reminiscent of acoustic panels one would see inside a music studio. He noted that his architecture firm was located in the American Twine Building in East Cambridge. How could the building name help to capture the cultural history of the building? How could an area of the building be curated or interpreted? A roof deck would need to be purposeful and programmed. Overall, the architects had done a good job preserving the history of the building, but could be more deliberate about the music era.

Mr. Irving asked what zoning relief was needed. Mr. Rafferty answered that the openings on the sides with non-conforming setbacks would require zoning relief but the roof deck would not.

Mr. Barry said the landmark study process provided for review of alterations during the study. The design approach for the rear wall was a good opportunity for showing evolution of the CMU portion of the building. He agreed with Mr. Sheffield's suggestions for the cladding panels.

Dr. Solet asked if the building would be occupied 24/7. John DiGiovanni of Ledgemoor LLC said it would operate in the same way as other office buildings on the street. It would be a good neighbor and would conform to city regulations such as the noise ordinance. He offered to come back with more information about the roof deck. He noted that the wood framing of the building was being revealed and preserved and re-used. He did know the artist of the mural. It had been spray painted on the building, so it wasn't clear how well it would age, but there were no plans to change it.

Mr. Sullivan said the project was an adaptive re-use and would speak to the two or three inflection points in the history of the building. The artistic and musical use of the building was no longer attractive to the owner and could not be regulated by the Commission. He recommended more detail be presented about the roof deck and that the hearing be continued.

Mr. Rafferty said his client would amend the application to withdraw the roof deck and asked the Commission to approve the balance of the application.

Mr. Sheffield said he would like to see further study of the cladding panels.

Ms. Harrington said she would like to see progress on planning for interpreting the artistic history of the building. Would the owner meet with the artists?

Mr. Rafferty explained that they wanted to move forward to seek zoning relief for the windows

from the Board of Zoning Appeal but would agree to come back about the deck and possibilities for artistic interpretation. Mr. DiGiovanni agreed to engage in such discussions.

Dr. Solet said she had no objections to the replica factory sash but the metal cladding and entry needed further study.

Mr. Barry moved to approve the project in principle as presented, except for the roof deck, on the understanding that the owner had committed to preserving the painted signs and mural and on the condition that the applicant return to the full Commission with further details of the deck, cladding, entry, curtain wall and get other construction details approved by staff. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 7-0 without further discussion.

Public Hearing: Demolition Review

Case D-1494: 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane, by The 5 Fresh Pond Lane Nominee Trust c/o James J. Rafferty, Esq. Demolish house (1922).

Case D-1495: 36 Larch Road, by The Thirty-Six Larch Rd. Realty Trust c/o James J. Rafferty, Esq. Remove house (1751) and relocate to 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane.

Mr. Sullivan explained the demolition review ordinance, hearing process and possible outcomes. He showed slides and described the history of the Wyeth farmstead and the Gray estate, including the house called The Larches that was moved from Brattle Street to 22 Larch Road when the Larchwood subdivision was laid out in 1915. He described the 1751 Wyeth farmhouse, which was detached from The Larches and relocated to 36 Larch Road at the same time. The 1922 house at 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane was designed as part of the Larchwood subdivision by architect Roscoe B. Whitten for client Sophia Moshier. He noted some architectural details of this Federal Revival house, including the unusual Monk's bond masonry and the trumpet cornice with flared brackets. There were three other houses in the subdivision designed by Whitten as well as The Birches and The Larches apartment buildings on the other side of Brattle Street. He recommended that both buildings be found significant for their architecture and associations with the history and development of the city and in the context of their surroundings – 36 Larch Road as part of The Larches estate and 5 Fresh Pond Lane at the gateway to Larchwood.

Mr. Irving asked for questions of fact regarding the significance of either building. There were none, so he asked for comments regarding their significance. He noted that following the Commission's vote on significance there would be a presentation by the proponents about the proposed changes.

