



**CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS**  
**OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**  
**JOSEPH A. CURTATONE**  
**MAYOR**

*HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION*

**DRAFT MINUTES**

Tuesday, November 15, 2011 at 6:40 p.m.  
Third Floor Conference Room

**Staff Present:** Kristi Chase and Brandon Wilson.

**Members Present:** Kevin Allen, Alan Bingham\*, Dick Bauer, Tom DeYoung\*, Ryan Falvey, Abby Freedman, Eric Parkes, Kelly Speakman and Todd Zinn\*\*. Dick Bauer left at 9:00 PM.

**Members Absent:** Natasha Burger\*, DJ Chagnon\*, Sarah Degutis\*, Derick Snare\*, and Brad Stearns\*

\*Alternates

\*\*Non-voting Alternate until 9:00 PM

**Others present:** Abe Barker, John and Madeline Belski, Danielle Bennett, George Born, Alderman Bruce Desmond, Paula Dowd, David Hanauer, Brian Houseman, Dylan James, Richard McDevitt, Danny Mehigan, Debbie Lewis, Pablo Nistal, Hank Reisen, Sara Kristal Towsley, Patty Trullo, Kaj Vandkjaer, Gilda Walsh.

*The meeting was called to order at 6:50 pm.*

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*The Commission voted unanimously (5-0-2(Kevin Allen and Kelly Speakman) to approve the October 2011 Minutes as amended.*

**DELIBERATION OF HPC CASES**

The Somerville Historic Preservation Commission will hold public hearings on the following applications, all in accordance with the Historic Districts Act, Chapter 40C of the Massachusetts General Laws, as amended, and the City of Somerville Ordinance (Sections 7-16 – 7-28):



CITY HALL • 93 HIGHLAND AVENUE • SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS 02143  
(617) 625-6600 EXT. 2500 • TTY: (617) 666-0001 • FAX: (617) 625-0722

[www.somervillema.gov](http://www.somervillema.gov)



**HPC 11.98 – 50 Bow Street – 1874 Former Union Square Police Station (continued from October 18, 2011) 9/26/11**

Applicant: Abriam Barker, Contractor for Danielle Bennett, Condominium Owner

The Applicant seeks a **Certificate of Appropriate (C/A)** for the following:

1. Remove 5 existing double-hung, single pane windows on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor north (front)(1), west (side)(3) and rear(1); and
2. Replace with 5 Marvin® Ultimate double-hung magnum insulated windows

***David Hanauer** presented with additional comments from **Danielle Bennett** and **Abe Barker**, the contractor. He summarized their presentation from the previous month and reiterated the reasons why they did not want to use JB Sash windows and had purchased Marvin Ultimate magnum windows. They have spoken with other owners and neighbors and presented a petition to the Commission stating their view of the proceedings. They had met with 2 Commission members (Eric Parkes and Kelly Speakman) who reviewed the visibility issues, dimensional differences, and the reflectivity of the Lo-E glass. The contractor noted that he could alter the windows to look like the JB Sash windows but they would not be operable. The muntin would not be as pointed but it was salient that one could not see the triangular profile from the distance of the street. Alterations to the fastener would void the warrantee on the windows. They had not talked to Kim Cleary about repairing and weather-stripping the existing windows as recommended at the previous SHPC meeting because they had already decided to replace the existing windows with the Marvin windows that they had purchased.. Many of the condominium owners are unhappy with the JB Sash windows and some have replaced them and still have problems. David Hanauer finds putting undue 'onus on the other owners' excessive. Abe Barker said that he had opened one window casing and it had no proper jack studs. The windows need solid rigid posts so if these are done, the windows should hold. He stated further that these would be the 'biggest puppies he had ever put on a leash'. The Applicants stated that the owners were responsible for windows while the condominium association was responsible for the rest of the building. They stated that a letter of support from the condominium association board had been submitted.*

***Public Comment** was received from other residents of the 50 Bow Street and Alderman- at- Large Bruce Desmond. Some of the **residents** comments regarding the existing windows were that wood is rotting on the lower portion of the sashes; and that they are not insulated and are not well-framed. Pablo Nistal, as did the other residents, said they were not tight. One resident putty-sealed her windows closed. Debbie Lewis felt that the Applicants had done thorough research. She would be glad to know what changes such as windows were pre- approved. Uniformity and integrity are important. One resident said that the condominium association board may not have the ability to enforce a choice. They may ask that windows be similar in appearance. A balance needs to be achieved between the values of retaining the historic building ; its cohesive appearance; and its livability.*

