



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

MICHAEL F. GLAVIN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Dick Bauer, Chair
Jillian Adams
Alan Bingham (Alt.)
Natasha Burger
Tom DeYoung (Alt.)
Eric Parkes
Todd Zinn (Alt.)

Abby Freedman, Vice Chair
Kevin Allen
George Born (Alt.)
Denis (DJ) Chagnon (Alt.)
Ryan Falvey
Derick Snare (Alt.)

Historic Preservation Commission Minutes

Conference Room, 3rd Floor, City Hall, 93 Highland Avenue
6:40 p.m. on Tuesday, January 15, 2013

Staff Present: Kristi Chase, Amie Hayes and Brandon Wilson (in and out)

Members Present: Jillian Adams, Dick Bauer, Alan Bingham*, George Born*, Eric Parkes, Ryan Falvey, and Abby Freedman. Jillian arrived at 8:00 p.m.

Members Absent: Kevin Allen, Natasha Burger, DJ Chagnon, Tom DeYoung, Derick Snare and Todd Zinn*.

*Alternates

Others present: Joseph S. Artley, Keith Beardsley, Adam Dash, David DePree, Richard DiGirolamo, Paula Dowd, Katy Etheridge, Cynthia Fowler, Josh Freeman, Nancy Fulton, Keith Glover, Lenore Hill, Jessica Hull, Attila Javor, AC Kemp, Jim McGinnis, Pieter Miner, Theresa Nibi, Katya Podsiadlo, Gwen Simpkins, Alderman Thomas Taylor, and Frank Valdes.

Proposed Alterations to Designated Historic Properties



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

www.somervillema.gov



HPC Review for Issuance of Certificates of Appropriateness

17 Bow Street (Case HPC 2012.135)	
Applicant:	Josh Freeman, Heath Properties
Property Owner:	17 Bow Street Realty Trust
Application Date:	December 20, 2012
Legal Notice:	Replace aluminum downspouts with copper downspouts and add one conductor box, all on right side façade.
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Presentation	<u>Josh Freeman</u> presented. There are leaks through the wall in one of the units and the current gutter system is inadequate. The repointing has helped but further work is necessary to keep the mortar from eroding and to protect the walls further. They had decided not to install the conductor box which had been recommended by the contractor.
Staff Report	<u>Kristi Chase</u> recused herself as a direct abutter to the project. The Staff Report was prepared and read by Amie Hayes.
Public Comment	<u>Public Comment</u> was received from Kristi Chase, abutter, who notes that the building is a prominent landmark. She appreciates the investment into the building and the Union Square neighborhood.
Documents	Staff Report based upon the City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.16 – 7.27, HPC Design Guidelines, and Massachusetts Historical Commission Property Survey Form
Discussion	The <u>Commission</u> agreed that copper was a better solution than aluminum but had some concerns about theft. Color was discussed: paint versus the natural process by which copper develops a thin layer of oxidized metal on its surface over time.
Decision	Because the proposed alteration met HPC Guidelines, the Commission voted unanimously (6-0) to grant a <u>Certificate of Appropriateness</u> to replace aluminum downspouts with copper downspouts on front right side façade

30 Day Street (Case HPC 2012.137)	
Applicant:	Alan Bingham
Property Owner:	Rosemary Broome-Bingham
Application Date:	December 26, 2012
Legal Notice:	Install a black DuraVent® chimney cap on roof.
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Presentation	<u>Alan Bingham</u> recused himself from the Commission and presented his proposed chimney cap. The contractor, Black Magic had installed his vent on a chimney in Cambridge instead of his and therefore had placed the wrong cap on the chimney, which was nothing like the one proposed. He proposed a 4” high terminal vent cap on a low platform covering the chimney. It would be minimally visible, especially compared to the one placed there now.
Staff Report	The <u>Staff Report</u> was read by Kristi Chase.
Public Comment	None received.
Documents	Staff Report based upon City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.16 – 7.27, the MHC Property Survey Form, HPC Design Guidelines and the online manufacturer information.
Discussion	The <u>Commission</u> discussed the number of flues and the methods of venting direct vent fireplaces.
Decision	Because it met HPC Guidelines, the Commission voted unanimously (6-0) to grant a <u>Certificate of Appropriateness</u> to install a black 4” by 6 5/8” DuraVent® low profile termination cap on top of the existing chimney to vent a gas fireplace.



