

Minutes of the Mid Cambridge Neighborhood Conservation District Commission

Monday, March 3, 2014, 6:00 PM, McCusker Center, 2nd Fl., 344 Broadway, Cambridge

Commission Members present: Nancy Goodwin, *Chair*; Tony Hsiao, *Vice Chair*; Lestra Litchfield, Charles Redmon, Carole Perrault, *Members*; Sue-Ellen Myers, Margaret McMahon, *Alternate*

Commission Members absent: Monica Pauli, *Alternates*

Staff present: Sarah Burks, Samantha Paull

Members of the Public: See attached list.

Chair Nancy Goodwin called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M. and explained procedures.

MC-4423: 84 Antrim St., by John and Margaret Walsh. Remove historic slate roof and install asphalt shingles.

Samantha Paull, staff member, presented the application. She showed slides, summarized the request and basic history of the structure. Ms. Paull mentioned that the structure reflects elements of the Queen Anne style and was constructed in 1885, as a two-family residence. The structure was altered in 1896. Ms. Paull noted that the application sought to remove the original slate roof, remove chimneys and install asphalt shingles. She noted that there are a variety of different roofing materials on the street around the subject property.

Mr. John Walsh, an owner, was present. Mr. Walsh mentioned that the roof is plagued with problems including ice dams and water leaks inside the house, causing damage to the ceilings. Mr. Walsh called a couple of roofers to replace in-kind with slate and another to re-use some of the existing slates. To replace the roof with slate, he got a quote of approximately \$45,000. Mr. Walsh stated another contractor never got back with him and the third he called about removing one side, installing ice shield and reinstall it would be \$15,000. Mr. Walsh stated that the asphalt shingles for the entire roof would be approximately \$10,200, as reflected in the quote included in the application.

Ms. Lestra Litchfield, commissioner, asked Mr. Walsh if he looked at asphalt with the appearance of slate. Mr. Walsh stated yes, it was approximately \$30,000.

Ms. Perrault asked about the condition of the existing slate. Mr. Walsh stated there were a number of broken slates currently and in the past roofers have broken even more slates trying to repair the roof as they set a ladder on top of the existing slates. Recently the valley was replaced for approximately \$6,000, Mr. Walsh pointed out; additionally every time the roofers come out, it's at least \$100.

Ms. Perrault asked Mr. Walsh how long he had lived there. He stated that three generations have lived here. Mrs. Walsh stated that they do not have a next generation.

Mr. Walsh stated he had put heated wires on top of the roof to melt the ice dams on the right elevation. Ms. Litchfield asked if it is necessary to remove the chimneys. Chimneys add a lot to the historic character of the house. Mr. Walsh stated that he did not need them because he had new boilers installed.

Ms. Goodwin explained that this is a non-binding review. The Commission would try to convince them of what it thought was appropriate but in the end, they can do what you will. Mr. Hsiao added that monetary issues were not part of our criteria for appropriateness. Mrs. Walsh stated that only four (4) houses on the block still had their original slate roofs. Mr. Walsh mentioned that the nails rust out and slates fall off. He continued that one of the cars was damaged by the snow coming off the roof.

There were no other comments by the public.

Ms. Litchfield summarized that the roof and chimney were two (2) of the original building materials still visible from the street. She encouraged them to give second thought to removal of the chimneys; nothing that, like any other part of the house, they will need periodic maintenance.

Ms. Sarah Burks, staff member, mentioned that there was a cost to demolishing the chimneys and a mess. It might balance out to cap and repoint the chimneys. Ms. McMahon added that she went by the structure and it was her opinion that the slate added to the appearance of the house and it contributed positively to the character of the street.

Mrs. Walsh commented that she doesn't readily observe or notice roofing materials on structures but does notice other elements of the structures.

Mr. Hsiao moved to reject the application as submitted with a strong recommendation to preserve the chimneys and repair or replace slate to the extent that you can. The motion was seconded by Mr. Redmon and passed unanimously. Mr. Hsiao reminded all that this was a non-bonding review. Ms. Goodwin explained that they could proceed with the permit process.