***Alderman Desmond** noted that this is one of the most important historic buildings in the City. He did not find the rear and sides to be visible. He noted that 2 mistakes had been made. The Applicants should have come to the Commission first because they have made a huge investment in their property. The second is that City may have dropped the ball; the Inspectional Services Division did not catch the incorrect installation of the windows. People have made a huge investment but should not compromise the building. Does the City have funds to help pay for the windows? Could they adapt the front window to match? He would like the Commission to make a list of approved items. He would like the Commission to notify Eddie Nuzzo to instruct ISD to pay more attention to the correct installation of windows so that this problem does not re-occur.*

***Staff Recommendations** were revised as comments were made. The Staff recognized many of the issues that had been brought up as being important and thanked Alderman Desmond. The Commission wants the City and the building to be livable; they are willing to work with the owners to make things work for all so that residents continue to stay invested in the City. Staff reviewed whether the problems with the*

windows were due to the size or installation. The alteration would set a precedent for the building. Applications for work should have come from the condo association because generally a condo association represents the building as a whole rather than the owners individually. Staff noted that the SHPC guidelines for all designated buildings highly encourage that windows be consistent, especially on the front façade. Generally speaking, alterations are not recommended for publicly visible windows. All windows highly visible from the public way should be consistent, especially those on the front of the building. However, the decision in this case should be based on the current circumstances.

**Documents:** City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.16 – 7.27, Property Form B, HPC Design Guidelines, e-mail from Go Management, LLC dated September 30, 2011, petition by the Applicant stating their point of view signed by 43 people of whom 7 are Bow Street residents, window specifications from Marvin®, and photographs of the building.

**Discussion:** **Eric Parkes**, who had visited the site with the homeowner and contractor, noted that he did not believe that the windows on the rear were visible and that the windows on the side were minimally visible due to the oblique angle from which they could be viewed from the street. There were dimensional differences between the historic reproduction windows in the thickness of the profiles, jambs and rails with less set back. These differences are (from the exterior): the existing windows have wider side rails and top rail (about 2 1/2" vs. 1 1/2" for the Marvin) and meeting rail (about 1 5/8" vs. 2 3/8"), deeper casings (3/4" vs. 3/8"), thinner glass (3/8" vs. 3/4" - not measured, though), and deeper reveal of the glass (not measured) within the sash. Also, the J.B. Sash window has a simulated putty bead around the glass while the Marvin windows uses a flatter convex w/ filet profile similar to what one sees on the interior of a window. **Kelly Speakman** noted several possible reasons for the failure of the existing windows. They may be too large for the size of the opening and too delicate to support the weight of the glazing; or they may have been improperly installed with inadequate support in the framing. She does not have experience with windows of this scale. The proposed windows could have the same issues. She believes that the Marvin is a very good quality window and noted that the windows selected by the Applicants are the best for the size of the opening. Neither Eric Parkes nor Kelly Speakman were able to assess the reflectivity of the Low-E glass contained in the applicants' purchased windows.

The **Commission** reviewed the visibility, reflectivity and dimensional issues. They noted that the Staff and Commission decide what is under the review by the Commission not the Applicants. The Applicants should have met with the Staff to review the procedure and not interpreted the Ordinance themselves. The windows should have been reviewed by the Commission before they were purchased by the Applicants. If the windows were not visible from street, a Certificate of Non-Applicability would be issued. After some discussion, the Commission agreed that while the side and rear windows of the building, being visible, were under their purview, they were primarily concerned with the consistency of those on the main façade.

The differences between the JB Sash and the Marvin windows would be visible from the street especially if they were next to each other in a paired window casing rather than separated by the brick work into single window units. If the new paired windows were the same, and if, whenever other owners in the building were considering replacing their windows, all of them agreed to use the same Marvin Ultimate double-hung magnum insulated windows, perhaps the alteration would not be as visible. A trained eye would notice the differences between the new pair of Marvin windows and the JB Sash windows on the rest of the facade, but this difference would be less noticeable than if a JB Sash window and a Marvin window were paired together side by side in the same opening. Paint would make the differences less visible. **Eric Parkes** and **Kelly Speakman** were unable to evaluate the Low E coating on the Marvin windows during the site visit. The difference in the glass between the Marvin windows and the existing JB Sash windows may not be apparent until the new windows are installed. It may be subtle. Both windows in the opening would need to be done together.