11 Linden Avenue (Case HPC 2012.075R1)	
Applicant:	Derick Snare
Property Owner:	Linden Tree Realty Trust
Application Date:	December 27, 2012
Legal Notice:	Site plan revision to modify parking.
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Presentation	<u>Katya Podsiadlo and Richard DiGirolamo</u> presented. The Applicants were reluctant to make too many changes to the site plan after 2 meetings with the Zoning Board of Appeals. In response to the neighbors' concerns, the Applicants held several neighborhood meetings. While the neighbors would have preferred underground parking, the Commission had decided that this option would present too big an alteration of the site. To meet the City's parking requirements for 6 cars, the spaces were altered from 9'x16' to 8'x16' and moved further from the neighbors' windows. These spaces are considered compact but still within the normal size range. Fencing and plantings will help keep the light from the cars from piercing the windows at night. The area is edged with concrete unit 1'x1' pavers and will have a strong underlayment to support the weight of cars and fire engines when necessary. The exact brand has not yet been decided but they will be ADA approved and will be either a vineyard gray or granite color.
Staff Report	<u>The Staff Report</u> was read by Kristi Chase.
Public Comment	An e-mail received from the neighbor, John Belski, was read, which included 2 photos of cars as seen from his dining room window.
Documents	Staff Report based upon the City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.16 – 7.27, HPC Design Guidelines, MHC Property Survey Form and site plans by Blair Hines Design Associates dated 12/18/12.
Discussion	<u>Abby Freedman</u> stated that she still wished the building were smaller and that many of the issues presented could be solved by having a smaller building with a smaller footprint. New buildings tend to belittle historic buildings. The Commission noted the fences and plantings but was not concerned by them. The bituminous paving was discussed along with ways to break it up visually and to minimize the space devoted to automotive uses. A central median using pavers was suggested. There are still issues with the Fire Department and the Traffic and Parking Department that need to be worked out.
Decision	The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (6-0) to issue a <u>Certificate of Appropriateness</u> for the site plans by Blair Hines Design Associates dated 12/18/12 with further minor revisions to be approved by Staff Review in consultation with Eric Parkes, DJ Chagnon and Abby Freedman. A meeting will be scheduled to review the plans and make final decisions.

Staff Review for Issuance of Certificates of Non-Applicability

17 Bow Street (Case HPC 2012.136)	
Applicant:	Josh Freeman, Heath Properties
Property Owner:	17 Bow Street Realty Trust
Application Date:	December 20, 2012
Current Status:	Certificate of Non-Applicability issued 12/21/2012

28 Highland Avenue (Case HPC 2013.002)	
Applicant:	Robert Tingle, Contractor
Property Owner:	28 Highland Avenue Condominium Trust
Application Date:	January 7, 2013



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

www.somervillema.gov



Current Status:	Certificate of Non-Applicability issued 1/7/2013
-----------------	--------------------------------------------------

Demolition Reviews

Determination of Significance

7:30

197 Washington Street (Case HPC 2012.134)	
Applicant:	Anthony Cota
Property Owner:	Anthony Cota
Application Date:	December 17, 2012
Legal Notice:	Determination of Significance
Recommendation:	Significant
Presentation	<p><u>Adam Dash</u> presented. Amie Hayes did a good job researching the site and they learned several things they had not known about the building. The linkage with former Alderman Holt was not known but everyone was familiar with the marker for James Miller. The building has undergone numerous alterations since it became a funeral home. The proposal is to redevelop the site consistent with the CCD 55 zoning. They have spoken with Aldermen Heuston and Taylor and will be setting up a neighborhood meeting in early February.</p> <p>The architect, <u>Frank Valdes</u> said that they had done very preliminary massing studies on what could be placed on the site.</p>
Staff Report	<u>The Staff report</u> was read by Amie Hayes.
Public Comment	<p><u>Alderman Tom Taylor</u> said that he would reserve comment at this stage on the proposal and noted that he had believed that the building was "historic." He was known as someone who does not always want change. His presence at the meeting is to listen and get feedback. He has pushed for Local Historic designations in the past. The list of potential LHD properties needs to be re-introduced. The CPA may be able to help pay for renovations to historic properties.</p> <p><u>Jim McGinnis</u> said that the building is on every walking tour of Union Square that he can remember. The setback and green space of the site are important. The Italianate design is clearly visible. The large lot shows what upper middle class life was like in the early days of the town. He believes that it should be found significant due to its relationship to important people and events and due to the historic layout of the lot. He urged the Commission to have a real public hearing on the building.</p> <p>Letters from <u>Keja Valens</u> and <u>Mimi Graney</u> Union Square Main Streets (USMS) noting the significance of the building were read into the record. Mimi also alluded to the Main Streets mission to support economic development and her belief that it was more important than preservation.</p>
Documents	Staff Report based upon the City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.28, MHC Property Survey Form, independent research by HPC Staff, and letters from Keja Valens and Union Square Main Streets.



