

MINUTES OF THE MID CAMBRIDGE NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION DISTRICT COMMISSION
APPROVED AT THE _6/4/2018_ HEARING

Monday, May 7, 2018, 6:00 PM, 4th Floor Meeting Room, City Hall Annex, 344 Broadway, Cambridge

Commission Members present: Nancy Goodwin, *Chair*; Tony Hsiao, *Vice Chair*; Monika Pauli, *Member*; Lestra Litchfield, Charles Redmon and Margaret McMahon, *Alternates*

Commission Members absent: *none*

Staff present: Samantha Elliott

Members of the Public: See attached list.

Ms. Nancy Goodwin, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. She reviewed the agenda as well as meeting procedures. She noted that voting alternates would be: for MC-5407 Commissioners Lestra Litchfield and Charles Redmon, for MC-5408 all alternates, for MC-5412 Ms. Litchfield and Mr. Redmon, for MC-5413 Mr. Redmon and Ms. Margaret McMahon, for MC-5414 Ms. Litchfield and Ms. McMahon.

MC-5407: 227 Prospect Street, by Magna Development, LLC. Demolish one-story commercial structure and construct new residential dwellings.

Mrs. Samantha Elliott, staff, showed photos while giving an overview of the structure and the application scope before the Commission. She noted that this was a binding review as it was new construction and demolition.

Mark Boyes-Watson, the project architect, introduced himself, Dan Adelson, an owner, and Kelly Speakman, another architect working on the project. He said the proposal included demolishing the existing structure and constructing three (3) two-family houses for a total of six (6) units. He noted that the area had a mixture of styles. He reviewed the proposed site plan, noting the orientations of the buildings, parking and open space. He directed the Commission's attention to the 3D model. Mr. Boyes-Watson said the first structure was designed to be similar to the older houses on the street to keep up the rhythm of the street. He noted trying to be conscious of scale by constructing separate structures versus one large structure. He continued, addressing the elevations of the proposed buildings and showed a shadow study for the proposed project. He showed that the shadow impact was minimal. Mr. Boyes-Watson noted that they hoped to add more trees as part of the project while showing a site landscaping plan, which included creating a landscape buffer along the rear elevation.

Ms. Goodwin thanked him for bringing a model. She asked what materials were proposed. Mr. Boyes-Watson replied that the front building would be wood clapboard and the rear buildings would have a fiber cement siding with a composite trim.

Tony Hsiao, Commissioner, asked if he could note the side setbacks. Mr. Boyes-Watson clarified the front would have 10 feet, side 7 feet, then 15 feet, 13.9 feet between buildings, side setback of rear left structure is seven and a half feet, rear setback is 30 feet, the buildings are 13.7 feet, the side setback is 7.5 and 10 feet. Mr. Hsiao asked what the build to open area ratio was. Ms. Speakman clarified it would be 40%.

Monika Pauli, Commissioner, asked if zoning requirements were met. Mr. Boyes-Watson said yes and noted only Historical approval was required.

Ms. Goodwin asked what windows were proposed. Mr. Boyes-Watson said aluminum clad wood windows. Lestra Litchfield, Commissioner, asked what muntin pattern was proposed. Mr. Boyes-Watson said front building was proposed as two-over-two and the rear buildings were solid casements. Ms. Litchfield asked for the proposed height. Mr. Boyes-Watson noted that the buildings at the back were 35 feet tall and 32 feet at the front.

Mr. Hsiao asked if the basements were living space. Mr. Boyes-Watson said yes. Ms. Litchfield asked if there were light wells. Mr. Boyes-Watson replied yes and pointed them out on the elevations adding there was one on the front elevation under the bay.

Mr. Hsiao asked how people would not back out on to Prospect Street. Mr. Boyes-Watson pointed out the turn around on the site plan. Mr. Hsiao asked for the driveway paving material. Mr. Boyes-Watson said they had not solidified the plan. Mr. Adelson said that they had looked at asphalt and also had considered stamped concrete.

Margaret McMahon, Commissioner, asked if the rendering colors were the final proposed colors. Mr. Boyes-Watson replied no, the bright colors were colors to help difference.

Susan Fleischman, resident at 5 St. Mary Road, asked what fence was proposed along the side and rear. Ms. Boyes-Watson said fencing was proposed all the way around and was noted as a six (6) vinyl fence on the site plan. Ms. Fleishman said there were some border issues there, could you tell me where the existing building ends. Mr. Boyes-Watson showed the survey slide on his PowerPoint. Ms. Speakman noted the boundaries that it was currently about five (5) feet.

