



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
George Born (Alt.)
Denis (DJ) Chagnon (Alt.)
Ryan Falvey
Derick Snare (Alt.)
Todd Zinn (Alt.)

Abby Freedman, Vice Chair
Alan Bingham (Alt.)
Natasha Burger
Tom DeYoung (Alt.)
Eric Parkes
Brad Stearns (Alt.)

Historic Preservation Commission Draft Minutes
Visiting Nurses Association, Community Room, 3rd Floor, 259 Lowell Street
6:40 p. m. on Tuesday, July 15, 2014

Staff Present: Kristi Chase, and Amie Hayes. George Proakis arrived at 9:30 PM

Members Present: Jillian Adams, Alan Bingham*, George Born*, Ryan Falvey, Abby Freedman, Brad Stearns*, and Todd Zinn*. The meeting opened at 6:40 PM with Jillian Adams, Secretary opened the meeting when a quorum was reached with Todd Zinn, Ryan Falvey and Brad Stearns in attendance. Abby Freedman arrived at 6:43 PM followed by George Born at 6:45 PM and Alan Bingham at 7:05 PM.

Members Absent: Dick Bauer, Natasha Burger, DJ Chagnon*, Tom DeYoung*, Eric Parkes, and Derick Snare*.

*Alternates

Others Present: Linde & Ron Dynneson, Francis X. Fahey, Dylan James, Monica Jimenez, Barbara Mangum, Anna & George Saropoulos, Patricia Seitz, Chris Sennott, Gordon & Daniel Swartz, Michael Thomas, Dorr (Woody) Woodward, and Charles Zammuto.

Proposed Alterations to Local Historic District Properties

1 Westwood Road (HPC 2012. 019 R1)	
Applicant:	Richard Graf, Architect
Property Owner:	Somerville Historical Society
Application Date:	June 19, 2014



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

www.somervillema.gov



Legal Notice:	<i>Addition of short fence at ADA chair lift.</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, July 15, 2014
Presentation:	Barbara Mangum, President of Historic Somerville presented. The chair lift was initially designed to have the mechanicals in a pit. This posed moisture problems and the lift area was redesigned to eliminate the pit. A small ramp was then needed which would require a railing to protect the ramp from becoming a trip hazard from the sidewalk or an area where a wheel chair might go off the edge. They currently have funding for the exterior work and are raising funds for the new accessible bathroom and other necessary interior alterations.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	Staff determined that the alteration for which an application for a Historic Certificate has been filed is appropriate for and compatible with the preservation and protection of the Westwood Road Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission grant 1 Westwood Road a Certificate of Appropriateness based upon the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A short railing shall be installed per Plan Sheets 3 and 4 by Richard Graf, Fort Point Consulting Inc. , dated January 21, 2014 at the intersection of the ramp to the chairlift and the public sidewalk.
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, Plan Sheets 3 and 4 by Richard Graf, Fort Point Consulting Inc., dated January 21, 2014 and site visits.
Discussion:	The Commission thanked Barbara for all the work the Museum is doing to make the building accessible and the important role it plays in the community.
Decision:	The Commission voted unanimously (6-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following contingencies: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A short railing shall be installed per plans Sheets 3 and 4 by Richard Graf, Fort Point Consulting Inc., dated January 21, 2014 at the intersection of the ramp to the chairlift and the public sidewalk.

222 Morrison Avenue (HPC 2014. 012 R1)

Applicant:	Dorr Woodward
Property Owner:	Dorr Woodward
Application Date:	June 23, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Alteration to porch railings.</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, July 15, 2014
Presentation:	Dorr (Woody) Woodward presented. He found that the style of balusters for which he had requested and received a Certificate of Appropriateness were too expensive for his budget on a rental property. He would now like to do a simpler style that had previously been approved for other Mansard homes by the Commission in those cases where the original



	balusters were unknown. Also his insurance company is requiring the railings to meet building code. He does not plan to re-grade the yard to make the historic height of the porch railing meet building code at this time.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<p>Staff determined that the alteration for which an application for a Historic Certificate had been filed is appropriate for and compatible with the preservation and protection of the Morrison Avenue Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission grant Dorr Woodward a Certificate of Appropriateness for 222 Morrison Avenue to replace the existing porch rails and railings with simple wood railings, simple square balusters of a heavier weight than the existing, and newel posts consistent with the existing porch balusters and rails shown on the examples below because they meet guidelines noted above.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new railings and balusters shall <i>exactly match those on the front of 45 Vinal Avenue in construction, size, shape, proportion, detail and material.</i> 2. The 6" newel posts shall be detailed to match the existing historic porch posts.
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, photos of the proposed railing assembly and site visits.
Discussion:	The Commission commented on the importance of maintaining the historic height and proportions of the original railings. Abby Freedman recommended looking in the salvage yards for appropriate baluster. Woody Woodward responded that he needed 50 of them and that was unlikely that he would be able to find that many matching balusters for the porch.
Decision:	<p>The Commission voted unanimously (6-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following contingencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The replacement skirt shall be simple vertical boards. 2. The replacement wood railings shall have a simple generic style. 3. The top of the porch railings shall be 27" high as can be seen in the existing paint shadows on the porch. 4. An additional second handrail may be placed at building code height. 5. The height of the hand rails on the stairs shall meet building code. 6. The replacement balusters shall be simple square balusters. 7. The railing and baluster assemblage shall match that found on 45 Vinal Avenue. 8. The replacement newel posts shall match in size and style the porch columns and capitals with a pyramidal cap. 9. Staff and a member of the Historic Preservation Commission shall review and approve the balusters and newel posts for conformance with the work approved by the Commission at the meeting.