Discussion	<p><u>Abby Freedman</u> noted that the architect for the project, Frank Valdes, is a Prospect Hill resident and therefore also a neighbor of the project. He is also the chair of the City's Design Review committee. In 2007-2008, Jeff Meese, a former Commissioner and she did walks around Union Square with Monica Lamboy and others in Economic Development. Jeff and she had recommended that this building along with others be designated as a LHD but the City has not acted on any of their recommendations for Union Square.</p> <p>She showed recent photos of 197 Washington St., 215 Washington St., and 209-207-205 Washington St., noting the unusual roof line and careful restoration of 215 Washington St., and the moderately good condition of 209-207-205 Washington St., a double triple-decker. Taken together, these three buildings, adjacent to one another and located in a row along Washington St., demonstrate the evolution of housing types and styles throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries.</p> <p>215 Washington Street, a designated property, has a similar setback to 197 Washington St. She disagreed that the alterations to 197 Washington St. made it difficult to understand the historic architecture of the building. A lot of the building is visible despite the alterations. Cupolas such as the one on 197 Washington St. are rare on Italianate buildings. (Others at the meeting noted that there are cupolas on some Greek Revival buildings on Spring Hill.) The cornice, bracket details, half-moon window, roofline and other details on 197 Washington St. are largely intact. She found the fact that the driveway is an historic landscape feature to be unique and important. She disagrees with Mimi Graney's letter to the SHPC in that she believes it is not necessary to have all of Union Square built up to the sidewalk in order to encourage pedestrian activity. Some green space should remain in Union Square, and care should be taken that new construction does not overshadow the historic fabric.</p> <p><u>George Born</u> gave an overview of the history of funeral homes and noted that the building's 20th century history should not be ignored. There was a national trend in the 1930s when the economy was bad. Trade organizations pushed for the use of grand homes that were falling into neglect. The Staff Report should be amended to discuss the importance of the funeral industry. Most properties change over time and not all alterations are bad. Context is very important. This is the optimal time to preserve a significant number of buildings in the Green Line Extension areas. He also noted that the building was significant as part of a collection of 19th century buildings and demonstrate a range of use and styles.</p> <p>(Jillian Adams arrived at 8:00 pm.)</p> <p><u>Alan Bingham</u> said he found the house handsome. Because the funeral home was still in active use, there should be no major structural issues. With its setback and green space, the building could also be reused as a restaurant or a B & B, as well as remaining a funeral home.</p> <p><u>Dick Bauer</u> said he agreed with the assessment of important associations but he disagreed about whether the alterations detracted from the buildings significance. One can still see what the building looked like because it still has most of its details. He found that the site itself has significance.</p> <p><u>Eric Parkes</u> noted that when driving past the house, his eyes were always drawn up the hill to the cornice.</p>
------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Decision	<p><u>The Commission voted</u> unanimously (6-0-1(Jillian Adams)) to find the building “<u>Significant</u>” because it is “at least 50 years old, and is or has been determined by the Commission to be a significant building or structure after a finding that the building or structure is either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. “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 ii. “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.” <p>The structure was determined ‘Significant’ due to an association with Samuel Holt, a member of the Common Council from 1884-85 and an Alderman from 1886-87. Additionally, the building is architecturally ‘Significant’ for its retention of form, Italianate details such as double brackets and cupola, and original site plan as well as the use of the building, since 1933, as a funeral home.</p>
----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

