

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

January 5, 2017 - 806 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge Senior Center - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: William King, *Chair*; Bruce Irving, *Vice Chair*; William Barry, Robert Crocker, Chandra Harrington, Jo Solet, *Members*; Joseph Ferrara, Kyle Sheffield, Susannah Tobin, *Alternates*

Members absent: Shary Berg, *Member*

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

Public present: See attached list.

Chair King called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M. and explained the hearing procedures.

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 3727: 1-3 Brattle Street, by Brattle Street Properties LLC o/b/o MA Pizza Store UUC. Construct trellis over sidewalk in conjunction with storefront alterations.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the building.

Lesley St. Germaine, attorney for the applicant, described the &Pizza business and their intent for a new location in Cambridge.

David McMahan of McMahan Architects presented the design proposal which included expanding the former Tory Row restaurant space into the Crimson Corner newsstand at the corner of the building closest to Harvard Square. The proposal also included a trellis, signs, and outdoor seating. He described the location of the proposed seating and trellis, the white tile to infill the storefront around the glazing, and a new door on the east-facing elevation at the narrow end of the building facing the subway headhouse. All the original marble would be retained and not covered.

Mr. King asked for clarification about the easement noted on the plan. Mr. McMahan said it was not a true easement, but rather the edge of the area where sidewalk seating was allowed. Mr. Sullivan noted that the Commission staff had allowed temporary seasonal corrals for tables and chairs as long as they were portable but anything permanently installed required approval of the Commission.

Dr. Solet asked if the sidewalk would be obstructed and Mr. McMahan replied in the negative. Dr. Solet asked about the purpose of the trellis since it provided neither sun nor rain protection. Mr. McMahan answered that it was a design feature of most &Pizza restaurants.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the LED light tape on the trellis. Mr. McMahan answered that it would provide a warm glow to the underside of the trellis. Mr. Sheffield asked about other lighted elements of the design. Mr. McMahan noted the sign on the trellis post would be lit, as would the wall sign at the corner. The sign would attach at the new porcelain tile and would not touch the marble.

Mr. Barry asked how the trellis would be supported on the far right side. Mr. McMahan indicated there would need to be an additional post there. The trellis would be freestanding and would not attach to the building.

Mr. King invited questions of fact from the public.

City Councilor Dennis Carlone encouraged the applicants to consult with the Superintendent of Streets.

Craig Appel of 11 Gerry Street asked about the dimensions of the trellis and its distance from the street. Mr. McMahon answered that it would be 8' above the sidewalk and 12' from the street.

Carol O'Hare of 172 Magazine Street asked about the regulations on sidewalk structures. Mr. McMahon indicated that 14' clear sidewalk depth was required. She asked about the size, colors, and brightness of the signs. Would they require a variance? Mr. McMahon described them and said that they were zoning compliant.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place asked about service lines and egress provisions for the restaurant. Mr. McMahon said there was room inside for queuing up. Prof. Blier also asked about the company branding in relation to the trellis.

Susan Miller-Havens of 18 Brattle Street asked about the color of the lights. Mr. McMahon said they would be a warm white. She also asked about the white tile and suggested it should match the stone on the building.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked if the entrance had to be located on the east corner.

Pebble Gifford of Hilliard Street commented that the plans were incomprehensible and the proposed trellis seemed more appropriate for the North End.

Dennis Coveney of Cambridge asked if the trellis was necessary; it would affect a lot of other businesses.

Michael Brandon of 27 Seven Pines Avenue asked several questions and Ms. St. Germaine and Mr. McMahon answered. Number of outdoor seats? 18. Table service? No. Exterior trash and recycling bins? Yes, at the patio.

Alan Greene of 82 Fifth Street asked if the outdoor seating would be year-round. Mr. McMahon indicated it would be seasonal.

Councilor Jan Devereaux asked about the corral fencing for the seating. Mr. McMahon said it would be black and white metal and canvas.