Judy Nee, resident at 3 St. Mary Road, noted that there were property line issues and felt that the property lines were mismarked on the site plan and included her property. Ms. Speakman referred her to the paper site plan. Ms. Nee asked if it would be built into that space. Mr. Adelson replied that there were lawyers working out the details and he would defer to them once the final details had been sorted out. He noted that from his last conversation with his attorney, he was told that 227 Prospect Street has the right to that piece of property and was in the process of having that piece attached and would be closing on it soon. Mr. Adelson said he would like to talk separately from the hearing so that the issue could be worked out with the abutter. Ms. Goodwin asked them to have the discussion outside of the hearing. Ms. Speakman said that if it impacted the building, the plans would be amended but deferred to the final plan with the attorneys.

Sara Mae Berman, resident at 23 Fayette Street, asked if he knew the price range. Mr. Adelson said he had not settled on that yet. She asked what size trees would be planted. Mr. Adelson said it would have a minimum of six (6) to seven (7) foot tall trees. She asked how long until the overhang would look like the landscape plan. Mr. Boyes-Watson clarified within 5 years.

Mirko Ristivojevic, abutter at 5 St. Mary Road, asked if the trees along the rear property line would be preserved. Mr. Boyes-Watson said the trees along the rear property lines had not yet been evaluated but if they were healthy they would stay. Mr. Adelson said if some of the trees were in rough condition they

would be removed. Natasha Ristivojevic, an abutter at 5 St. Mary Road, asked how many parking spots were proposed. Mr. Boyes-Watson showed the six (6) spaces.

Gail Sylvester, resident at 84 Amory Street, asked how the project would impact traffic. Mr. Boyes-Watson replied that the proposed use was less intense than the existing use, so it would be reduced from current conditions.

Gerry Laidley, resident at 90 Amory Street, asked if the owner would take down damaged tree and if any new trees were going to be installed how far they would be set back from his garage so the roots would not impact his garage. Mr. Boyes-Watson said he was happy to discuss the exact locations with abutters. Mr. Laidley asked if they had a rodent abatement plan. Mr. Boyes-Watson said yes.

Martin Utengaard, abutter at 7 St. Mary Road, asked large trees could be preserved and how the preservation of those trees would that impact the rear landscape buffer. Mr. Boyes-Watson said you had to pick either preserve older trees or a visual landscape buffer as a landscape buffer cannot be added under existing trees. Mr. Utengaard asked where the fence was proposed. Mr. Boyes-Watson said the outside section of the landscape buffer. Mr. Utengaard asked how dust would be managed. Mr. Adelson said adding lots of water during demolition was helpful to reduce demolition dust and noted that he would happy to take care of exterior impact issues after they were done with construction. Mr. Utengaard asked if it would have toxic materials. Mr. Adelson said they did a 21E report and there is a slightly higher level of lead in the ground due to it being filled land; he added that there was not a substantial concern otherwise.

Ms. Ristivojevic asked what the timeline was. Mr. Adelson said he hoped for a year and a half.

Sharon DeVos, resident oat 118 Antrim Street, asked if the building itself had hazardous materials. Mr. Adelson said no, it had been tested.

Ms. Goodwin asked for comments from the public; there were none.

Ms. Litchfield said of the front two units, the addition appeared to be larger and was overpowering and the union of the two units was awkward. Mr. Boyes-Watson said that the square footage was needed in the rear unit versus the front unit. He said they had played with the plans and believed it would not be as visually impactful from the street.

Mr. Hsiao said it seemed a little forced and that there was not a good conversation between the front structure and the rear two structures. He expressed concern that the two tall structures with the driveway in between would feel like an alley. He continued that the side setback from the commercial building on the front structure was too narrow. Ms. Litchfield added that it felt dense for the site. Mr. Boyes-Watson responded that it was only .75 FAR, adding that the area's current density was similar or more dense compared to what was proposed. Mr. Hsiao said he felt like there was a way to thread a better continuity between all three structures.

Charles Redmon, Commissioner, wondered if the unit on the right rear structure could be setback slightly.

Ms. Litchfield said that the front building was awkward, especially the bay around the front window.

Ms. Goodwin said that the Commission did not like the use of fiber cement siding on buildings and asked if the applicant would consider wood clapboards. Mr. Boyes-Watson replied yes.

Ms. Pauli asked if there was concern with emergency services accessing the site. Mr. Boyes-Watson said no.

Ms. Litchfield asked if the applicant had considered altering front building, putting something modern or even losing a unit and have a larger front unit. She was concerned with the design and location being on Prospect St might be unappealing but having a nicer unit might off-set that.