95-101 Wheatland Street (Case HPC 2013.003)	
Applicant:	Richard Berg
Property Owner:	Richard Berg
Application Date:	January 10, 2013
Legal Notice:	Determination of Significant
Recommendation:	Significant
Presentation	<u>Richard DiGirolamo</u> , attorney presented with additional comments from Richard Berg, applicant. The building is part of 356-360 Mystic Avenue Mill building complex and had been intended to be included in the original demolition application for 360 Mystic Avenue. The building is indicated as 95 Wheatland street on the MOA for 356 Mystic Avenue.
Staff Report	The Staff report was read by Kristi Chase.
Public Comment	There was no public comment although Bobby Medeiros, abutter had come by earlier in the evening to hear what was being proposed.
Documents	Staff Report based upon the City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.28, 356-360 Mystic Avenue MHC Property Survey Form, minutes from HPC meetings on 6/2/2009 and 6/16/2009, Structural Reports from Weston and Sampson (10/4/12), Roome and Guaracino (6/26/2012), Jolanda Kenyeres-Pavlinic (1/18/2012 and 11/8/2011).
Discussion	The <u>Commission</u> discussed the relationship of the various buildings in the furniture mill complex and decided to include the 1950 metal portion of the building into their determination. The Commission requested that the Staff take a closer look at the connections and materials between the various portions of the complex.



Decision	<p>The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (7-0) to determine the circa 1887 and the circa 1950 industrial buildings at 95-101 Wheatland Avenue are ‘<u>Significant</u>’ because the buildings are (Section 2.17) “at least 50 years old, and is or has been determined by the Commission to be a significant building or structure after a finding that the building or structure is either:</p> <p>i. “<i>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</i></p> <p>ii. “<i>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.</i>”</p> <p>Specifically, the Significance of the structure reflects the industrial history of the City, especially with regard to furniture-making, not only individually, but particularly in the context of the group of buildings on the site. Despite some alterations, the buildings still retain their essential industrial character.</p>
----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Determination of Preferably Preserved

360 Mystic Avenue (Case HPC 2012.116)	
Applicant:	Richard Berg
Property Owner:	Richard Berg
Application Date:	November 05, 2012
Legal Notice:	Determination of Preferably Preserved
Recommendation:	Unable to Recommend
Current Status:	Continued Tuesday, February 19, 2013
Presentation	<u>Richard DiGirolamo</u> , attorney requested that the case be continued until the following month to bring all buildings on the site into synchronization with regard to the hearings and status.
Decision	The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (7-0) to continue the case until the February 19, 2013 HPC meeting.

82 Dover Street (Case HPC 2012.126)	
Applicant:	Deleporte Development
Property Owner:	Deleporte Development
Application Date:	November 8, 2012
Legal Notice:	Determination of Preferably Preserved
Recommendation:	Not Preferably Preserved
Presentation	<u>Gwen Simpkins</u> presented. They had not yet developed plans since they did not yet know what they would be permitted to do. They had developed and rehabilitated numerous properties in the area for over 20 years and it was rare for them not to work with the existing structure. She believes there is not much left of the original building worth saving. The layout is also not really amenable to modern life. She prefers to work within the permitted zoning without special permits. She stated that she intends to live there when it is finished. She would like to preserve as much open space as possible but would need to meet the parking requirements including space for guests.
Staff Report	<u>The Staff Report</u> was read by Amie Hayes.



Public Comment	<p><u>Joseph S. Artley</u> said the most notable aspects of the building are the front facing gable, cross gables and the setback from the street. The building doesn't fill the design connection with its enclosed porches. Only a small portion of the building was in-keeping with its style and the rest was at odds with it</p> <p><u>A C Kemp</u>, who lives on Dover Street, found that there were important issues to consider and handed out her "arguments in favor of preserving 82 Dover Street/ January 15, 2013," a series of photos taken of the street with commentary pointing out the relationships between the buildings and the streetscape taking note of the green space and contrasting it with the development at 29 Day Street on the other side of the block. The intense development of 29 Day Street was for the wealthy and renters like her would be forced out. The house begins the residential trend of the street from the commercial uses in Davis Square. She is very concerned about the environmental impact of the proposed demolition and redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Another neighbor noted that the addition to the Mansard style house on Day Street is huge. All the trees were removed from the site. It is important that a new building keep the historic footprint of the existing building.</p> <p><u>Pieter Miner</u> said that as an owner and a landlord, he is pro-development, but feels that Davis Square needs to be preserved. The building is an anchor for this section of Dover Street. He would like to see what is being proposed to see how it would fit or not in the neighborhood. The original lots were 120'x120' prior to subdivisions.</p> <p><u>Nancy Fulton</u> stated that she enjoyed seeing improvements to the neighborhood. The house had been treated poorly. She is concerned about maintaining and improving the neighborhood. What mechanism is there to protect the residential character of the neighborhood? Design review is needed.</p>
Documents	<p>Staff Report based upon the City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.28 and independent research by HPC Staff, and "arguments in favor of preserving 82 Dover Street/ January 15, 2013" by A C Kemp.</p>