**Kevin Allen** noted that manufacturers may change their window specifications over time and that manufacturers may go out of business. Therefore, a list of windows acceptable to the SHPC would not

work. *Enabling condo owners to make a selection from a list of windows without SHPC review of each alteration could lead to the undesirable result of a hodgepodge of windows on the main façade.*

*There was also some discussion about the responsibilities of the condominium association and the condominium owners. None of the residents at the meeting represented the association, only individual ownership of their condominium units. The e-mailed letter of support from Go Management stated that the condominium board was in support of the Application and did not discuss whether or not the windows were subject to their review. There should be a consensus in the condominium association regarding any alterations to the envelope of the building, as such decisions affect the entire building, not just one unit. The Commission was under the impression that the condominium association rather than the individual owners were the responsible party of record. The Commission would like to see a copy of documents/master deeds to better understand the responsibilities of owners and the association board. It is important that any solution in this case works for all, not just one owner. To ensure consistency of the building exterior, the Commission needs to work with the condominium association*

*Todd Zinn, Abby Freedman and Alan Bingham expressed concerns about the inaccuracies and misrepresentations of the petition presented by the Applicants and would like their concerns noted for the record. They recognized the frustration of the applicants, but believed that the petition circulated among the condominium owners and neighbors contained misinformation and did not make clear what the real issues were.*

**Decision:** *The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to*

1. Remove 1 existing double-hung, insulated glass window on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor north front facade; and
2. Replace it with a Marvin® Ultimate double-hung magnum insulated window as specified in the application
3. Subject to the conditions that:
  - a. The companion window in the pair also be replaced with the same Marvin® Ultimate double-hung magnum insulated window, and
  - b. The applicants supply the SHPC with a copy of the condominium documents showing their authority to make the changes for which the permits were requested.

*The Commission noted that this decision is considered precedent setting for 50 Bow Street. Therefore the Commission expects that any other condominium owners at 50 Bow St. wishing to replace their current windows will be required in the future to install windows with the same manufacturer, style, details, and materials, so long as they are available, in order to maintain the consistency of the façade. Under the Somerville Historic Preservation Ordinance, each owner will still need to have their windows reviewed and approved by the Commission before purchasing and installing them. The Commission does not intend that this decision sets a precedent for other buildings in the Bow Street District or other Local Historic Districts in the city.*

*While 3 of the remaining 4 windows to be replaced are partially visible from the public right of way, and it is arguable that the 4th window is also visible, the details of the windows are not. Therefore the Commission also voted unanimously (7-0) to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for those windows to*

4. Remove 4 existing double-hung, insulated glass windows on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor west side and rear elevations; and
5. Replace them with 4 Marvin® Ultimate double-hung magnum insulated windows. 6. Subject to the condition that the applicants supply the SHPC with a copy of the condominium documents showing their authority to make the changes for which the permits were requested.

**HPC 11.107 – 23 Pleasant Avenue, 1893 Henry Colson House**

10/7/11

Applicant: Dylan James, Contractor for Timothy Brown, Owner

The Applicant seeks a **Certificate of Appropriate (C/A)** for the following:

1. Remove rear basement door;

2. Install new bay window on ground floor;
3. Remove 2 windows on rear and rear side ell;
4. Replace with siding to match existing;
5. Remove and replace front, side and rear porch doors; and
6. Install a second set of stairs from rear entry landing into backyard.

**Dylan James presented.** *They have been primarily doing interior renovations especially to the bathrooms and kitchen. Some choices made for better efficiency in the use of spaces and to relate the kitchen to the backyard are reflected in changes to the exterior. These changes are all on the rear of the building, not the main façade. The bay/oriel window will be constructed as shown. It is not a modern shallow prefab design and will have details inspired by those found on other parts of the building.*

*Other alterations proposed include new doors to replace those that were inappropriate to the building or the location. The porch door on the second floor rear would be replaced with either a French door or one with multiple lights to bring more light into the upstairs hallway. The side door would be one with multiple lights and a single panel beneath. There are 2 proposed doors for the front entry: one with a single light and single panel below, the other would be a simple 2-panel door. Either of the proposed front doors would use either the Baldwin Barclay or Baltimore Doorknob sets which have a very traditional look.*