Andrew Hubble of 244 Brattle Street commented that he lived in the Whitten designed apartments and that the architect's buildings were an important part of the neighborhood.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street indicated her agreement with the director's recommendation that both buildings be found significant.

Paul Walker of 237 Brattle Street said he supported the application. The house at 5-7 Fresh Pond

Lane had been neglected for 30 years and would cost well over a million dollars to renovate. The farmhouse had originally been located on a site not far from the proposed 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane location.

Karen Falb of 245 Brattle Street said the full significance of either house was not fully known yet.

Ms. Meyer said 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane was a stately house in context and scale. She said disrepair was often a fall-back reason for demolition requests.

James Rafferty, attorney representing the owner, Sheryl Handler, said she did not contest that the buildings were significant. He noted that he lived next door to 36 Larch Road at 40 Larch Road.

Regis de Silva of 40 Larchwood Drive said the neighborhood was culturally significant. Each house was unique but 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane was one of the most beautiful. The area needed protection as a group of buildings to ensure preservation of the enclave.

Ms. Tobin moved to find both houses significant as defined in the ordinance and for the reasons described in the staff memorandum. Mr. Barry seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.

Mr. Rafferty distributed a supplemental packet of drawings but clarified that they did not represent a change to the proposed design. He displayed a site plan showing the historical locations of The Larches and the Wyeth farmhouse. He noted that Ms. Handler had spent many years restoring and improving the garden at 22 and 36 Larch Road. She had purchased #22 over thirty years ago and #36 twenty years ago. The Rotner house at 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane had been purchased more recently. He said it had significant problems including mold, which was particularly of concern to Ms. Handler. The garage for #22 Larch Road and the basement of #36 were currently being used for gardening supplies. The replacement at #36 would be an accessory building better suited for equipment and supplies. The significance of the Larchwood neighborhood did not hinge on any one building but was related to its layout, lot sizes, and architectural harmony. He described the proposal to move the farmhouse (minus the 1969 addition) to approximately its original location, which would create a link from the history of the site as a farm to the 1915 subdivision. It would be sited in a zoning-compliant manner. Ms. Handler would bring the same level of horticultural development to the 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane lot that she had done at 22 Larch Road. There had been quite a bit of support for the proposal expressed on the neighborhood listserv. These posts had been submitted to the Commission. The house at #5-7 had significant challenges. He believed the proposed relocation of the farmhouse would provide a public benefit by linking the two neighborhoods in a beneficial way. He displayed renderings of the farmhouse in the new location on Fresh Pond Lane.

Sheryl Handler explained that she had a passion for history, architectural history, and horticulture. She described some of the significant buildings in which she had located her offices. She had never before thought of making a demolition request. She was very susceptible to mold. The Fresh Pond Lane house had been vacant for over two years. She did not want to build a new house, but then the idea came to her

that the farmhouse could move to that location. It would re-establish a connection between Larchwood and the area's farming history.

Mr. Irving asked for questions of fact.

Dr. Solet asked if she had been assured that the farmhouse could be safely moved. Mr. Rafferty replied in the affirmative. Thoughtforms and Admiral Building Movers had surveyed the house and the street. The house will fit on a flatbed truck.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the costs of demolition, moving, and building an accessory building had been compared to the preservation of 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane. He said he was trying to understand why 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane could not be renovated. Mr. Rafferty answered that the decision was outcome-driven, not based on cost. Given the history of the health issues at 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane it was not an appealing residence option for Ms. Handler's family.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the design of the proposed accessory building. Mr. Rafferty displayed plans. It would be less than 15' high as required by zoning, would have a hip roof, and would be set back 25' from the front. It would not be for the storage of vehicles but would house equipment and plant material for the garden. The landscape in front of the building would be heavily planted.

Mr. Sullivan asked why the farmhouse would face north. Why not orient it as it had been originally, with the entrance facing east? Ms. Handler explained that they had considered many orientations for the house but chose this one because it would face the Larchwood community.