Ms. Goodwin suggested continuing the hearing to allow the applicant to amend the design. Mr. Boyes-Watson asked if he could limit the redesign to the front unit and how it related to the back two units. Mr. Redmon said yes and suggested that preserving the open crossings on the lot to mimic the block's existing design would be helpful. He added that making the front house more prominent would be helpful.

Mr. Redmon summarized the Commission's concerns, stating that the primary front house needed to be made more dominant and the addition/second unit flat or lower. Mr. Adelson asked if unit 2 could be a flat roof. Ms. Litchfield yes or a height lower than the front portion with the same pitch as the main roof. She added that the front house could even be taller to help make the front house more dominant.

Ms. Litchfield made a motion to continue the hearing to the June 4, 2018 and that he come back with several design options that address unit 1 and 2 with the preference that unit 1 become more dominant. Mr. Redmon seconded the motion; the motion was approved 5-0. (NG, MP, CR, LL, TH)

Ms. Goodwin recused herself, citing that she knew the architect personally, and sat with the members of the public. Mr. Hsiao assumed the role of Chair.

MC-5408: 147 Amory Street, by Robert Livermore o/b/o Mela Lyman. Demolish one-story garage and construct new residential building.

Mrs. Elliott showed photos while giving an overview of the structure and the application scope before the Commission. She noted that this was a binding review due to the extent of the construction.

Bob Livermore, the project architect, introduced himself and Mela Lyman, the owner. He gave an overview of the location and proposal with boards. He noted that the zoning would allow for 3 units on the lot. He said the main structure had two units and the garage is currently a studio. He continued, the proposal was to demolish the garage and driveway and construct a new residential dwelling. He showed the site plan and how it would be reoriented for the proposal. Mr. Livermore showed boards with renderings and elevations. He noted that the usable open space had been increased from the existing. He said the new unit would have two floors of living space with an unfinished basement. He showed the shadow study and the proposed structure's impact.

Mr. Redmon asked for the rear setback. Mr. Livermore replied it was proposed at 20 feet, two inches and 20 feet was the minimum required by zoning.

Ms. Pauli asked if there was an attic. Mr. Livermore replied that the second floor had cathedral ceilings.

Ms. Litchfield asked what the height of the front house and the new structure. Mr. Livermore said the new house was 29 feet and the existing main house was 34 feet. Ms. Lyman added that her house and her neighbor's house were the same.

Ms. Litchfield asked what materials were proposed. Mr. Livermore said they were proposing Hardi-board for the rear structure's siding, vinyl-clad windows, composite trim, and composite decking.

Ms. Litchfield asked in your previous attempts to develop the back, what were the zoning issues with using the existing footprint of the garage. Mr. Livermore said part of the issue is the garage is low to the ground, the second floor had to be pulled back from the existing and with a garage that was only 18 feet deep it was very limiting.

Mr. Hsiao asked to have the location of the entrance clarified. Mr. Livermore said that in order to have better programming on the interior, the entrance was proposed on the side. Mr. Hsiao asked to understand why the pitch was chosen. Mr. Livermore said it was chosen to keep at a reasonable height. Mr. Hsiao said what was intended for landscaping. Mr. Livermore said there was not a strong landscape idea except that the owner wanted to preserve as much of this part of the site as possible – he motioned on the site plan - which included preserving an existing pear tree and fencing. He added that the rear yard would be open for the tenant in the unit and a flagstone walk would be added.

Mr. Hsiao asked for questions from the public. There were none. He asked for comments. There were none.

Ms. McMahon said that the entrance was very unfriendly and looked very blank. She continued that the rooflines from the street did not relate to the existing area. Mr. Redmon agreed and said it seemed like the idea to match the pitch of the main house and not create an L shaped house. Mr. Livermore said he was attempting to meet the setbacks and usable space. Ms. Lyman said she hoped to maintain the existing garden and pear trees which drove the L shape. Mr. Livermore said he understood that other houses had entrances on the street but the proposed house was not up close to the street. Ms. Litchfield asked if he had considered a flat roof. He said no but the higher peak to match the existing causes issues with creating cathedral ceilings.

Ms. Litchfield said infill houses in Mid Cambridge are hugely controversial, so when the Commission sees a proposal that has issues, such as the floor plans to be driving everything, they work to adjust the exterior to reduce the impact the proposed structure has on character of the area.

Mr. Redmon said he felt that the proposal was not in line with the existing vein of the area, which was simple box houses with gable roofs. He continued, noting that the proposed structure's ell should be flat roofed and the main house should match the pitch of the primary structure. He suggested looking at moving the structure forward another 10-15 feet.