81 Benton Road (HPC 2014. 030)	
Applicant:	Gordon Swartz
Property Owner:	Gordon Swartz
Application Date:	May 21, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Addition of second front door on porch.</i>
Recommendation:	<i>Conditional Certificate of Appropriateness</i>



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:	Heard on Tuesday, July 15, 2014
Presentation:	Gordon Swartz presented. He has concerns about security of the individual units with the building. The second floor unit is completely open and cannot be securely set apart from the current front door entry. Due to the configuration of the interior space, he would like to add a second front door for the ground floor unit. The new second front door would provide access to the ground floor unit exclusively. He emphasized that he was flexible in his ideas on what the door should look like and the he would do whatever the Commission thought was most appropriate.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<p>If it could be determined that there was no feasible method of providing interior security to both units in the building, Staff determined that the alteration for which an application for a Historic Certificate had been filed is appropriate for and compatible with the preservation and protection of the 81 Benton Road Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission grant Gordon Swartz a <i>conditional</i> Certificate of Appropriateness for 81 Benton Road based upon the following conditions and contingencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The historic door would be retained. 2. The second entry door into the ‘front parlor’ ground floor unit match the existing in terms of <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Materials b. The window glazing shall have the same dimensions in height, depth and width as the existing front door. c. The new door shall have all the same proportions as the existing door including height, width and depth. d. The door shall have panels to match the existing panels in size, depth, number, location, and other details. 3. The door casing shall have matching dimensions and details.
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, a rendering of the proposed door and site visits.
Discussion:	The Commission discussed the proposed placement of the doors and how this was an uncommon alteration. It was noted that most typically doors on a 2- or 3-family are located sided by side. Todd Zinn provided interior plans showing how the configuration of the stairs, halls and rooms made it impossible to securely separate the second floor from the main entry on the ground floor. The Commission discussed the possible sizes and locations of a second main door and whether the doors should be differentiated in some way. George Born read the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard #9. Door hardware and marking the new door in a discrete and distinctive manner would ensure that it would be clear what was old and what was new could be distinguished.
Decision:	<p>The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following contingencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The historic door would be retained. 2. The second entry door into the ‘front parlor’ ground floor unit match the existing in terms of <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Materials b. The window glazing shall have the same dimensions in height, depth and width as the existing front door.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. The new door shall have all the same proportions as the existing door including height, width and depth. d. The door shall have panels to match the existing panels in size, depth, number, location, and other details. e. The door shall be centered on the wall as seen in the attached rendering. f. The door shall not have a mail slot. g. The door casing shall have matching dimensions and details.
--	---

37 Albion Street (HPC 2014. 034)	
Applicant:	Carroll & Sons Roofers
Property Owner:	Genevieve Daly
Application Date:	May 29, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Replace 7' of wood gutter with aluminum.</i>
Recommendation:	<i>Deny Certificate of Appropriateness; Certificate of Non-Applicability</i>
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, July 15, 2014
Presentation:	Chris Sennott, grandson of Paul Carroll, roofing contractor presented. The wood gutters are deteriorated and dumping water. The building already has 95% of its gutters in aluminum. He thinks they are more functional and don't need maintenance. He said the K-style gutter was very similar to a wood gutter in appearance.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<p>Staff determined that the alteration for which an application for a Historic Certificate had been filed is not appropriate for and compatible with the preservation and protection of the 37 Albion Street Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission deny Carroll and Sons Roofing, contractor and Genevieve Daly, owner a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of wood gutter with aluminum. Further Staff recommends that a Certificate of Non-Applicability be issued with the following contingencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The roof will be stripped and re-shingled with 3-tab asphalt shingles with no ridge vent. 2. The chimneys shall be re-flashed with in-kind materials as needed. 3. The rotted and damaged fascia shall be replaced with wood fascia. 4. The aluminum gutters may be replaced with aluminum gutters. 5. The remaining wood gutter shall be replaced with a new wood gutter with the same size and profile as the existing wood gutter. 6. The down spouts shall have the same size and shape as the existing.
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, and site visits.
Discussion:	Brad Stearns noted that wood gutters can be repaired with deep scraping and epoxy to rebuild the rotted portions. Chris Sennott stated that the gutters were too far gone to be repaired. The proposed gutter would not be the same as the existing wood gutters and would not preserve the character of a wood gutter. The requested replacement with K-style aluminum gutter is not based on any evidence of original or later important features and does not match the profile of the existing wood gutter. The amount of wood gutter