Mr. Barry asked about the ancillary structures on the Larchwood Drive side of the property. Mr. Rafferty answered that those were the remnants of two greenhouses that pre-dated the 1915 subdivision. Peonies were being cultivated in that part of the garden.

Mr. de Silva asked if the health issues at 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane had been documented. Ms. Handler said that mold is very difficult or impossible to remove in some cases. She said she would not feel comfortable having family live there.

Ms. Meyer asked about a design precedent for the accessory building. Ms. Handler likened it to a gazebo. She said she would pay careful attention to its proportions and design.

Nancy Daley asked why Ms. Handler had purchased 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane. Ms. Handler explained that encroaching vegetation into her garden had prompted her to buy it.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the estimated renovation cost for the house. Ms. Handler said it would cost between \$1.5-\$2.0 million to renovate, plus finishes.

Dr. Solet said she had heard of serious mold problems and indicated that large portions of the building, including maybe the roof, might have to be demolished in order to remediate the mold.

Mr. Irving noted that about fourteen letters had been submitted to the Commission, split evenly in

support and against the proposal. He asked for public comment and limited each speaker to three minutes.

Mr. Hubble disputed that there would be a public benefit to moving the farmhouse to the Fresh Pond Lane site. He did not agree with the statement that one house doesn't make a neighborhood.

Mr. de Silva said he was concerned the project would create division in the neighborhood.

Ms. Meyer remarked that the new garden building looked modern and squat. The new paneling was too heavy. She said it might be easier to reconfigure the garden than to move buildings around.

Ms. Falb said it would be a bad precedent to start tearing houses down for replacement. She noted that Forris Norris' house had been in bad condition with termite damage but had been successfully renovated. A demolition delay could allow time for research on the neighborhood and its landscape.

Mr. Walker said he had thoroughly reviewed the proposals. He noted that he ran an environmental sustainability company. The house on Fresh Pond Lane was a very sick building. He said the proposal was a practical solution to the problem and credited Ms. Handler for her investment in the horticulture of the neighborhood. He said it would be a pleasing end result.

Mr. Sheffield said he appreciated the care Ms. Handler had put into The Larches and surrounding properties. The mold was not an insurmountable problem. The house was a great design and was at an entry point for the neighborhood. Losing a dwelling would not be good for the city and the demolition of 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane would detract from the neighborhood. The farmhouse had been related to The Larches since 1804. Moving it further away would degrade the formal association between the two buildings.

Mr. Ferrara agreed. He did not support the demolition of 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane. It had a special scale that was important to preserve.

Mr. Irving agreed. The Larchwood subdivision was an imagined and realized piece of design. They picked up and moved the two Larches buildings to make it happen. How would he explain the logic of reversing history and scrambling the arrangement? The new location for the farmhouse was convenient, but not justified. He invited Ms. Handler to bring a report to the Commission about the mold; perhaps it would be seen as a hardship.

Mr. Barry also did not favor the proposal. The benefit of locating the farmhouse near its original site was outweighed by the negative impact of demolition of 5-7 Fresh Pond Lane. The impacts of the Fresh Pond Lane property on the garden could be addressed even if it was not commonly owned.

Ms. Tobin moved to find both buildings preferably preserved in the context of the current proposal. Ms. Harrington seconded. The Commission voted 6-1 on the motion. Dr. Solet voted in opposition.

Mr. Sheffield said he hoped the owner would not just wait out a delay but would come back with an alternative plan to consider. Mr. Sullivan stated that Ms. Handler had invited him to see the property. He believed she was completely sincere in wanting the best for the properties and the neighborhood.

General Business

Case 2445: 1991 Massachusetts Ave., St. James’s Episcopal Church. Extension of certificates of appropriateness.

Mr. Sullivan said the staff had signed off on building permits for the new parish house and condominiums at St. James’s Church, based on the plans that the Commission had granted an amended Certificate of Appropriateness on May 19, 2011. A member of the public had questioned the validity of the Commission’s certificates and if they had in fact expired. The Law Department advised that the Commission could consider a request to extend the life of the certificates “for cause” at a public meeting.