Mr. Appel asked about the permitting violations that occurred at an &Pizza in the District of Columbia. Ms. St. Germain explained that the employee who was responsible had been fired and other corrective measures were taken by the company.

Adrian Landsman of Cambridge asked about the number of pedestrians that use the crosswalk, but the proponents did not have those figures.

Sarah Keslew, who worked in Harvard Square, asked about the white tile and its size relative to the existing marble. She remarked that the tile would overwhelm the appearance of the marble.

Mr. Sullivan explained the district's design guideline for allowing alterations within the masonry storefront surround.

Nancy Gold of 938 Massachusetts Avenue asked about a light study, graffiti prevention, and height of the trellis.

Mr. King opened the public comment period.

Prof. Blier showed slides and remarked that the east end entrance did not make good sense.

Councilor Carlone remarked that the sidewalk trellis would probably not be allowed by Public Works. The tables and chairs would be allowed but would require a permit. The white tiles would be a magnet for posters.

Ms. Meyer expressed concern about adding tables and chairs near the curve of the sidewalk. The trellis was not appropriate. The tile should not cover the marble.

Ms. Corcoran said the trellis would obscure her storefront (Black Ink). There were a lot of obstructions in the sidewalk already. The trellis could be a safety issue for pedestrians.

Ms. Gifford said it was the most important corner in Harvard Square. She suggested that the guidelines be revised to prevent damage to first floor features in the district.

Tim Mudarri of 112 Fayerweather Street commented that the trellis was inappropriate.

Councilor Devereaux registered her opposition to the trellis, white tile, and the entrance location. She added that the Board of Zoning Appeal should not allow the use at that location.

Ms. Miller-Havens remarked on the inappropriateness of the shiny white and black logos.

Ms. O'Hare commented that having separate hearings for every board's review of the project was tedious for the public. All information about the project should be available prior to the first hearing.

Chris Macken of JFK Street said the corporate brand should not overpower the historic appearance of the building.

Mr. Appel spoke against the new use and in favor of the community benefits of the newsstand.

Carole Perrault of 9 Dana Street listed her reasons to find the application incongruous to the location in the district. She indicated it would not preserve or enhance the functional or visual form of the district, was incompatible in its orientation, lot coverage, and relationship to the street, and lacked integrity of location, feeling and association, particularly with its sign board, branding and trellis. She commented that its design, materials and doorway location were more appropriate for a strip mall than a busy pedestrian corner in Harvard Square. She remarked on the quality and significance of the building.

Mr. Brandon asked the Commission to find the trellis inappropriate. It would damage the integrity of the district.

Mr. Coveney said another pizza place was not necessary.

Mr. King closed the public comment period. He noted that the trellis would be new construction, but of a type not anticipated or addressed in the design guidelines. He indicated it was his opinion that the trellis was inappropriate to the district and incongruous to its setting. It would detract from the setting of the Brattle Building and would be an inappropriate addition to the sidewalk. He noted that the storefront

guideline was intended to allow creative retail design but perhaps it should be revised for the central part of the square.

Mr. Ferrara noted that the white tile was too opaque and too much like a sign. He moved to deny the application for a certificate of appropriateness for the trellis on the basis that it was inappropriate in relation to the district guidelines and because it would not enhance the livability of the district. Mr. Barry seconded, and Mr. King designated Mr. Ferrara to vote on the motion. Mr. Barry remarked that the black and white color scheme did not add to the vibrancy or vitality of the district.

Dr. Solet asked if the proponents would consider an ongoing discussion about the design and door placement with the staff. Mr. McMahon said he had heard the comments and was taking it all in. The motion passed in a vote of 7-0.