	remaining on the building was discussed along with the relative costs of replacing two short lengths of wood gutters in the context of the entire project. Brad Stearns recommended using Penetrol of the end grain as well as along the length of the gutters for protection. The Commission recommended regular maintenance and cleaning noting that wood gutters can last a very long time.
Decision:	<p>The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) denied a Certificate of Appropriateness because The proposed gutter would not be the same as the existing wood gutters and would not preserve the character of a wood gutter. The requested replacement with K-style aluminum gutter is not based on any evidence of original or later important features and does not match the profile of the existing wood gutter. They further recommended regular cleaning and oiling to prevent rot.</p> <p>The Commission concurred that a Certificate of Non-Applicability may be issued with the following contingencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The roof will be stripped and re-shingled with 3-tab asphalt shingles with no ridge vent. 2. The chimneys shall be re-flashed with in-kind materials as needed. 3. The rotted and damaged fascia shall be replaced with wood fascia. 4. The aluminum gutters may be replaced with aluminum gutters. 5. The remaining wood gutter shall be replaced with a new wood gutter with the same size and profile as the existing wood gutter. 6. The down spouts shall have the same size and shape as the existing.

45 Tennyson Street (HPC 2014. 038)	
Applicant:	Jed Lippard
Property Owner:	Jed Lippard & Todd Zinn
Application Date:	June 12, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Remove landscape timbers & asphalt driveway, replace with stone wall and unit block pavers.</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, July 15, 2014
Presentation:	Because he is part owner of the property, Todd Zinn recused himself and left the room. Jed Lippard presented. The asphalt driveway is cracking and uneven. The landscape timbers are rotten and deteriorating. They would like to install Camelot 6" x 6" pavers in place of the asphalt and a low 'dry laid' retaining wall. It would not have a cap, just the stones.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<p>Staff determined that the alteration for which an application for a Historic Certificate has been filed is appropriate for and compatible with the preservation and protection of the 45 Tennyson Street Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission grant Jed Lippard a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The asphalt driveway shall be replaced with Unilock Camelot 6" x 6" pavers. 2. The rotted landscape timbers shall be replaced with a 'dry-laid' Pennsylvania fieldstone retaining wall.



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, photos of materials, manufacturers cut sheets and site visits.
Discussion:	There was no discussion. The Commission concurred with the Staff Report.
Decision:	The Commission voted unanimously (6-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following contingencies: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The asphalt driveway shall be replaced with Unilock Camelot 6” x 6” pavers. 2. The rotted landscape timbers shall be replaced with a ‘dry-laid’ Pennsylvania fieldstone retaining wall.

36 Atherton Street (HPC 2014. 044)	
Applicant:	George Saropoulos
Property Owner:	George Saropoulos
Application Date:	June 24, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Install driveway.</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, July 15, 2014
Presentation:	George Saropoulos presented. He would like to install a 16’ wide driveway to allow the vehicle doors to be fully opened without anyone needing to walk on the plantings or grass. The driveway would serve as a patio in the summer. The driveway would be 47’ long. He would like to install at least 3’ of landscaped buffering between his property and the adjacent one along the driveway. He also wants to install a border. He had tried various versions of the parking area by staking them out. This was the most efficient use of the space.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	Staff determined that the alteration for which an application for a Historic Certificate had been filed is appropriate for and compatible with the preservation and protection of the 36 Atherton Street Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Commission grant George Saropoulos a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a driveway at the north end of the site, condition upon reducing the width to no more than 10 feet.
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, site plan with driveway indicated and site visits.
Discussion:	The Commission discussed the necessary widths of driveways. The commonest widths of driveways in Somerville were between 8’ and 10’. The use of pavers to demote pedestrian areas and to delineate the space was recommended.
Decision:	The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following contingencies: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The width of the driveway shall not exceed 12’ and the length shall not exceed 45’; 2. The dimensions of the driveway may be marked on the property;



	3. The Applicant MUST come back before the Commission to determine the material that will compose the driveway prior to any removal of the softscape.
--	--