The attorney for the owners had submitted a letter requesting such a finding. The letter outlined the timeline of the original approvals, lawsuits, appeals, and permitting requests. Four lawsuits and subsequent appeals had stopped the project from moving forward for six years. The suits were resolved in August 2017, and the applicants subsequently filed requests for demolition permits for the parish house and car wash. On August 7, 2018 the Planning Board found “good cause” for the delay and upheld the Special Permit, making it possible for a building permit to be issued.

CHC staff did not think an extension by the chair was necessary because the applicants had acted to obtain demolition permits soon after the litigation concluded and were then engaged in further permitting reviews by the city. The Law Department said that the best way to handle the request for an extension was to consider it at a public meeting. The Commission could vote to find cause without a new public hearing, and the request for an extension did not have to be made before the expiration of the certificates. Additionally, he said the Law Department advised that the Commission could look to zoning precedents for finding good cause. He recommended finding that there was good cause for the delay in the issuance of permits due to the four lawsuits and six years of court proceedings regarding this project and subsequent permitting procedures by the city and granting the requested extension.

Peter Caro of Casner & Edwards said that the owners’ position had been summarized accurately by Mr. Sullivan and he had nothing further to add.

Dr. Solet asked if this passage of time was normal for the consideration by city departments of a permit request. Phil Terzis of Acorn Holdings explained that they had submitted for a building permit in September of 2017 and didn’t get comments back from Inspectional Services until February 2018. Then they had proceeded to review the permit documents with Community Development.

Mr. Williamson said the CHC policy clearly said requests for extensions should go to the chair. That process should be adhered to.

Michael Brandon of 27 Seven Pines Avenue said the North Cambridge Stabilization Committee had been tracking the project since the beginning. He asked if the advice of the law department could be shared in writing. Mr. Sullivan replied in the negative. Mr. Brandon said the certificate was good for six

months from the date of issuance. Then the state permit extension act had extended the life of permits, including this one, for an additional four years. He said the certificate had expired, even with that extension. The Inspectional Services Department had issued the demolition permits, so the owners could have proceeded with demolition but had not. They should have requested an extension if they were not going to proceed in a timely manner. He hoped the Commission would consider the public's interest in the project and deny the request for an extension for cause for the sake of due process. The zoning laws that the Planning Board operated under in its finding of good cause did not apply to the Commission. He asked the Commission to conduct a *de novo* review of the project. One of the terms of settlement of the lawsuit were the design of the new Knight's Garden, which had been changed without a public process. He noted that there were new members of the Historical Commission now. Climate change was worse, and the loss of trees would not be good. He had questions about construction mitigation. The building permit could be appealed, and he hoped the Commission would make the right decision.

Richard Clarey of 15 Brookford Street said the settlement agreement entered into in May 2016 provided that the Association of Cambridge Neighborhoods would have ongoing involvement in the design of the garden. He asked the Commission to add language about that into its finding.

Ms. Tobin said that she appreciated hearing from the public and understood the frustration with a project that had gone on so long, but she considered the reasons for the substantial delay, including extended litigation and the tolling of the permit issuance for departmental review, were valid.

Dan Totten of 54 Bishop Allen Drive said that more had been learned about the city's diminishing tree canopy since the project was initially approved by the Commission. The canopy had shrunk 18% since 2009. He asked how many trees there were in the garden. Mr. Caro objected to the question because the reason for the current meeting was not to re-hear the case. Mr. Terzis stated that 17 trees would be removed and replaced with 88 trees, resulting in a larger canopy at the end of the project. Mr. Totten asked the Commission to continue the matter until November so that the Commission could read Councilor Zondervan's letter. Mr. Irving said all the Commission members had received a copy of the letter, which he summarized for the public.

Dr. Solet asked if the Commission's certificate was obsolete because of the legal settlement. Mr. Sullivan replied in the negative. He had reviewed the changes to the garden plan that resulted from the settlement and found them to be inconsequential. They had to do with plant material and a bench, which would not need to come back to the full commission.