Public Hearings: Landmark Designation Proceedings

Case L-122: 101 Rogers St., Foundry Building. Consider petition of registered voters to initiate landmark designation study.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized the staff memo about the history and significance of the city-owned building. The Cambridge Redevelopment Authority had been granted authority to oversee the re-use and renovations to the building. The public process regarding re-use had become divisive and suggestions of demolition had been made. Citizens had filed a petition requesting that the Historical Commission initiate a landmark designation study for the property. Originally constructed as an iron foundry for Blake & Knowles Steam Pump Works, the building was adapted for office use in the 1980s. He described recent research by Marie Elena Saccoccio revealing important women's labor history associated with the foundry, adding to the building's significance. He advised that the property met the criteria of significance set out in the ordinance and said that a landmark study would send a strong message that demolition should not be considered an option.

Mr. King noted that the principal petitioner was unable to appear. He asked if anyone else wanted to speak on behalf of the petitioners.

Alan Greene of 82 Fifth Street introduced himself as a board member of the East Cambridge Planning Team. He said the Planning Team members appreciated the building and would support a landmark study. The neighborhood wanted more public uses accommodated in the building.

Tom Evans, Executive Director of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (CRA), reported that the CRA had terminated its contract with the designated developer, CIC Graffito.

Heather Hoffman of 213 Hurley Street spoke in favor of landmark study. She said she hoped the vinyl siding would be removed from the upper stories.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place said it was a perfect building to landmark, exhibiting social, cultural, and architectural significance.

Mr. King closed the public comment period.

Dr. Solet moved to accept the petition and initiate a landmark designation study. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion. Mr. King designated Ms. Tobin to vote as an alternate, and the motion passed 7-0.

Case L-123: 207 Cambridge St. and Case L-124: 227 Cambridge St. Consider petitions of registered voters to initiate landmark designation studies.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized the recent history of the properties. The Commission had initially found both buildings significant and preferably preserved under the demolition delay ordinance. The proponents had modified their proposal several times and continued their hearings with the Commission in order to undertake discussions with the East Cambridge Planning Team. At its December hearing the Commission had considered a revised proposal for a retail and residential building which included preservation of the bank at 227 Cambridge Street but demolition of the former bakery at 207 Cambridge Street. The December hearing coincided with the fifth month of the demolition delay, and in conformance with its usual practice the Commission also considered whether to initiate landmark studies for the buildings. The Commission voted to initiate a study for 227 Cambridge Street to ensure appropriate restoration of the bank building, but to not initiate a landmark study of the former bakery; it instead found that 207 Cambridge Street was no longer preferably preserved in the context of the revised development proposal. Meanwhile, landmark designation study petitions had been received for the two buildings. Though lacking ten verified signatures upon first receipt, additional signatures resulted in valid petitions. He recommended that the Commission decline to accept the petitions to initiate landmark studies because the events of the December hearing had overtaken the situation.

Alan Green of 82 Fifth Street spoke in support of the petitions. The December hearing on the properties had come up very late in the evening. It was worth reconsideration.

Dr. Solet asked if the Commission had the option to not accept a petition. Mr. Sullivan answered that the ordinance pertaining to landmark designation procedures had been in effect since the 1980s and it had been the Commission's habitual practice to decide whether or not to accept a petition and undertake a landmark study. The Commission had already had a hearing on the question in December.

Ms. Harrington moved to acknowledge the receipt of the petitions but to decline to proceed with a landmark study for 207 Cambridge Street due to the previous actions of the Commission to allow the redevelopment project that included the demolition of the building and restoration of 227 Cambridge under landmark status. Mr. Crocker seconded the motion. Mr. King designated Mr. Sheffield to vote as alternate. The motion carried 6-1, with Dr. Solet opposed.

Case L-125: 1-7 JFK St., Abbot Building. Consider petition of registered voters to initiate landmark designation study.

Mr. Sullivan reported that a petition had been received on November 23, 2016, and verified by the Election Commission. On December 1 the Commission voted to schedule a public hearing on the matter for January 5. He showed slides and summarized the staff report dated December 29, 2016. He stated

that a landmark study was unnecessary because the property was already protected under the same ordinance and procedures as part of the Harvard Square Conservation District. Landmark designation would be duplicative. He noted that the ordinance provided for designation of either single-property landmarks or multiple-property neighborhood conservation districts, but the protection provided by either designation was the same. Contrary to popular belief, initiating a landmark designation study would not freeze the ongoing review of the existing application by the Commission under the Harvard Square Conservation District order.