MC-4430: 328 Broadway, #1, by Andrew J. Meyer & Jessica B. Barber. Exterior alterations and a roof deck with trellis.

Ms. Paull showed slides as she introduced the application for 328 Broadway, Unit 1. The subject property was originally constructed in 1886 as a stable for the residential structure in front of #1. It was converted into a residential use in 1985, per Hail.

The stable was a simple structure with minimal detailing. It had a combination of clapboards and T-111 siding. The windows were vinyl replacement windows many of which had bars on them currently. A cupola and a framed hay door on the second floor, reminiscent of its former use, accented the one and a half story structure. The structure had a lattice-screened roof deck over the single story portion of the structure.

The application proposed to remove the metal bars from the windows, add some new windows, reroof the structure, rebuild the roof deck, extend the trellis over a portion of the roof deck, and add a new covered front entry on the elevation facing Broadway. The proposed roof deck trellis would be most visible from Broadway, and may have some limited visibility from Harvard Street between the existing multi-story residential buildings.

Ms. Perrault asked where the access to the structure was. The applicant, Ms. Denise Myer, responded that it was accessed from the east side. She further clarified that the application proposed to move the entrance to the elevation facing Broadway. Ms. McMahon asked what type of windows the applicant proposed to use. Ms. Myer responded some would be new and some would be relocated from existing

openings on the structure. She also stated that they were looking at American Craftsman windows insulated with argon gas and screens. She expounded that they wanted to restore some of the charm of the structure.

Mr. Redmon asked if they were proposing a center entry. Ms. Myer clarified yes, the proposal included replacing the sliding glass doors and installing a pair of swinging doors on the front elevation. Proposed were Reliabuilt 6 panel doors, two doors under covered entry, one for bike storage and the other for entry into living space. The property is currently zoned multi-use, the main structure is an office building. They planned to use this as a single family residence but wanted a second entry for resale value, in case it were to be turned into office suites like the main structure on the front of the lot. There was further discussion about the existing parking configuration for the property and the parking proximity to the new covered entry.

Mr. Redmon recommended extending the roof all the way across the façade and putting a column on each end. Ms. Burks noted that the existing structure has a generous eave and that all covered area would count toward the FAR.

Mr. Redmon asked what they were going to do with the T-111 existing siding, and if they had considered replacing with clapboards or not. Ms. Meyer stated it was in good condition and there was not money in the budget to replace it.

Mr. Hsiao agreed with Mr. Redmon's recommendation to extend the roof across and also mentioned that the owner may want to install bollards to protect new entry addition from cars. Mr. Hsiao also stated he believed they were enhancing the appearance of the house.

Ms. Litchfield asked if the addition extended to the property line. Mr. Andrew Meyer, an owner, stated that it would extend to the end of their exclusive use space but the structure was actually part of a larger condo parcel.

Mr. Hsiao said they need to make sure it really works dimensionally. Ms. Litchfield offered that they consider pulling the asphalt back away from the building. Mr. Redmon suggested adding a curb along the exclusive use line. Mr. Hsiao recommended a low terrace there.

Mr. Walsh asked if it had a slate roof. Ms. Meyer responded no.

Mr. Redmon moved to approve the application as submitted with the suggestions that the roof on the addition be extended the entire length, a terrace, curb, or bollards be added along the exclusive use line, and that the applicant follow up with a local architect about potential code and zoning issues. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hsiao and passed unanimously.

Minutes

Mr. Redmon moved to approve the minutes of February 3, 2014. Mr. Hsiao seconded the motion, which passed unanimously

Mr. Redmon moved to adjourn the meeting with Mr. Hsiao seconding the motion. The motion was supported unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Samantha Paull
Preservation Administrator

**Members of the Public
(who signed the Attendance list)**

Andrew Meyer	328 Broadway, #R
Jessica Barber	328 Broadway, #R
Denise Meyer	334 El Vedado Rd, Palm Beach, FL 33480
Margaret Walsh	84 Antrim Street
John Walsh	84 Antrim Street

Note: All addresses are located in Cambridge unless otherwise noted.