*During the repairs and reconsideration of what needed doing, they discovered that one of the windows on the side of the building had been made smaller and should be returned to its original size and another one also needs to be replaced. These had not been part of the original proposal and so were not given legal notification. The applicants will return next month to present the window changes.*

**Staff Recommendations** were read.

**No Public Comment** was received

**Documents:** *City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.16 – 7.27, Property Form B, HPC Design Guidelines, plans by Reisen Design Associates dated 08/08/11 and revised on 10/3/11, window specifications from Marvin®, brochure from Lemieux Doors showing # 2081, cut sheets for Simpson Door Company for Thermal French (SDL) 37944, and for Baldwin door hardware #6552 and #6554, and photographs of the building.*

**Discussion:** *On the whole the Commission found that all the proposed changes were appropriate. Further detail is needed of the side porch. The dumpster currently hides the door and porch but these will be visible once they have been removed. The front door should have a single light, solid door being less appropriate*

**Decision:** *The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to:*

7. Remove rear basement door;
8. Install new bay window on ground floor;
9. Remove 2 windows on rear and rear side ell;
10. Replace with siding to match existing; and
11. Remove and replace front and rear porch doors

*Because they met the HPC Guidelines*

*The Applicant is to return next month with further information concerning the side porch and doorway along with information on the 2 windows on which no legal notice had been given.*

1. Construct an additional 2-unit dwelling designed to resemble a barn to the lot containing an existing 1-family dwelling.

***The Applicant has requested** a continuance until the December 20, 2011 meeting in order to make a more complete presentation to the Commission than will be possible at this time.*

***Staff Recommendations** were not read.*

***No Public Comment** was received*

***Documents:** City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.16 – 7.27, Property Form B, HPC Design Guidelines, Plans and photographs of the building.*

***There was no Discussion:***

***Decision:** The Commission **voted** unanimously (7-0) to continue the meeting until the regularly scheduled December 20, 2011 HPC Meeting.*

## **REVIEW AND COMMENT**

### **HPC 11.116 – Mystic Water Works at Capen Court Housing Project Owners: Somerville Housing Authority**

1. Create 60 affordable rental dwelling units for seniors and persons with disabilities by
  - a. Converting the existing Mystic Pumping Station into 25 units;
  - b. Demolishing the existing 1941 garage and office buildings at the rear of the property; and
  - c. Constructing a 35 unit apartment building;

*Due to the lengthy meeting, the Applicants chose to return to give their presentation to the Commission at a later date since there were no decisions to be made.*

## **DEMOLITION REVIEWS**

### **9-MONTH REVIEW PERIOD**

**HPC 11.02 Demolition – 39-43 Elmwood Street, circa 1898 wood-frame house** 2/15/11  
Applicants: Charles Aggouras and Daniel DiPierro, GFC Development Inc

*The house at 39 Elmwood was ‘preferably preserved’ because its history reflects the neighborhood from its earliest days when it was the home of the local baker and Italian grocer, and then the home of French-Canadian immigrants whose names are inscribed on the Roll of Honor, and who lost their lives as soldiers in World War II. Architecturally, the house fits in well with the residential streetscape to the north and south.*

*There are no further proposed changes to the original house.*

## **NEW DETERMINATIONS OF “PREFERABLY PRESERVED”**

**HPC 11.109 Demolition – 29 Day Street, circa 1870 Rich Collins House** 10/17/11  
Applicant: Kaj Vandkjaer, architect for **Borderline Improvements LLC**, Owner

Review of the SHPC’s previous determination (11/17/08) that under of the City of Somerville Ordinance, the subject house is considered “significant” as set forth in Section 7-28 b (2). Public testimony will be

taken, followed by discussion and a vote by the Commission on whether the building should be “preferably preserved” per section b (2) b. The building is at least 50 years old, and has been determined by the Commission to be:

- a. **“Importantly associated with** one or more historic persons or events, or with **the broad architectural**, cultural, political, economic or social **history of the City** or the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or
- b. **“Historically or architecturally significant (in terms of period, style, method of building construction**, or association with a reputed architect or builder) either by itself or **in the context of a group of buildings** or structures, and therefore it is in the public interest to be preserved or rehabilitated rather than to be demolished.”