Mr. Sullivan described the history and significance of the Abbot Building. The developer had stated its intention to restore the exterior. He showed slides of the original architectural plans and elevations and early photos of the building. He noted some changes that had been made over time. A great deal was known about the building and how to restore it if the Commission determined to adopt the goal of a full restoration as part of the larger project involving the two adjacent buildings.

Dr. Solet asked if the details of the storefronts were excluded from the Commission's review as they were in the recent 1-3 Brattle Street case. Mr. Sullivan clarified that because this was a redevelopment project, the Commission could condition approval of the overall application on approval of construction details that could include storefront arrangements. Dr. Solet asked if a landmark study would tie the Commission's hands in any way. Mr. Sullivan said it would not, but it also would not give the Commission a stronger hand in reviewing the project.

Mr. King asked for testimony from the petitioners.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place showed slides and gave a presentation in support of the petition for landmark study. She said there was no reason the Commission could not have duplication of protections within the district. The landmark study process would allow for a careful investigation of the plans and a better understanding of the building. The Abbot Building met the criteria for landmark designation. She stated that landmarks and historic districts had stronger regulatory controls than neighborhood conservation districts.

Abra Berkowitz of Broadway described the economic history of the building and the locally-owned businesses located there. Including the public in the process of a landmark study could reveal new information about the building's history.

Councilor Dennis Carlone asked for confirmation that the Commission could require restoration of the Abbot Building as part of its existing Harvard Square Conservation District review of the project. Mr. Sullivan confirmed that within the context of a redevelopment project such as this the Commission could require an appropriate restoration as a condition of approval. He indicated that the Tess storefront was worth preserving.

Councilor Jan Devereaux said she understood the limitation on the CHC's jurisdiction, but the public had spoken clearly about their desire for more predictable rules for this owner and others in Harvard Square. The relative height of the Abbot Building above the Corcoran's Building gave the Abbot more prominence. Adding an infill building of equal height would diminish the Abbot's prominence. A belt and suspenders approach to regulation was warranted.

Vincent Lawrence Dixon a Cambridge tour guide and former resident, testified that Harvard Square was the crossroads of the world. Each building had a story to tell about the history of the city and its people. An additional preservation tool would be important.

Adrian Landsman of Cambridge referred to a period photo. The Abbot Building soared above the others around it and that relationship should be preserved. The rear elevation should continue to be visible, not just the front and sides.

Michael Brandon of Seven Pines Avenue stated that the storefront guidelines of the Harvard Square Conservation District might not protect the Abbot Building storefronts long term. Future owners or tenants might want to alter the restored or preserved storefronts. He urged the Commission to proceed with a landmark study for the building. He noted that the Commission had initiated a study for the Harvard Square Kiosk.

Susan Miller-Havens of 18 Brattle Street said the purpose of the infill was to allow for the penthouse floor on top of the buildings. She expressed concern that the views of the rear of the Abbot Building would be lost.

Mr. King asked that comments remain relevant to the question of a landmark study and not the design details of the proposed project. He said he shared concerns about the current economic changes in the Square but noted that neither landmark nor NCD designation could regulate the use of or interior alterations to the buildings. The staff would use the same diligence of research and advice to the applicant and Commission under either designation. He said that emphasis on individual buildings such as the Kiosk, Abbot, or Brattle buildings would de-emphasize or denigrate every other building in the Conservation District. He agreed with Mr. Dixon that each building had a story and was worthy of protection. He noted that a landmark study or designation would not freeze a property in time. Landmark properties could still be altered, but would require a certificate from the Historical Commission to do so in the same manner as changes to buildings in a neighborhood conservation district.