34 Day Street (HPC 2014. 048)	
Applicant:	Chris Bailey, Landscape Architect
Property Owner:	Serena Crosina & Michael Thomas
Application Date:	June 23, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Demolish gazebo; install new picket fence, new garden shed; and new hardscape.</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness; <i>Deny</i> Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, July 15, 2014
Presentation:	Alan Bingham recused himself from voting on the case since he is a direct abutter. He left the table to comment as a member of the public. Michael Thomas presented. They wanted to clean up the back yard. The gazebo has a major carpenter ant infestation. The gazebo is used for tool storage but since it has screens not windows, water and snow infiltrate the building. The area behind the gazebo is shady and overgrown with weeds. It is located where they would like to build a patio and open up the yard. A new smaller tool shed would be located on the north east corner of the lot where it would be minimally visible. They have chosen a pre-fabricated shed in a style that would harmonize with the historic building.
Public Comment:	Rosemary Broome Bingham said that she thought of the two Mansard cottages as being a masculine and feminine pair due to the roof shapes and the details. She found the gazebo is a distraction from the 1870s Mansards. She said she looked forward to having the yard more open and closer to the original setting. Alan Bingham, having left the table spoke as the next door neighbor. He said that he owned photos taken during the 1930s and 1940s of the houses and yards on Day Street in which the gazebo does not appear.
Staff Report:	Staff determined that the alteration for which an application for a Historic Certificate had been filed is appropriate for and compatible with the preservation and protection of the 34 Day Street Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommended the Historic Preservation Commission grant 34 Day Street a Certificate of Appropriateness to: <p style="margin-left: 40px;">1) Install granite steppers from the rear brick landing to the proposed patio area; 2) Install a brick patio area (10' x 12') at the east rear corner of the lot, to be composed of brick with a limestone or granite edge; 3) Create a lattice screen (20' x 10') to obscure the compost and trash areas; and 4) Install a new shed (8' x 12') with aluminum windows and screens at the west rear corner of the site.</p> <p>Staff determined that the alteration for which an application for a Historic Certificate had been filed is not appropriate for, nor compatible with the preservation and protection of the 34 Day Street Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Commission <u>do not</u> grant 34 Day Street a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the gazebo at the east rear corner of the lot. Staff did recommend that the Applicant look further into alternative uses or locations for such an accessory structure, which is very unique to the building stock and historic landscape of the City. Staff also recommended looking further into how much of the damage may be repairable.</p>
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, and



	site visits.
Discussion	Abby Freedman said that she had some reservations about the use of a stock shed. Other Commissioners noted that it was one of good quality and reasonably priced. Jillian Adams said that she found it ironic to be demolishing a historic gazebo and then installing a modern shed. Michael Thomas said that because the gazebo is open to the elements it is not the same thing as an enclosed shed. There was short discussion regarding the plantings and the locations of trees vis a vis the visibility of the shed. George Born asked several questions regarding the condition of the gazebo and its roof. Michael Thomas said that about a third to a quarter of the structural members had been damaged by insects. Todd Zinn found the design of the gazebo interesting and thought there was a trade-off between the later building and the restoration of the yard. Staff recommended that the Applicants thoroughly document the building. Its context adds a dimension to its importance. Abby Freedman said it was more important to preserve and reclaim the landscape as it was for over 75 years than to preserve the later building. George Born recommended installing a picket fence instead of lattice around the compost and trash receptacles.
Decision:	<p>The Commission voted unanimously (6-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following contingencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Install granite steppers from the rear brick landing to the proposed patio area and near the lattice screening; 2. Install a brick patio area (10' x 12') at the south rear corner of lot, to be edged in limestone or granite; 3. Create a screen to obscure the compost/trash area, to be composed of either wood lattice that is consistent with the porch skirt or a wood picket fence. The screen shall not exceed 4' in height; 4. Install a new shed (8' x 12') at the north rear corner of the lot, sheathed in Cedar, with aluminum windows and screens. The new shed shall be screened with plantings. <p>The Commission voted unanimously (4 (Ryan Falvey, Abby Freedman, Brad Stearns*, and Todd Zinn*) - 2 (George Born and Jillian Adams)) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following contingencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The gazebo may be demolished once the structure has been documented and submitted to Staff. This shall include photos (historic and current); scaled elevations of each façade (please also note the materials present), a scaled floor plan, and a section to show the structure. This documentation may be done by an architect or another design professional and shall be submitted to Staff in both hard and digital copies.