Mr. Livermore asked if he could keep the entrance on the side elevation. Ms. Litchfield replied yes but the main concern the Commission was expressing was related to the interaction of the front elevation. Ms. Lyman said she felt that the change would cast shadows on the primary structure. Ms. Litchfield said it would cast shadows regardless. Mr. Redmon suggested eliminating the ell to get enough sun if that was the main concern. Ms. Lyman said she did not think that would impact it. Mr. Redmon said his main concern, as well as the Commission's concern, was working on massing to relate to the remaining structures in the area.

Mr. Hsiao said a 3D rendering or model would greatly benefit this project. He said there was some awkwardness of the house, as the pitch did not relate to the main house or other houses in the area. He said there was also awkwardness in the plan layout, with the overhangs and bumpouts; noting that these features should appear more like bays to relate to the primary structure. Mr. Hsiao added that if one wanted to be respectful to the existing structure and its character, that kind of vocabulary needs to have more careful attention; he added that proportions were very important and needed more careful study. Mr. Hsiao said he felt the plans needed further study, warranted further development and believed that the model/rendering would help both that study and the Commission in reviewing the updated proposal. He agreed with the other Commissioners who recommended keeping the ell and shifting the entrance to the interior area by the garden so all the entrances at the back side talking to each other, pushing the ell for the entrance. He also agreed that making the ell roof flat so it was clearly subservient to the main portion of this rear block house was a helpful suggestion. He closed suggesting the idea that the entrances have a conversation with each other and relate to each other in that central garden area, along with making more greenspace at the perimeter.

Ms. Litchfield added that the front needs more study. Mr. Hsiao suggested that it could be more celebrated, even adding more windows or larger windows. Ms. Pauli said it could look more like a carriage house and have its own character. Mr. Redmon suggested a larger more substantial bay on the front elevation. Ms. Lyman asked if he meant like the front of the primary structure. Mr. Redmon said yes. Ms. Litchfield said more study, more examples and a massing model. Mr. Hsiao added that capturing abutters within the model would be helpful to understand the massing along the street/block. Ms. Litchfield said that it would be nice to consider wood clapboards as well.

Mr. Redmon made a motion to continue the application to the next hearing taking suggestions into consideration. Ms. Litchfield seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0. (NG, MP, CR, LL, MM)

The Commission took a brief recess from 7:55 PM to 8:01 PM.

MC-5412: Inman Square and Vellucci Plaza, by City of Cambridge. Intersection alterations and alterations to plaza.

Mrs. Elliott showed photos while giving an overview of the application scope before the Commission. She noted that this was a binding review as it was located within the Inman Square National Register District and publicly owned.

Ms. Goodwin confirmed and outlined what would be discussed at the hearing – the proposal was to discuss the proposed Plaza designs, not the movement of the plaza, landscaping, bike lanes, or intersection travel itself.

Kathy Watkins, City Engineer, introduced herself and the team. She gave an overview of the scope and noted that there had been numerous meetings with the neighborhood including a tree hearing.

Jerry Friedman, Supervising Engineer with the Department of Public Works, introduced himself and gave a presentation that outlined the reason for the Inman Square realignment and relocation of Vellucci Plaza.

Kaki Martin, Landscape Architect at Klopfer Martin Design Group and a part of the consultant team, introduced herself and noted that the process has had a number of public meetings over the last few

years. She reviewed the programming requests from the neighborhood and said the team had put together two concepts. She pointed out that the elements were the same between the two concepts with plantings, trees, seating, pavers, lighting, movable and fixed furniture, public art, memorialization, and possibly a water feature. She pointed out a slide that showed both plans, how they were very similar except for the treatment of the north edge. The first is called the Eddy, creates a grove of trees on the east and west sides which would be planted in the ground. The grove of trees is not in a raised planter and you can walk around the trees themselves. Second concept is called the Puzzle, it would have an on the ground planter and change the pattern of movement, creating an enclosed plaza area.

The public erupted and asked what would be discussed at the hearing. Ms. Goodwin said that the neighborhood has had a lot of involvement to review the intersection and give feedback on the proposals. John Pitkin, resident at 18 Fayette Street, asked what the Commission's purview was. Ms. Elliott clarified that the Commission did not have purview over the streets, trees, or landscaping but that it was reviewing the proposed plans for the Plaza itself as that was what was in front of the Commission. Mr. Pitkin argued that streets were structures per Municipal Code 2.78. Ms. Elliott clarified stating that historically the Commission had not reviewed streets in Neighborhood Conservation Districts and that as the street specifically was not included in the notice, it could not be voted on at this hearing. She continued, should that directive change a separate meeting would be held and notice would be sent out. She stated she had clarified this with the department prior to the hearing.