Ms. Miller-Havens said the public should be inviting developers that would love to restore the buildings, not alter them.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street said some buildings were more important than others. Key foundational issues set the tone. She noted that a depth of approximately 20' was retained at the Read Block when it was redeveloped.

Francis Donovan of 42 Irving Street said that if there was no downside to a landmark study, the Commission could make a lot of people happy by deciding to study the Abbot Building.

Carole Perrault of 9 Dana Street said the Commission's hasty vote in December to allow the demolition of the Corcoran's Building did not inspire her confidence in the Commission's review of the Abbot Building. The Commission must do everything possible to resist and restrain negative impacts to the buildings. The landmark study process was not arduous. She did not trust that the building would be protected in perpetuity.

Pebble Gifford of Hilliard Street asked if the appeal measures for landmarks and NCDs were different. Mr. King answered that the same appeal clause applied to both.

Mike Solet of 15 Berkeley Street said that while the protections might be the same, the impact of the word "landmark" had an inherent meaning that set a building apart. It could be instructive to out-of-state developers to know that they were dealing with a landmark building.

Mr. Sullivan said that everyone present seemed to share the same goals, wanting the best result in Harvard Square. Addressing the question about the harm in landmarking individual buildings within the district, he said it would contradict and confuse the process of historic preservation designation. He explained that when Cambridge wrote the ordinance enabling designation of landmarks and NCDs in the 1970s, the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) would not accept single property historic districts under M.G.L. Ch. 40C. Cambridge's only choice at that time was to use its Home Rule powers to write its own ordinance allowing for landmark and NCD designation. Landmark and NCD designations were considered to be an either-or proposition: landmark designations were intended to protect individual properties, while NCDs were intended to protect groups of buildings. The concept of NCDs was developed in Cambridge and broke new ground for preservation ordinances. It wasn't clear at first if the measure would be challenged, but now MHC advocated for this type of district designation in addition to Ch. 40C historic districts. Other states and municipalities had adopted the Commission's general approach to preservation regulation, but each applied different regulations concerning single property designations; their procedures could not be viewed as applying to Cambridge.

The initial study for Harvard Square anticipated a Ch. 40C historic district, but the stakeholders whose support was necessary would not support it because of the appeal provisions in the statute. The study committee was reconstituted to examine the possibility of an NCD, which was adopted in 2000. The two studies encompassed an extensive public process of 52 meetings over 2½ years. To start landmarking some buildings now would have the effect of giving other buildings second-class status. It would be an administrative nightmare to undertake landmark studies on the 80+ buildings that people might petition for in the Square.

Dr. Solet asked about what could happen several years from now if an owner wanted to change a storefront at the Abbot Building. Mr. Sullivan said the Commission could put restrictions on a certificate to protect such features in the long term.

Dr. Solet moved to accept the petition and initiate a landmark study, saying that she did not think the Commission had the option of not accepting a petition and preparing a landmark study report. Mr. King noted that the Commission had received a report from the staff recommending that the Commission not initiate a study. He asked for a second to Dr. Solet's motion. Mr. Barry seconded, saying that he supported a study not because he believed it offered greater protection to the building but because there was a huge number of members of the public supporting it.

The Commission discussed the motion. Ms. Harrington said she was torn for the same reasons as Mr. Barry. She added that it could be good to let the Council make the decision at the end of a study. Mr. King described some things in the ordinance (Ch. 2.78 of the municipal code) that he would like to see refined including the definition of demolition and the confusing language in the landmark/NCD article cited by Dr. Solet.

Mr. King designated Mr. Ferrara to vote as an alternate. The motion failed in a vote of 3-4 with Dr. Solet, Mr. Barry, and Ms. Harrington voting in favor and Messrs. Ferrara, King, Crocker, and Irving opposed.

Determination of Procedure: Landmark Designation Proceedings

Case L-126: 40 Cottage Street and L-127: 44 Cottage Street. Consider petition of registered voters to initiate landmark designation study.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the two properties on Cottage Street and reported that two petitions for landmark study had been received and verified by the Election Commission.