Demolition Reviews

Determination of Significance

311-315 Highland Avenue (HPC 2014.037)	
Applicant:	Laurentzi Brabo
Property Owner:	Lalo Corporation
Application Date:	June 11, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Significance</i>
Recommendation:	Not Significant



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:	Heard on Tuesday, July 15, 2014
Presentation:	Gwen Simpkins presented. They plan to redevelop the site but do not have any specific plans for the parcel yet. Getting the demolition permit is the first stage, they need to achieve.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<p>Highland Avenue was developed in the 1880s when the Tufts brick yard closed. Building permit records indicate a construction date of 1915. The original brick facade has either been removed or is completely sheathed in concrete. There are no architectural merits to the structure.</p> <p>The subject structure retains a low level of historical and architectural integrity due to the altered exterior sheathing, fenestration pattern, and a lack of remaining architectural detail.</p> <p>(a) In accordance with the <i>Findings on Historical Association</i>, which utilizes historic maps/atlasses, City reports and directories, and building permit research, and through an examination of resources that document the history of the City, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find 311-315 Highland Avenue <u>importantly associated</u> 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. OR</p> <p>(b) In accordance with the <i>Findings on Historical and Architectural Significance</i>, which addresses period, style, method of building construction, and association with a reputed architect or builder, either by itself or in the context of a group of buildings or structures, as well as integrity, the ability to convey significance, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find 311-315 Highland Avenue historically or architecturally significant.</p>
Documents:	Staff Report based upon the City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.28, historic maps, City Building Permits, and site visits.
Discussion:	Abby Freedman noted that one could see the underlying brick in a few places.
Decision:	<p>While the building is more than 50 years old and not on the National Register of Historic Places, the Commission determined unanimously (7-0) that 311-315 Highland Avenue is not a significant building or structure after finding that the building or structure is (n)either:</p> <ol 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,” (n)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. ”

204 Morrison Avenue – wood garage only (HPC 2014. 047)	
Applicant:	Linde & Ronald Dynneson
Property Owner:	Linde & Ronald Dynneson
Application Date:	June 23, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Significance</i>
Recommendation:	Significant
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, July 15, 2014



Presentation:	Ron Dynneson presented their plans for the demolition of the garage to allow the rear ell of the house to be enlarged. They need to have a certain number of rentable rooms, public rooms, a kitchen and rooms to house the innkeeper. The ground floor will meet ADA. A parking space and chairlift needs to be inserted into the structure. The porch would be moved to fall in line with the west side of the building. This building footprint would make the garage less usable. The garage would also interfere with the planned ADA access. Charles Zammuto spoke regarding the structural condition of the garage. The outbuilding is leaning and sagging. It had been enlarged without regard to best practices with holes cut in two sides of the building to allow a long vehicle to fit inside. There is no foundation. The wood lies directly on dirt.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<p>The Morrison Avenue streetscape and neighborhood developed in a relatively short time span, fueled by improved transportation access. The shed/garage is not identified with a particular owner of the property, but was likely constructed c. 1880. The style is likely Italianate, but the existing conditions are poor; however, original features, such as windows and exterior sheathing, do still exist.</p> <p>Although the existing conditions are poor, the original materials are still present, including wood 6/6 windows. Additions have modified the front and rear façades, but the form and massing are still clear. The building still retains a moderate level of integrity, due to the retention of original materials, but the existing conditions are poor. If the building continues not to be used, the integrity will continue to deteriorate along with the structure itself.</p> <p>Staff found the subject building historically and architecturally significant due to the remaining architectural detail and due to the shared context, as a group of buildings, with 204 Morrison Avenue.</p> <p>(a) In accordance with the <i>Findings on Historical Association</i>, which utilizes historic maps/atlasses, City reports and directories, and building permit research, and through an examination of resources that document the history of the City, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find the shed/garage at 204 Morrison Avenue <u>importantly associated</u> 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. OR</p> <p>(b) In accordance with the <i>Findings on Historical and Architectural Significance</i>, which addresses period, style, method of building construction, and association with a reputed architect or builder, either by itself or in the context of a group of buildings or structures, as well as integrity, the ability to convey significance, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission find the shed/garage at 204 Morrison Avenue historically or architecturally significant.</p>
Documents:	Staff Report based upon the City of Somerville Ordinance sections 7.28, historic maps, City Building Permits, draft survey report; and site visits.
Discussion:	The Commission discussed the conflicts between the massing of the proposed enlargement of the existing house and the location and massing of the out building.
Decision:	The Commission voted (5-2(Alan Bingham and Brad Stearns)) to determine the c. 1881 shed/garage at 204 Morrison Avenue ‘Significant’ because the building, per Section 2.17.B of the Demolition Review Ordinance 2003-05, 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>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</p> <p>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> <p>The structure was determined historically ‘Significant’ due to the remaining architectural detail, material integrity, and due to the shared context, as a group of buildings, with 204 Morrison Avenue.</p>
--	--