<p>Discussion</p>	<p><u>Alan Bingham</u> stated that the large yard was important and that such amenities were growing scarcer. The structure appears to be sound and does anchor the block. He said that the building was part of the streetscape and part of the neighborhood context originally belonging to a family of influence as seen by the large block of land and the way it is situated on the lot and the street. He would be glad to see it Preferably Preserved.</p> <p>It is noted that the fabric of the street is composed of repetition and variation and that this was part of its history. <u>Jillian Adams</u> said that the massing and relationships between buildings could be recreated.</p> <p><u>George Born</u> reminded the Commission that if every vinyl window, enclosed porch and changes to the vernacular is taken into consideration, most of the City could not be considered, despite reversibility of many of these changes to the vernacular. The Staff Report seems to hold opposing positions. Scarcity and typicality are both valid. Context is also important in a group of buildings. What is its addition to the streetscape? How does its massing contribute? It is best to preserve what exists. The building has been contributing to the neighborhood for more than 100 years.</p> <p><u>Abby Freedman</u> notes that it is part of the collection of buildings, while it is not in the middle, it anchors one end and forms the boundary between residential and commercial sections of Davis Square. She notes further that 2 of the neighbors are architects. A real conversation about the design and possibilities could be held at the meetings on Preferably Preserved buildings. The proposed new building would be constructed by right with no input from the Design Review Committee.</p> <p><u>Eric Parkes</u> said that he is still on the fence about the property since it is not that cohesive but an 8000 SF building is about 3 times larger than any other building on the street, most houses are about 4000 SF. It is important for the discussions not to devolve into design review at the meetings.</p> <p><u>Dick Bauer</u> said that he would like to preserve the streetscape; that historic issues are not the responsibility of other agencies and that the massing, detail and character of the building and the lot still have historic value.</p>
<p>Decision</p>	<p>The Commission voted (5-1-1 (with Eric Parkes opposed and Ryan Falvey abstaining)) to find demolition detrimental due to the location of the structure as a bookend in the streetscape, as a building within a context of structures that illustrates the suburbanization of West Somerville, and as an important component to the rhythm of the Dover streetscape. Therefore, it is in the best interest of the public to preserve or rehabilitate 82 Dover Street.</p>

Demolition Review Period



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

www.somervillema.gov



336 Summer Street (Case HPC 2012.056)	
Applicant:	Cindy He
Property Owner:	Cindy He
Date of Signif:	5/15/2012
Date of Pref Pres:	6/19/2012
Recommendation	Memorandum of Agreement, whereby, in exchange for photo documentation and a walk through, prior to demolition, to develop a plan that will ensure any materials of high architectural value will be salvaged, the Commission will lift the remaining delay.
Action:	Vote to accept Recommendation; Sign Memorandum of Agreement
Current Status:	Review period over 3/19/2013
Staff Report	Amie Hayes presented the draft Memorandum of Agreement discussed at the January 9, 2013 Meeting on Preferably Preserved structures
Documents	City of Somerville Ordinance section 7.28, Minutes of the 1/4/13 meeting and Draft Memorandum of Agreement.
Discussion	
Decision	The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to accept Staff recommendation and to sign the Memorandum of Agreement as amended.