Ms. Burks noted that the matter had not yet been scheduled or advertised for a public hearing.

Ms. Harrington moved to acknowledge receipt of both petitions and to schedule public hearings for the matters on February 2. Mr. Ferrara seconded the motion. Mr. King designated Mr. Sheffield to vote as alternate. The motion passed 7-0.

Reports

Summary of Campus Architectural Survey, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Presentation by MIT Planning Office.

Mr. Sullivan explained the background of the protocol between Harvard University and the Commission with regard to National Register listed or eligible properties. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) had recently entered into a similar protocol with the Commission. The first step in the process was to evaluate MIT buildings for significance. In 2002, MIT had completed a survey of its buildings not on the academic campus, but it had been several decades since the campus buildings had been surveyed by the Historical Commission as part of the ca. 1978-86 multiple-resource nomination. Over the

last six to nine months, MIT had undertaken a new survey of its campus buildings, hiring the Public Archaeology Lab (PAL) to perform the study and compile the survey results. The staff of the MIT Planning Department wished to present a summary of the survey process and results.

Thayer Donham of MIT showed slides and described the methodology. After PAL completed the inventory forms and the related research for the 71 buildings in the study, a review panel evaluated their recommendations and rated each building according to National Register evaluation criteria. The resulting report would be used by MIT staff for planning purposes and as a general reference tool. The survey should be updated in about ten years to include buildings that were presently less than 40 years old. The keyed map of surveyed properties went to all 65 project managers at MIT so that they would know when to contact CHC staff.

Mr. King suggested that the survey be used for long-term planning as well as shorter term maintenance projects and renovations. He thanked Ms. Donham for the presentation and extended thanks to the MIT staff and consultants who worked on the project.

Policies and Procedures

Policy requiring posting notice of proposed demolition of a potentially significant 50+ year old building.

Mr. Sullivan summarized the proposed new policy that would require posting of a meeting notice on the property. He reported that he had sent a draft to the City Solicitor but had not yet received any comments from her office. He recommended that adoption should be contingent on any comments or edits proposed by the City Solicitor.

Mr. King reported that the staff had also sent the draft for comment to two lawyers familiar with the commission's demolition procedures. Neither had offered comment on this policy.

Ms. Harrington asked if the notice board would be in addition to the other existing notification methods. Mr. Sullivan replied in the affirmative.

Dr. Solet asked if the policy would be consistent with other boards and commissions. Mr. Sullivan answered that the Board of Zoning Appeal and Planning Board require posting of notices. The Historical Commission used to require it years ago, but a property owner complaint prompted an order from the City Solicitor to cease the practice because it was not specifically authorized in the City Code. Mr. King said the Commission could either adopt a policy or seek to amend the ordinance. Ms. Burks noted that the Commission currently requires posting of notices in the Harvard Square Conservation District.

Michael Brandon suggested that the word "continued" be changed to "postponed" in relation to hearing procedures in the event that inadequate provision of public notice is given. He stated that each city board and commission should have the same notification requirements. He recommended mailed notice to abutters and abutters-to-abutters within 300 feet. Ms. Burks answered that such mailings were already the practice of the Commission staff.

Mr. Barry weighed the benefit of using the word “may” vs. “shall” in the last sentence. Mr. Sullivan said he could change the sentence to say “postponed or continued.” John Hawkinson of cambridgeday.com suggested keeping the language as originally drafted.

Mr. Irving moved to approve the policy as drafted, subject to becoming final upon the Law Department’s approval or on February 2, whichever comes first. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion. Mr. King designated Ms. Tobin to vote as an alternate and the motion passed 7-0.

Policy allowing relocation of potentially significant 50+ year old buildings to achieve conformity with zoning setbacks.

Mr. Sullivan described the intent of the measure, but said he had received substantive comments and the policy needed more study. Mr. Barry moved to continue the hearing until February 2. Mr. Crocker seconded. The motion passed 7-0 with Ms. Tobin voting as an alternate.