*Specifically, the significance of the building is: associated with a group of similar buildings constructed in the Mansard style in a prominent location. It shares a common roofline and massing with several other buildings on the street. The building retains the massing and form characteristic of the neighborhood. The iteration and repetition of the roof lines and the eave returns form the rhythm of the streetscape. The Commission was particularly interested that those aspects of the building be retained.*

**Paula Dowd presented.** *This is really a partial demolition. She would really like to work with the Commission to bring the building back to what it should be and could be. The building had changes and alterations over time that resulted in a loss of detail and much of its historic character. Garrett Laws confirmed that the slate roof is still good and only needs a small amount of repair. Wood gutters and copper flashing will be used. The window hoods in the mansard and window casing details still need to be determined as does the front porch. She is looking for a new front door as well.*

**Staff Recommendations** were read.

**No Public Comment** was received.

**Documents:** *City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.16 – 7.27, Draft Property Form B, HPC Design Guidelines, Plans and photographs of the building.*

**Discussion.** *Because this is a partial demolition and the Applicants desire to return the building to a semblance of its former style, most of the discussion centered on various resources for salvage materials. In the interest of speed, Staff may review and consult with Commissioners to offer advice as they go forward.*

**Decision:** *The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) that the building was “preferably preserved.” The Applicants may return to the Commission and Staff for advice and recommendations on best practices for rehabilitation of the facade.*

## NEW DETERMINATIONS OF “SIGNIFICANCE”

The Commission may make a preliminary determination under the City of Somerville Ordinance as set forth in Section 7-28 b (2) on whether any buildings are “significant”. Prior notice is not required by the Ordinance. Public testimony followed by discussion and a vote by the Commission.

**HPC 11.113 – 1 Village Terrace – pre-1874 Workers Cottage**

10/25/11

Applicant: Doug S. Beaudet, Owner

**The Applicant has requested** *a continuance until the December 20, 2011 meeting in order to make a more complete presentation to the Commission.*

**The Applicant has requested** a continuance until the December 20, 2011 meeting in order to make a more complete presentation to the Commission than will be possible at this time.

**Staff Recommendations** were not read.

**No Public Comment** was received.

**Documents:** City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.16 – 7.27, Property Form B, HPC Design Guidelines, Plans and photographs of the building.

**There was no Discussion.**

**Decision:** The Commission **voted** unanimously (7-0) to continue the meeting until the regularly scheduled December 20, 2011 HPC Meeting.

**HPC 11.114 – 2 Village Terrace – pre-1874 Workers Cottage**

10/25/11

Applicant: Doug S. Beaudet, Owner

**The Applicant has requested** a continuance until the December 20, 2011 meeting in order to make a more complete presentation to the Commission.

**The Applicant has requested** a continuance until the December 20, 2011 meeting in order to make a more complete presentation to the Commission than will be possible at this time.

**Staff Recommendations** were not read.

**No Public Comment** was received.

**Documents:** City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.16 – 7.27, Property Form B, HPC Design Guidelines, Plans and photographs of the building.

**There was no Discussion.**

**Decision:** The Commission **voted** unanimously (7-0) to continue the meeting until the regularly scheduled December 20, 2011 HPC Meeting.

**HPC 11.118 – 36 Rush Street – circa 1870 Second Empire**

11/9/11

Applicant: Doug S. Beaudet, Owner

**The Applicant has requested** a continuance until the December 20, 2011 meeting in order to make a more complete presentation to the Commission.

**The Applicant has requested** a continuance until the December 20, 2011 meeting in order to make a more complete presentation to the Commission than will be possible at this time.

**Staff Recommendations** were not read.

**No Public Comment** was received.

**Documents:** City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.16 – 7.27, Property Form B, HPC Design Guidelines, Plans and photographs of the building.

**There was no Discussion.**

**Decision:** The Commission **voted** unanimously (7-0) to continue the meeting until the regularly scheduled December 20, 2011 HPC Meeting.

**OTHER ACTION ITEMS**

**LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT EXPANSIONS**

- Vote to write a Preliminary Report for Properzi Way LHD

*The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) that the Staff should write a Preliminary Report for submittal to the Planning Board and the MHC as quickly as is feasible.*

- Vote to write a Preliminary Report for American Tube Works LHD

*The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) that the Staff should write a Preliminary Report for submittal to the Planning Board and the MHC.*