Ms. Goodwin reiterated what Ms. Elliott said and noted that the Commission was only discussing what was before them that evening, which was the plaza programming. Ms. Goodwin asked if Ms. Watkins had any commentary.

The public erupted again.

Ms. Goodwin gained order and said there was a process to the hearing, noting that the Commission would ask questions first, then she would ask the public if they had questions of fact and then would hear comments from the public.

Mr. Redmon asked if the paving material could be expanded across the street to visually connect the two. Ms. Watkins said they try not to do that at signalized intersections.

Ms. Litchfield asked why planting stopped and did not extend along Hampshire Street. Mr. Friedman pointed out that there were existing driveways that limited some of the layout and they were considering special paving to have use of space when driveways were not being utilized.

Ms. Goodwin asked if either plan had more trees. Khaki replied that both plans were a rough layout and that it would depend specifically on the species as to what size would go in and how many could be placed within the areas. She added that they hoped to add variety to the area.

Mr. Hsiao asked if the crossings were at grade. Mr. Friedman clarified that it would be at grade or sidewalk grade, as he pointed out on the plans.

Mr. Redmon asked what lighting would be there beyond festoon lighting. Mr. Friedman said there would be a variety of lighting scales at street/vehicular and pedestrian scale. He noted that the exact fixtures had not been chosen.

Ms. Pauli asked if there would be enough lighting for the Plaza and street. Ms. Watkins said yes, it would be the same level as that on Cambridge Street. Ms. Pauli asked if the traffic lights were on wires. Mr. Friedman clarified that they were going to be using black mast arms. Ms. Pauli asked if there would be more than there was currently. Mr. Friedman replied no.

Mr. Redmon asked if there would be any new street tree plantings on the opposite side of Cambridge St from the plaza. Mr. Friedman said there would be more street trees added to Inman Square as a whole.

Phyllis Bretholtz, resident at 65 Antrim Street, asked how someone would have access to Cambridge Family Health if they were in a wheelchair or on crutches. Mr. Friedman said the access would be from driveway and added that they were trying to work to adjust the bus stop up Beacon Street. He noted that they were going to be creating an area for loading and unloading right there as well. Ms. Bretholtz asked where the Hubway would be relocated to. Mr. Friedman said they were working out final details but it looked like they would add it to the Springfield Street lot, which would allow for more bikes to be added. Ms. Bretholtz asked if the benches were flat. Ms. Martin said they were working out programming details and had not chosen the final benches yet. Ms. Bretholtz said that Union Square was so well lit and asked if this Plaza would be as well lit. Mr. Friedman said they would be working to incorporate a variety of lighting styles. Ms. Bretholtz asked what size trees were proposed. Ms. Watkins said they would get the largest trees that they could healthfully plant and had provided room in the budget for such. Ms. Bretholtz asked if a water feature could be added on both sides. Ms. Watkins said it would depend on the space constraints.

Sharon DeVos, resident at 118 Antrim Street, asked the sidewalk width. Ms. Watkins replied six (6) feet wide. Mr. Friedman added that it would be very similar to the sidewalk width that existed today with clear walking space by the businesses. Ms. DeVos said when people come off of the three (3) cross walks it seemed like it would be difficult to get into the plaza. Ms. Watkins said it was 10 feet wide, so it was unlikely that it would be problematic. Ms. DeVos asked how long construction would take. Ms. Watkins said they were still working out the details but were looking at 18-24 months to complete everything.

Jack Walsh, 84 Antrim St, asked if the park is as wide as the hearing room. Mr. Friedman said it was approximately 4,000 sq ft, not including the edges or cycle track. Mr. Walsh asked what would stop restaurants from utilizing the plaza to expand for cafe seating. Mr. Friedman said that outdoor dining required a permit from the city and the Plaza would not be approved for such use. Mr. Walsh asked if there was money set aside to take care of the plaza after it was done. Ms. Watkins said it would be incorporated into the DPW's annual budget.

Charles Teague, resident at 23 Edmunds Street, asked for the square footage comparison of the existing Plaza and the proposed Plazas. Mr. Friedman said the original was 6,500 sq ft and the remaining west side of Vellucci Plaza would be 2,700 sq ft and the new side would be about 3,800 sq ft, about 6,500 sq ft still. Mr. Teague asked if the festoon lighting type could be clarified and asked if it would come down. Ms. Miller said it would be attached to permanent poles and they were working on final details still. Mr. Teague asked if there were other mechanical components in the Plaza. Ms. Watkins said it would only have an irrigation box above ground.