4 Milk Place (HPC 2014.041)	
26-28 Prospect Street (HPC 2014. 042)	
30 Prospect Street (HPC 2014. 043)	
Applicant:	City of Somerville
Property Owner:	Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Application Date:	June 19, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Significance</i>
Recommendation:	<p>4 Milk Place : Not Significant</p> <p>26-28 Prospect Street: Significant</p> <p>30 Prospect Street: Significant</p>
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, July 15, 2014
Presentation:	George Proakis, Director of Planning presented the information for 4 Milk Place, 26-28 Prospect Street, and 30 Prospect Street all at the same time on behalf of the Somerville Redevelopment Authority. These buildings are all located in the area that the City has slated for redevelopment as they were located in a blighted area. A revitalization plan as well as the City’s comprehensive plan targeted the area for change. Some of the redevelopment block is needed for the new Union Square MBTA station. George Proakis read some of the definitions in the revitalization plan to clarify the purpose and the parameters chosen to define the boundaries of the urban renewal plan. Zoning changes several years ago had been made to allow for redevelopment. The parcels are located in an area designated as TOD 100. The area also has contamination issues.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment regarding 4 Milk Place. Francis X Fahey who lives at 30 Prospect Street and whose family had owned and lived in on Prospect Street for 3 generations, described how his grandfather lost his property and his barrel business in 1936 due to unpaid taxes. He mentioned other buildings that had been part of the property and are now gone. He had bought 26-28 Prospect Street in 1986. Francis Fahey said he was also familiar with the O’Regans who had lived there. He uses the building to store salvage materials. He would like to see his building documented. He found his thoughts on the loss of the building very ‘hard to get his hands around.



Staff Report:	<p>The subject building at <u>4 Milk Place</u> is associated with the broad architectural, cultural, and economic history of the City due to the modest massing and form of a workers cottage, the long-term association as an income producing property, and due to the relationship of the parcel with the drainage and abating of the Miller's River.</p> <p>The subject structure retains a low level of integrity due to the raised foundation or altered location. In addition, while the form and massing remain intact, and the three-bay primary façade, the structure does not display original fabric. In addition, this structure was once part of a collection of late nineteenth century income-producing buildings. The demolition of these four buildings removed the historic context to which this structure is directly associated.</p> <p>(a) In accordance with the <i>Findings on Historical Association</i>, which utilizes historic maps/atlasses, City reports and directories, and building permit research, and through an examination of resources that document the history of the City, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find 4 Milk Place <u>importantly</u> 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. <i>AND/ OR</i></p> <p>(b) In accordance with the <i>Findings on Historical and Architectural Significance</i>, which addresses period, style, method of building construction, and association with a reputed architect or builder, either by itself or in the context of a group of buildings or structures, as well as integrity, the ability to convey significance, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find 4 Milk Place historically or architecturally significant.</p> <p><u>26-28 Prospect Street</u> was constructed as rental property by prominent City figure, Clark Bennett and served as a home for workers and their families throughout the last half of the 19th century through the middle of the 20th century.</p> <p>On the whole the building is not as much altered as its neighborhood as changed around it. The house is a typical center hall entry vernacular Italianate style two-family home. Its distinction lies mostly on its visibility separate from the light industrial landscape that surrounds it. This building has been a familiar landmark on the entry to Union Square due to its color (light green), and its lack of maintenance (do not enter fire department signage) along from its singularity in the light industrial landscape.</p> <p>(a) In accordance with the <i>Findings on Historical Association</i>, which utilizes historic maps/atlasses, City reports and directories, and building permit research, and through an examination of resources that document the history of the City, Staff recommend that the Historic Preservation Commission find 26-28 Prospect Street <u>importantly associated</u> 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. <i>OR</i></p> <p>(b) In accordance with the <i>Findings on Historical and Architectural Significance</i>, which addresses period, style, method of building construction, and association with a reputed architect or builder, either by itself or in the context of a group of buildings or structures, as well as integrity, the ability to convey significance, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission find 26-28 Prospect Street historically and architecturally significant.</p> <p><u>30 Prospect Street</u> was constructed as rental property by the heirs of prominent City figure, Clark Bennett and served as a home for workers and their families throughout the last quarter of the 19th century through the middle of the 20th century.</p> <p>In accordance with the <i>Findings on Historical Association</i>, which utilizes historic maps/atlasses, City reports and directories, and building permit research, and through an examination of resources that document the history of the City, Staff recommend that the</p>
---------------	--