**STAFF REVIEW & APPROVAL OF DEMOLITIONS & CERTIFICATES OF NON-APPLICABILITY**

*None as of November 3, 2011*

**STAFF REVIEW AND COMMENTS AS PER REQUEST OF OTHER DIVISIONS**

**PLANNING DIVISION REVIEWS**

**HPC 11.112 – 21 Chetwynd Road**

11/4/11

Owner: Chabat of Medford

*The addition on the rear of the building follows HPC guidelines in the retention of the characteristic gambrel roof shape and replication of window sizes and style where new openings are needed.*

**SECTION 106 REVIEWS**

**Storefront Improvement Program Reviews**

**HPC 11.110 – 62B Summer Street, Dreamstar Studios**

11/3/11

*Replacement of signage and awnings will have no “adverse effect.”*

**HPC 11.111 – 510 Medford Street**

11/3/11

*Replacement of signage and awnings will have no “adverse effect.”*

**Telecommunications Facilities**

**HPC 11.120 – 425 Broadway**

11/10/11

Applicant: The Ottery Group for AT & T Mobility

*Relocation and replacement of telecommunications equipment will have no “adverse effect”.*

**HPC 11.121 – 27 College Avenue**

11/10/11

Applicant: The Ottery Group for AT & T Mobility

*Relocation and replacement of telecommunications equipment will have no “adverse effect”.*

**HPC 11.122 – 252 Medford Street**

11/10/11

Applicant: The Ottery Group for AT & T Mobility

*Relocation and replacement of telecommunications equipment will have no “adverse effect”.*

**HPC 11.123 – 230 Medford Street**

11/10/11

Applicant: The Ottery Group for AT & T Mobility

*Relocation and replacement of telecommunications equipment will have no “adverse effect”.*

**PROJECT AND OTHER BUSINESS UPDATES**

**Project Updates**

**HPC Guidelines Revisions** (Abby Freedman with Amie Schaeffer)

- Committee will be meeting on Thursday, 11/10/11 from 7-9pm
- Update on progress at monthly meeting

**City-wide LHD Expansion Project** (Brandon Wilson with Amie Schaeffer)

- BOA voted on 8-0 (with Desmond, Pero & Taylor absent) to designate 9 of the 18 proposed properties in Group E as part of LHDs.
- Ordinance map amendments for Group E submitted to the Registry of Deeds for recording on 11/2/11; awaiting final stamps and book and page numbers
- Remaining properties in Group E on hold pending Ward Aldermen follow-up with owners
- PowerPoint presentation and neighborhood meeting re: proposed Hinckley-Magoun LHD properties– on hold pending further discussion with Ward Alderman.
- Group F Narrative and information packages to be reviewed by new OSPCD Exec. Director before being mailed to owners..

**Union Square LHD Expansion** (Brandon Wilson and Kristi Chase)

- Preliminary Report being reviewed by new OSPCD Exec. Director for discussion with Mayor
- Submission to the Somerville Planning Board and the MHC for review and comment will follow

**West Branch Library Access Study** (Brandon Wilson)

- Meeting with new City-wide Library Director, Maria Carpenter occurred 10-27-11
- Contract awarding to TBA Architects, Inc. in progress

**Upcoming 2011 Surveying Projects** (Brandon Wilson & Kristi Chase with Amie Schaeffer)

- Survey work to continue on St. Catherine’s Church with associated properties
- RFP for 2011 Broadway & Other CDBG Eligible Properties Survey
- RFP for Union Square NRD Nomination & Prospect Hill Park NR Eligibility Opinion
- Preliminary Report for Properzi Way LHD
- Preliminary Report for American Tube Works LHD

**Milk Row Cemetery Preservation Project – Outstanding Work** (Brandon Wilson)

- Heritage Tree Treatment awaiting Purchasing Dept. approval and new FY funding
- Site signage on hold until funding identified
- Fence Painting Touch-ups by Cassidy Fencing Co. – awaiting Cassidy site inspection
- Bike Racks on Somerville Ave. – awaiting new shipment to City
- Relocation, new signage & improvement of Market Basket bike racks – ph 1 completed
- Additional restoration & repair work on tombs and markers subject to funding availability
- Additional public access – ongoing; Veteran’s Day commemoration of those buried in the Milk Row Cemetery to occur at 3:30pm on Fri. Nov. 11<sup>th</sup> with brief wreath laying ceremony, and talk at the Somerville Museum .