315-321 Broadway (Case HPC 2012.061)	
Applicant:	Peter Young Lee
Property Owner:	Richard E. Blumsack, Richard D. Gilman & Cynthia R., Trustees
Date of Signif:	6/19/2012
Date of Pref Pres:	9/19/2012
Recommendation	Memorandum of Agreement, whereby, in exchange for photo documentation, a walk through, prior to demolition, to develop a plan to ensure any materials of high architectural value will be salvaged, and so long as the intent of the design is consistent with what was presented on 1/3/2013, the Commission will lift the remaining delay. To ensure the consistency of design, Staff also recommends a Memorandum be sent to the Design Review Committee which shall detail the characteristics that ensure this consistency. See Recommendations and Minutes for Public Meeting of Preferably Preserved Structures.
Action:	Vote to accept Recommendation; Sign MOA; Review of memorandum to Design Review Committee.
Current Status:	Review period over 6/19/2013
Staff Report	Amie Hayes presented the draft Memorandum of Agreement discussed at the January 9, 2013 Meeting on Preferably Preserved structures
Documents	City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.28, and Draft Memorandum of Agreement.
Discussion	
Decision	The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to accept the Staff recommendation and memorandum to the Design Review Committee.

26 Warwick Street (Case HPC 2012.108)	
Applicant:	Daniel Silva
Property Owner:	Daniel Silva
Date of Signif:	11/20/2012
Date of Pref Pres:	12/18/2012
Recommendation:	Schedule Public Meeting of Preferably Preserved Structures
Current Status:	Review period over 9/18/2013



20 Warwick Street (Case HPC 2012.109)	
Applicant:	20 Warwick Street Trust
Property Owner:	20 Warwick Street Trust
Date of Signif:	11/20/2012
Date of Pref Pres:	12/18/2012
Recommendation:	Schedule Public Meeting of Preferably Preserved Structures
Current Status:	Review period over 9/18/2013

Staff Review for Determination of Not Significant

70 Prospect Street (Case HPC 2013.001)	
Applicant:	Richard DiGirolamo
Property Owner:	Laurel Shuman, Trustee
Application Date:	January 4, 2013
Description:	Demolish 1973 Shell Service Station
Findings	Less than 50 years old
Determination:	Not Significant issued 1/4/2013

Other Action Items

Mystic Waterworks Pumping Station Housing Project (Case HPC 11.095)	
Applicant:	Albert Rex, MacRostie Historic Advisors
Property Owner:	Somerville Housing Authority
Application Date:	January 2, 2013
Description:	Massachusetts Rehabilitation Tax Credit
Action:	Vote to accept the Letter of Support
Current Status:	Round 5
Decision	The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to send the same letter as previously.

Public Meeting on Preferably Preserved Structures	
Address:	336 Summer Street (HPC 2012.056)
Address:	315-321 Broadway (HPC 2012.061)
Action:	Vote to accept minutes of January 3, 2013
Decision	The Commission voted to accept the minutes as presented.

Minutes	
Minutes:	March 20, 2012
Minutes:	April 17, 2012
Minutes:	August 21, 2012
Action:	Vote to accept minutes
Decision	The Commission voted to accept the minutes as amended and presented

All applications, plans and reports are available to the public on the City of Somerville website, at www.somervillema.gov/departments/historic-preservation-commission/hpc-cases-and-decisions, or on the third floor of City Hall at 93 Highland Avenue (Monday – Wednesday, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.; Thursday, 8:30 a.m. – 7:30 p.m.; and Friday, 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.). Cases may be continued to a later date(s); therefore, please check the agenda on the City website or call (617) 625-6600 x2525 or x2534 to inquire if specific cases will be heard. Continued cases will not be re-advertized, but will be listed on the agenda. Interested persons may provide comments to the Historic Preservation Commission at the public hearing, by fax to (617) 625-0722, by email to kchase@somervillema.gov or ahayes@somervillema.gov, or by mail addressed to the Somerville Historic Preservation Commission.



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

www.somervillema.gov



Monthly Report of the Executive Director

- HPC Guideline Revisions (Abby Freedman, Kevin Allen, Ryan Falvey & Eric Parkes)
Update on Committee progress; next meeting Wednesday, February 13, 2013, 7-9pm
- Update on Historic Plaque project (Brandon Wilson)
- 2013 Preservation Awards Program (Derick Snare and Brandon Wilson)
- Flag Raising
- Patriot's Day
- HPC Website Enhancement Project
- CPA Committee Update



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

www.somervillema.gov