Debra Mandell, resident at 242 Hampshire Street, asked how her building would be impacted by the bicycles and pedestrians. Mr. Friedman indicated the location of a bike lane and noted that the corner of the building would be about six (6) feet away from the street at the closest point.

Mr. Walsh asked if Antrim Street would be narrowed. Mr. Friedman said it was proposed along with a raised cross walk.

Ms. Bretholtz asked what the red line was. Mr. Friedman said that it was proposed as a bus lane during peak morning hours and on-street parking during off peak hours.

Sara Mae Berman, resident at 23 Fayette Street, expressed concern over the traffic back-ups in the intersection and asked how loading would be handled. She also expressed concern with idling motors and asked how that would be addressed. Ms. Watkins said the lights would cycle more quickly than they did currently which would help with queues.

Elena Saporta, resident at 102 Ellery Street, asked the distance a pedestrian had to cross from urgent care to the health alliance, it looks like it's 4 lanes plus the plaza and bike lanes. Mr. Friedman said the asphalt width was about the same or less, noting that the overall project was reducing roadway asphalt.

Lesley Phillips, resident at 1643 Cambridge Street, asked if it had been studied how Hampshire Street and Cambridge Street would share a roadway. Mr. Friedman directed her to their website which reviewed this and had a model.

Ms. Bretholtz asked if traffic would turn left on to Cambridge Street from Hampshire Street. Ms. Watkins said yes. Ms. Bretholtz asked about a left turn on to Antrim Street. Mr. Friedman said that would be prohibited.

Andrew Hovey, interested party who used to live on Antrim Street and now in Medford, said he did not think the crash data was correct and felt that the Plaza square footage calculations provided were wrong and it seemed like there was a loss of 2,000 sq ft. He asked if pedestrian counts had been done. Mr. Friedman responded saying there were about 600 bicycles and 1,000 pedestrians through the square during peak hour.

Ms. Bretholtz said if there was no left turn on to Antrim St, was there a potential for restricted hour left turns. Mr. Friedman said they could look at it. Ms. Bretholtz said traffic on Fayette was horrific and scary to pull out of on to Cambridge Street. Mr. Friedman said the timing of traffic signals would help that.

Richard Kreshnic, resident with the Inman Square Neighborhood Association, expressed concern about the business district. He said while he like the idea of the new plaza he felt it would be important to make it a community center, maybe even a water feature by the bust, additional seating, and larger water feature.

John Pitkin, 18 Fayette St, gave a hand out which highlighted sidewalks in the area. He noted that there was a gap in plaza where the sidewalks go and that elsewhere they went straight. He said it was not designated in the plans. He also asked Ms. Elliott if she could you clarify how this was exempt from review.

Mrs. Elliott referred him to Municipal Code 2.78.190 B(5) which exempted "sidewalks, driveways.... And other such structures" from review. She said this had been the Commission's practice over the years and historically none of the Conservation Districts had reviewed streets and sidewalks in the past, regardless of their binding or non-binding review status.

Ms. Watkins said that the tones could be different to help reflect the programming of the sidewalks.

Mr. Redmon said he felt that the spaces should be treated with a field of paving, not a change to concrete or asphalt. Ms. Watkins said their plan was to have a tonal change, not a change in paving materials.

Susan Ringler, resident at 82 Kinnaird Street, said that if the sidewalks were used by over 1,000 people, without a straight way to walk, that pedestrians would utilize the bike lanes. She asked how snow would be handled. Ms. Watkins said that the snow would be cleared by DPW.

Ms. DeVos asked if left hand turns would be allowed on to Springfield Street. Mr. Friedman said that it would be right in, right out, same as it was currently. Ms. DeVos asked how others would be kept out of the bike lanes. Mr. Friedman clarified that there were grade changes and curbs to help address that throughout the square. Ms. Watkins added that the Plaza was designed with planters to help separate the spaces as well.

Ms. Goodwin closed the public comment period, noting that the Commission needed to deliberate, the comments were beyond the scope of discussion that had been explained in the beginning of the hearing, and that there were other items on the agenda for that evening that still needed to be discussed.

The audience erupted. Ms. Goodwin attempted to gain order.

Jon Penterman, a resident at 5 West Pl, expressed his disdain with the hearing process, citing the lack of a time certain for when each case would be heard and that not everyone's comments could be heard. Ms. Goodwin noted that the items were always heard in the order they were noticed on the agenda and that it was impossible to predict how long each case will take to be heard as it depends on how many members of the public show up and want to speak. Ms. Elliott added that additionally the Commission was bound by law to hear applications within a certain number of days from the date in which they were received, so items could not be pushed off the agenda just because there were too many. She said it was not an option. She added that if anyone was unable to provide comments they were more than welcome to email their comments in or send them in via mail and they would be included in the record and added to the file.