**Orchard Street National Register District** (Kristi Chase and Brandon Wilson)

- At 10/20/11 meeting with Cambridge Historical Commission Staff it was determined that their intern had not adequately surveyed the proposed Somerville properties and there was now very limited support for a NR District in this area.
- Alternatively it was agreed that the work to date would be better suited to a walking tour. A collaborative venture between Cambridge and Somerville was proposed for a Jane's Walk to occur as part of events planned for May 2012 Preservation Month.

**Preservation Awards Program** (Brandon Wilson)

- **Deadline for nominations** for 2012 Awards is Fri. Nov. 18th; will be extended to Mon. **Nov. 28.<sup>th</sup>** Please look out for houses deserving a Director's Award, which are the non-designated older properties throughout the City.
- Exhibit of 2011 Awards artwork has moved from City Hall to Thalia Tringo's Real Estate office on Community Path, just off Willow Ave. Reception to showcase the winning properties and the SHS students' artwork TBA soon.

**Historic Afghan Re-design and Re-ordering** (Brandon Wilson with Mayor's Office)

- Re-design ideas to be sent back to production firm for new draft, pending PO approval

**Preservation Newsletters** (Brandon Wilson with Amie Schaeffer)

- Newsletter #3 planned for Winter 2012 pending funding for printing, postage, & staff time

**SHPC Website Enhancements** (Brandon Wilson with Communications Office)

- Check out ongoing additions to both of our websites via <http://www.ci.somerville.ma.us/departments/historic-preservation-commission> and <http://www.ci.somerville.ma.us/departments/ospcd/historic-preservation>
- Also note Somerville Journal has added a "History" link [http://www.wickedlocal.com/somerville/town\\_info/history](http://www.wickedlocal.com/somerville/town_info/history) to their Wicked Local online site which bundles lots of historic news in one place very helpfully; let them know this is appreciated.

**Other Business****Commission Appointments & Re-Appointments** (Brandon Wilson)

- Mayor submitted three re-appointments (DeYoung, Parkes, Snare) & one new appointment (George Born) to the BOA 10-27-11, and is awaiting confirmation.

**Conflict of Interest and Open Meeting Laws** (Brandon Wilson)

- Reminder #3 to return Acknowledgement and Certification forms to Brandon ASAP

**Somerville Museum ADA Access, Repairs and Restoration Work** (Brandon Wilson)

- Determination of how best to address all issues with very limited funds – in progress

**Photo Documentation of East Somerville via Arts Council LCC Grant**

- Photos taken & reviewed, but only of streetscapes & infrastructure & none of house interiors, as planned; waiting to hear outcome of new outreach to ES owners and date of photo exhibit in local location.

**CLG Reports** (Kristi Chase with Brandon Wilson)

- Copies available upon request of the SHPC's 2011 CLG Report that summarizes all of the cases and work completed from July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011 and was submitted to MHC in October..

**On-going and Upcoming Events** (Brandon Wilson)

- Videotaping of 10-23-11 “Ghosts of Somerville” as part of the City’s SomerStreets/Monster Mash Festival is now being shown on cable TV on a regular basis.
- Historic Somerville, with help from the SHPC, is sponsoring a talk by Dan Sullivan, blogger of [campcameron.blogspot.com](http://campcameron.blogspot.com) at the Somerville Museum on Fri., Nov. 11 from 2-3pm. Event designed to honor Camp Cameron (formerly near the Cambridge-Somerville border on Cameron Ave.) and the thousands of Union recruits who passed through the camp on their way to war. Following the talk there will be a brief ceremony at the Milk Row Cemetery at 3:30 pm.

**New Business**

**Upcoming Meeting Schedule for 2011:** December 20.

**Upcoming Meeting Schedule for 2012:** January 17, February 21, March 20, April 17. May 15, June 19, July 17, August 21, September 18, October 16, November 20, December 18.

All of the applications summarized above are available for public inspection at the Commission’s Office on the third floor of City Hall, 93 Highland Avenue, on Mon. -Wed. 9:00 am - 4:30 pm; Thurs. 9:00 am-7:30 pm; and Fri. 9:00 am-12:30 pm. Since cases may be continued to a later date(s), please check the agenda on the City’s website, or call before attending (tel.: (617) 625-6600 x. 2525). Continued cases will not be re-advertised. Interested persons may provide comments to the Historic Preservation Commission at the hearing, by fax to 617-625-0722, by e-mail to [kchase@somervillema.gov](mailto:kchase@somervillema.gov) , or by mail to the Historic Preservation Commission, City Hall, 93 Highland Avenue, Somerville, MA 02143.