	<p>Historic Preservation Commission find 30 Prospect Street <u>importantly associated</u> 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.</p> <p>(a) In accordance with the <i>Findings on Historical Association</i>, which utilizes historic maps/atlasses, City reports and directories, and building permit research, and through an examination of resources that document the history of the City, Staff recommend that the Historic Preservation Commission find 30 Prospect Street <u>importantly associated</u> 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. OR</p> <p>(b) In accordance with the <i>Findings on Historical and Architectural Significance</i>, which addresses period, style, method of building construction, and association with a reputed architect or builder, either by itself or in the context of a group of buildings or structures, as well as integrity, the ability to convey significance, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission find 26-28 Prospect Street historically and architecturally significant.</p> <p>The subject building, <u>30 Prospect Street</u> is found importantly associated with the broad architectural, cultural, economic and social history of the City due to its associations with Clark Bennett and his family, and with workers housing on the edge of the Union Square and the industrial uses of the surrounding area, particularly the glass and meat packing industries of Somerville and Cambridge.</p> <p>In accordance with the <i>Finding on Historical and Architectural Significance</i>, which addresses period, style, method of building construction, and association with a reputed architect or builder, either by itself or in the context of a group of buildings or structures, as well as integrity, which assess the ability of the property to convey significance, Staff find 26-28 Prospect Street historically or architecturally significant.</p> <p>The subject building is found historically and architecturally significant due to its architectural integrity as an Italianate style house.</p>
<p>Documents:</p>	<p>Staff Report based upon the City of Somerville Ordinance section 7.28, and Massachusetts Historical Commission Property Survey Form B, and site visits.</p>
<p>Discussion:</p>	<p>The Commission discussed the process and wanted to know who would be interacting with the Commission on the part of the Somerville Redevelopment Authority and the City of Somerville in the development and signing of a Memorandum of Agreement. George Proakis said that he would be meeting with the development team to discuss the community process. He would discuss with them how the various pieces of the HPC process would fit with the other plans for the site. He informed the Commission that due to the contamination on the site, these buildings would be very tricky to retain.</p> <p>Abby Freedman noted that the 4-family house at 26-28 Prospect Street had some very nice interior finishes and was currently being used for the storage of radiators. The building needs repair but was not as dangerous as it appears from the outside. She had toured the interiors of both the Prospect Street buildings and found 26-28 to be more impressive than she expected. Stylistically, it was not simple workers housing. There were nice marble mantles and detailed woodwork. She also noted that with many of the buildings now gone, one could get a sense of the marshland that had existed there.</p> <p>George Born asked whether these buildings were located on the parcels needed by the MBTA and about the public benefit of the proposed demolition. George Proakis would also double-check whether these buildings would be needed by the MBTA for the Union Square stop but did not think they were part of it. In any case the benefit lies with the elimination of blight in accordance with the Urban Renewal Plan. George Proakis stated that at this time he</p>



	<p>does not know what the MOA might entail, he does not represent the Somerville Redevelopment Authority just the Director of Economic Development at this time. He would need to speak with them. If the building were to be determined ‘significant’, he would do his best to find the additional information needed.</p>
<p>Decision:</p>	<p>The Commission voted to determine the c. 1870 single-family dwelling at <u>4 Milk Place</u> ‘Significant’ because the building, per Section 2.17.B of the Demolition Review Ordinance 2003-05, is “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, <i>AND</i> 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’ under finding “i,” as an important association with the broad architectural, cultural, and history of the City due to the modest massing and form of a workers cottage, the long-term association as an income producing property, and due to the relationship of the parcel with the drainage and abatement of the Miller’s River.</p> <p>The Historic Preservation Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to determine the c. 1858-1870 two-family dwelling at <u>26-28 Prospect Street</u> ‘Significant’ because the building, per Section 2. 17. B of the Demolition Review Ordinance 2003-05, 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 its associations with prominent businessman and politician Clark Bennett and his family, with workers housing on the edge of the Union Square, and the industrial uses of the surrounding area, particularly the glass and meat packing industries of Somerville and Cambridge; and to its due to its architectural integrity as a vernacular Italianate style house.</p> <p>The Historic Preservation Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to determine the c. 1890 vernacular Queen Anne house at <u>30 Prospect Street</u> ‘Significant’ because the building, per Section 2.17.B of the Demolition Review Ordinance 2003-05, 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



	<p>Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or</p> <p>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> <p>The structure was determined ‘Significant’ due to its associations with prominent businessman and politician Clark Bennett and his family, with workers housing on the edge of the Union Square, and the industrial uses of the surrounding area, particularly the glass and meat packing industries of Somerville and Cambridge; and to its due to its architectural integrity as a vernacular Italianate style house.</p>
--	---