Sarah Mae Berman of 23 Fayette Street said that she did not feel the Commission could approve anything as there were so many questions without answers. She asked where the snow would go for the bike lanes.

Ms. Goodwin noted that the public comment period was already closed.

Ms. Goodwin reiterated that the City had numerous public hearings on the intersection, trees, bike lanes, and other components. She said the City had heard the input of the citizens and were aware of the concerns. She noted that the project was still in the planning stages, thus why there were two rough proposals in front of the Commission that evening and even if one was to be approved, there are still other public hearings planned by the City regarding the changes to Inman Square. She continued, the City would come back to a neighborhood meeting with a final plan, as noted in the presentation, and would communicate clearly with the public as they had for the last 18 months.

Ms. Watkins asked if the team would need to come back to the Commission to review the plan. Ms. Goodwin answered in the negative. Ms. Litchfield asked if there were more public meetings planned for the project. Ms. Watkins replied yes, later this summer. Ms. Litchfield asked if they could do one sooner. Ms. Watkins replied that there were certain meetings already scheduled regarding the project. She said

that it sounded like the issues the public was having were related to the flow of the intersection not Vellucci Plaza or the proposed materials.

Mr. Redmon made a motion to approve the application as submitted and permit the applicant to utilize either plan proposed on the condition that the staff approve final materials, which should all be of high quality. Ms. Litchfield seconded the motion; the motion was approved 5-0. (NG, CR, MP, LL, TH)

MC-5413: 344 Broadway, by City of Cambridge. Accessibility alterations and stormwater improvements to entrance.

Mrs. Elliott showed photos while giving an overview of the structure and the application scope before the Commission. She noted that this was a binding review as it was a publicly owned structure.

Julie Lynch, from the Department of Public Works, introduced herself and noted that the goal of the project was to make the area more accessible and improve drainage at the entrance to the annex off Broadway.

Ned Collier, the project architect, said that the annex was not performing under the existing design. He said the goal was to address bike parking, stormwater management, wayfinding, pedestrian safety, and landscaping. He noted that the team had been working for about a year on the project, which included meeting with stakeholders and abutters. He reviewed the proposed site plan which included relocating street bike racks along Broadway, relocating bicycle parking to the Inman Street plaza for employees as a security fob entrance was being installed on the Inman Street elevation, landscaping, signage, ramps and drainage.

Ms. Pauli asked if lighting was proposed. Mr. Collier replied that new architectural lighting was proposed flanking the stairs and the sloped walkways with a uniform level of lighting the ground.

Mr. Redmon asked if the brick sidewalks were proposed for replacement. Ms. Lynch clarified that it was not part of the scope but noted that the sidewalks did present real accessibility problems.

Emily Talcott, resident at 3 West Pl, asked if landscaping was being lost. Mr. Collier replied yes and noted that more pervious surface materials were being introduced but did not know the number off hand.

Jon Penterman, resident at 5 West Place, said that occupants of the Annex were driving the number of bike spots proposed in the mature garden. He asked if the need for parking could be solved seasonally with temporary parking versus a permanent change to the garden area. Mr. Collier clarified that the design team had been asked to find ways to provide additional parking on site as far more is required than the site is providing. Ms. Lynch added that the team was concerned additional parking would clutter the space and noted that 12 spaces were still needed on site but the goal was to address it as best as possible around the Annex and even across the street.

Ken Lynch, resident at 3 West Pl, said that the argument was the same as the last time bike parking was added to the site.

Ms. Talcott said that the last time bike parking was reviewed, no one cared about the loss of landscaping but felt that it was enough between the existing parking, glass shelter and outdoor lockers. She noted that the shelter was being used as permanent parking by some people rather than temporary shelter and

transportation. She added that the issue would just spill over into the garden area and hoped that it could be addressed with removal of vehicular parking not landscaping.

Ms. Lynch noted that she did ask ICON and the Lombardi Group to come up with alternatives as she did not want to locate it in the garden. She noted that the team suggested taking out one of the tandem parking spaces, distributing some of that space to the other parking spots, and the remainder to bike parking. She noted that it was a long conversation and that the compromise was to locate it in the garden. She added that the goal was to have the project begin in November, regardless of what happens with the bicycle parking.

Ms. Goodwin noted that the Commission had been back and forth with bike parking in the past and that the building occupants refused to give up a parking space for additional bike parking or landscaping.

Mr. Hsiao commended them on a thoughtful proposal with the idea to strongly unify the building. He expressed concern with bike parking on the Inman Street garden side and felt that the Commission had given numerous approvals for bike parking in the past on site.