Preservation Grants

Case PG 17-3: 50 York St., by Just A Start, \$100,000. Repair fire damage.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the fire in the neighborhood in December.

Bill Gordon, Director of Real Estate for Just A Start Corp., said that 16 units of affordable housing had been damaged and many residents displaced. The structural damage was severe. The trusses in the attic had been largely burned out. In addition to the fire damage to the roof and upper floors there was water damage that might require a new foundation. The Travelers Insurance Co. had declared the building a total loss and would only cover the costs of new construction, not full restoration which would be more expensive. A public meeting with the community was being planned to discuss the issue and options. He said they might have to request a demolition permit, and asked for feedback about that possibility.

Mr. King asked about Board of Survey procedures. Mr. Sullivan explained that process.

Ms. Burks asked if the zoning code did not allow reconstruction within one year of a fire. Mr. Hawkinson noted that the City Council had asked the City Manager to look into zoning changes which would allow that.

Mr. Sheffield asked if new construction might allow the opportunity to be more efficient with the layout of units on the site. He referred to the reconstruction of two churches in the Back Bay in the 1960s and ’70s, where substantial portions of the structures were retained. Mr. Sullivan replied that St. Patrick’s had a wooden frame covered with plaster and lath, which would be much less forgiving of intervention.

Mr. Ferraro spoke admiringly of the fine proportions and character of the existing building.

Mr. Irving spoke in favor of building a contemporary design that would better meet current needs.

Dr. Solet asked about preserving the stained glass; Mr. Gordon said it might be salvageable.

Mr. King said that an interesting new design might be an appropriate replacement.

Mr. Gordon thanked the commissioners for their input.

Case IPG 17-6: 53 Antrim St., by First Reformed Presbyterian Church (#3), \$42,500. Accessibility ramp.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the request for a grant of \$42,500 to construct an access ramp along the south wall of the church. He recommended granting the full amount.

PG IPG 17-7: 106 Antrim St., by First Reformed Presbyterian Church Parsonage, \$12,500. Window restoration.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the request for a grant of \$12,500 to restore the windows of the 1888 parsonage on Antrim Street. He recommended granting the full amount.

Mr. Irving moved to approve both grants as requested. Mr. Crocker seconded. The motion passed 7-0 with Mr. Ferrara voting as an alternate.

Minutes

Mr. King deferred discussion of the minutes until the next meeting.

Director's Report

There was no discussion on the written report.

Mr. Irving moved to adjourn, Mr. Crocker seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:01 A.M. on January 6, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public
Who Signed the Attendance List on January 5, 2017**

Al May	411 Franklin St. #304
Elizabeth Gambosi	42 Irving St.
Francis Donovan	42 Irving St.
Suzanne Blier	5 Fuller Pl.
Susan Miller Havens	18 Brattle St. #354
Virginia Newes	986 Memorial Dr. #105
Graciela Galup	36 Copley St.
David Matthews	5 Arlington St. #42
Priscilla McMillan	18 Brattle St./12 Hilliard St.
Vince Dixon	60 Lake St., unit N, Winchester 01890
Bill Brown	410 Park Ave., NYC 10022
A. Burke	102 Perkins St. #2, Somerville 02145
Craig Appel	11 Gerry St.
Morgan Pinney	MIT, 77 Mass. Ave.
Thayer Donham	MIT, 77 Mass Ave.
Carol O'Hare	172 Magazine St.
Alan Greene	82 Fifth St.
Dennis Carlone	9 Washington Ave.
Susan Corcoran	5 Brattle St.
Dennis Coveney	Cambridge 02140
Richard Wilson	Cambridge 02138
Nancy Gold	Weston 02493
Tom Evans	CRA, 255 Main St.
Carole Perrault	9 Dana St.
Heather Hoffman	213 Hurley St.
Tim Mudarri	112 Fayerweather St. #1

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.