Determination of Preferably Preserved

350 Medford Street (HPC 2014. 031)	
Applicant:	City of Somerville
Property Owner:	City of Somerville
Application Date:	May 27, 2014
Significant	June 18, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Preferably Preserved</i>
Recommendation:	Not Preferably Preserved
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, July 15, 2014
Presentation:	George Proakis, Director of Planning presented for the City. He discussed Somerville by Design and the public planning process for Gilman Square and how it dove-tailed with the plans for the Green Line Extension by the MBTA and the City.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<p>The Commission found the subject building Significant due to the remaining historical and architectural integrity which is illustrated through the association with the development of Gilman Square and the retention of Art Deco architectural details. While the structural integrity of the building is of large concern, Staff acknowledged that the MBTA is not able to salvage the building other than the architectural details that have been incorporated into a Gilman Square MOA, and that the coming Green Line Station is imperative to the growth and development of Gilman Square. Therefore, Staff found the potential demolition of 350 Medford Street not detrimental to the heritage of the City, but is instead a catalyst for the growth and development of Gilman Square.</p> <p>In accordance with the Demolition Review Ordinance (2003-05), Section 4. D, Staff found the potential demolition of the subject structure not detrimental to the heritage of the City, and consequently not in the best interest of the public to preserve or rehabilitate. Therefore, due to the existing conditions, remaining structural integrity, imperative growth of Gilman Square and the ... understood recommendation of not Preferably Preserved, Staff recommend that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find 350 Medford Street Preferably Preserved</p>
Documents:	Staff Report based upon the City of Somerville Ordinance section 7.28, and Massachusetts Historical Commission Property Survey Form B, and site visits.



Discussion:	Jillian Adams, who had not been at the previous meeting on the determination of significance asked how the Commission could be more included in the planning process. George Proakis said that the planning for the Gilman Square Station had been underway for several years with a lot of public input. It was only in the last few months that it became obvious that the building could not be retained. Abby Freedman noted that was not only the doorway elements that were significant but also the repeating forms and shapes. Jillian Adams was concerned about the MBTA’s design plans for the station and the area since they tend toward large glass towers. George Proakis discussed the Gilman Square Plans again, showing how the area might be redeveloped with an emphasis on brick and traditional architecture. The Commission and George Proakis then spoke about the time frames involved for the MBTA to construct the Station and for the City to develop new plans for the lot.
Decision:	The Historic Preservation Commission voted to determine 350 Medford Street ‘Preferably Preserved. Per Section 4. 2. D of the Demolition Review Ordinance 2003-05, “If the Commission determines that the demolition of the significant building or structure would be detrimental to the architectural, cultural, political, economic, or social heritage of the City, such building or structure shall be considered preferably preserved.” The Commission found demolition detrimental due 1) to an association with the industry and growth of Gilman Square in the late 1920s, the Reid & Murdoch Company, and the retention of Art Deco details on a large scale industrial warehouse; 2) the original form, massing, fenestration pattern, and inlaid stone detail; and 3) due to the location of the structure within a collection of structures that represent the same cultural context, which, together, explain the historic development of Gilman Square, a small concentration of late 19th century commercial, fraternal, and industrial buildings.

Other Business

- CPA update (Dick Bauer & Amie Hayes)
- Vote to support enlargement of the Morrison Avenue Local Historic District (6-0-1(George Born))
- 204 Morrison Avenue B&B: Review & Comment

The reasons for the proposed enlargement of the rear ell included the number of rooms necessary for the innkeepers, and the ADA access requirements. Dormers are needed in the attic area for sufficient rentals to cover the costs of the renovation and the resident innkeeper. The dormers were thought to be overlarge and top heavy. Different types of traditionally proportions of dormers were discussed along with how buildings evolve over time. The commission noted that the reasons behind the alterations were sound.

- Other Business

Minutes:	June 5, 2014 – Preferably Preserved
Minutes:	June 18, 2014 – HPC
Minutes:	June 25, 2014 – Union Square LHD
Minutes:	July 3, 2014 – Preferably Preserved
Minutes:	July 10, 2014 – Union Square LHD
	The minutes were unanimously accepted by those attending the meetings.

Structures within 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



314-316 Somerville Avenue (HPC 2014. 009)	
Applicant:	Belmont Hill Corporation
Property Owner:	Belmont Hill Corporation
Significance:	April 15, 2014
Pref. Preserved	May 20, 2014
Recommendation:	Preferably Preserved
Current Status:	Vote to execute MOA (7-0)

Staff Review – Listed for informational purposes

45 Walnut Street (HPC 2014. 036)	
Applicant:	Lindsey Sudbury
Description:	<i>Replace aluminum downspouts with galvanized steel.</i>
Current Status:	Staff issued Certificate of Non-Applicability issued on June 19, 2014

17 Mount Vernon Street (HPC 2014. 049)	
Applicant:	Martin Scott
Description:	<i>Repair porches</i>
Current Status:	Staff issued Certificate of Non-Applicability issued on June 25, 2014

Reports and plans are available on the City of Somerville website at www.somervillema.gov/departments/historic-preservation-commission/hpc-cases-and-decisions and on the third floor of City Hall at 93 Highland Avenue. Cases may be continued to a later date(s); therefore, check the agenda on the website 48 hours in advance of the meeting or call (617) 625-6600 x2500 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 email to historic@somervillema.gov, by fax to (617) 625-0722, 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