Mr. Hsiao made a motion to approve the application subject to the condition that the bike parking in the garden on Inman Street not be included as part of the scheme. Ms. McMahon second the motion; the motion was approved 5-0. (NG, MP, CR, TH, MM)

The Commission took a brief recess from 10:14 - 10:17 PM.

MC-5414: 5 St. Mary Road, by Mirko Ristivojevic. Alter windows.

Mrs. Elliott showed photos while giving an overview of the structure and the application scope before the Commission. She noted that this was a non-binding review.

Shaun Morris, the architect, introduced himself. He said he met with the owners, Natasha and Mirko Ristivojevic, to help them with a kitchen renovation. They were proposing to alter two (2) to allow for a counter to go underneath them. He said they were proposing to raise up the sills and install casements, then Infill aluminum siding under the sills.

Ms. Goodwin asked if they had considered an awning style window instead of a slider. Mr. Morris said no but with how it was designed that was an option.

Ms. Elliott asked how they proposed to deal with the patch issues. Mr. Morris replied they were hoping it would be unobtrusive since there was other patch work on that elevation. CR you could also see if somewhere else it could be pulled to be patched. MR we might put a hanging basket to help disguise.

Mr. Morris presented a second option that preserved the exterior frame and infilled below the sill with an infill panel. The Commission commended the applicant for coming with a second option and voiced their support.

Ms. Litchfield made a motion to approve option 2 that included the wood panel infill below the raised sill to maintain the historic window opening. Mr. Hsiao seconded the motion; the motion was approved 5-0. (NG, MP, LL, TH, MM)

Mr. Hsiao made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Litchfield seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0 and the hearing was adjourned at 10:30 PM. (NG, MP, CR, TH, MM)

Respectfully submitted,

Samantha Elliott
Preservation Administrator

**Members of the Public
 (who signed the Attendance list)
 [clarifications]**

Kelly Speakman	Architect	30 Bow Street, Somerville
Daniel Adelson	Owner	300 1 st Avenue, Needham
Julie Lynch	Project Manager DPW	147 Hampshire Street
Jack Walsh	-	84 Antrim Street
Charles Teague	-	23 Edmunds Street
Sara Mae Berman	Neighbor	23 Fayette Street
John Pitkin	resident	18 Fayette Street
Deb Mandel	resident	242 Hampshire Street
Mela Lyman	resident [owner]	147 Amory Street
Bob Livermore	Architect	14 Spring Street, Waltham
Richard Krushnic	Inman Sq. Neigh. Assn.	20 Oak Street
Sayre Sheldon	-	14 Fayette Street
Natasa Ristivojevic	resident [owner]	5 St. Mary Road [unit 1]
Mary Kennedy	resident	16 Fayette Street
Mike Reppucci	Pharmacist Inman Pharmacy	1414 Cambridge Street
Elena Saporta	MC resident	102 Ellery Street
Kaki Martin	landscape architect	
Susan Fleischman	resident, abutter	5 St. Mary Road
TB Casey	-	18 Ellsworth Park
Ginny Berkowitz	abutter	5 St. Mary Road
Michael Carr	-	4 Beacon street, Somerville
C. Ward	-	4 Beacon Street, Somerville
Susan Markowitz	-	20 Oak Street
Susan Ringler	resident	82 Kinnaird Street
Joanna Herlihy	Inman Sq. resident	410 Norfolk Street
Kathy Watkins	City Engineer, DPW	147 Hampshire Street
Judy Nee	resident	3 St. Mary Road
Stephen Zecher	resident	42 Fayette Street
Greg Netland	abutter	1429 Cambridge Street
Phyllis Bretholtz	resident Inman Sq. Neigh. Assn	65 Antrim Street
Lesley R. Phillips	resident	1643 Cambridge Street, #52
Linda S. Pinti	resident	1643 Cambridge Street, #52
Sharon DeVos	-	118 Antrim Street
John Hixson	-	41 Norris Street

(additional members of the public who did not sign in)

Jon Penterman	abutter	5 West Place
Mark Boyes-Watson	architect	30 Bow Street, Somerville
Ned Collier	architect	101 Summer Street, Boston
Emily Talcott	abutter	3 West Place
Ken Lynch	abutter	3 West Place
Shaun Morris	architect	-
Mirko Ristivojevic	owner	5 St. Mary Road, Unit 1
Gail Sylvester	resident	84 Amory Street

Gerry Laidley	resident	90 Amory Street
Martin Utengaard	abutter	7 St. Mary Road
Andrew Hovey	-	Medford

Note: All addresses are located in Cambridge and/or Massachusetts unless otherwise noted.