Mr. Irving said that as chair he had been requested to extend the life of the certificate, but he felt the matter should be discussed by the full commission given the public's interest in the matter.

Ms. Tobin moved to find that there was good cause for the delay in the commencement of the

project and the issuance of the permits based on the extended period of litigation and city permitting procedures and to extend the life of the certificate. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.

Preservation Grants

IPG 19-1: First Church in Cambridge, 11 Garden Street. Masonry restoration and slate roof repairs, \$100,000

PG 19-1: 128 Reed Street, by Just A Start. Siding and windows, \$51,750.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of both properties and described the proposed scope of work for each. The total project costs for the First Church was estimated at \$213,000 while the residential project was estimated at \$51,750. He reported that the preservation grant fund had a balance of \$690,000. He recommended a matching grant of \$100,000 to the church and an outright grant of \$50,000 for 128 Reed Street.

There were no questions. Mr. Ferrara moved to approve \$100,000 for IPG 19-1 on a matching basis. Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, which passed 7-0. Mr. Ferrara moved to approve a grant of \$50,000 for PG 19-1 for 128 Reed Street. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.

Minutes

Mr. Ferrara said he had reviewed the minutes of September 6 and had no corrections. Mr. Sheffield moved to approve the minutes, as submitted. Mr. Irving seconded the motion, which passed 6-0. Dr. Solet abstained.

Director's Report

Mr. Sullivan introduced Eric Hill, the new Survey Director. Eric gave a brief description of his background before coming to Cambridge.

Dr. Solet asked about the affordable housing proposals being discussed as part of the Envision Cambridge planning process. Mr. Sullivan said they were still preliminary, but unless the Council were to pass a measure that cut the Commission and the NCDs out of the review process the commissions would still have jurisdiction if necessary to ensure appropriateness in a district.

Dr. Solet moved to adjourn. Ms. Harrington seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 11:29 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public
Who Signed the Attendance List on October 4, 2018**

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| Deborah Belle | 27 Myrtle Ave |
| Karen Falb | 245 Brattle St |
| Mel Downes | Concord Ave |
| Don Dellechiara | 52 Westland Ave, Boston |
| Margery Cobb | 100 Pacific St #3 |
| Anna Rae | 45 Trowbridge St |
| Chrishe Prince | 29 Norris St |
| Peter Parise | 119 Brookline St |
| Sandy Parise | 119 Brookline St |
| Andrew Hubble | 244 Brattle St #42 |
| Paul Walker | 237 Brattle St |
| Carol Lukas | 94 Larchwood Dr |
| Bill Warner | 35 Fresh Pond Ln |
| Claire Harden | 11 Fresh Pond Ln |
| Annika Greenleaf | 83 Brookline St |
| Regis de Silva | 40 Larchwood Dr |
| John Hawkinson | Cambridge Day |
| Peter Valentine | 37 Brookline St |
| Jon Glancy | 118 Norfolk St #3 |
| Laura Rathsmill | 380 Somerville Ave, Somerville |
| Jesse Moore | 18 Montrose St, Somerville |
| Joe Stohlman | 18 Montrose St, Somerville |
| David Broncazio | 17 Norumbega St |
| Daniel Totten | 54 Bishop Allen Dr #2 |
| Lauren Rigsby | 1991 Mass Ave, St. James |
| Matthew Steward | 1991 Mass Ave, St. James |
| Phil Terzis | 1991 Mass Ave, St. James |
| Marilee Meyer | 10 Dana St |
| Patrick O'Donnell | 31 lee St |
| Sylvia Barnes | 196 Harvey St |
| Marie Huber | 100 Pacific St |
| Cathy Rafferty | 40 Larch Rd |
| Michael Rafferty | 40 Larch Rd |
| Virginia Stanford | 17 Vincent St |
| Barbara Armistead | 66 Fresh Pond Pkwy |
| Quinton Zondervan | 235 Cardinal Madeiros Ave |
| Sarah Forrester | 1991 Mass Ave., St. James |

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.