



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 Minutes

Visiting Nurses Association, Community Room, 3rd Floor, 259 Lowell Street
6:40 p.m. on Tuesday, August 19, 2014

Staff Present: Kristi Chase, Amie Hayes, Brandon Wilson and George Proakis

Members Present: Jillian Adams, Dick Bauer, Alan Bingham*, Abby Freedman, Eric Parkes, Brad Stearns*, and Todd Zinn*. Dick Bauer arrived at 8:50 pm. Abby Freedman recused herself for 17-19R Aldersey Street case because she is an abutter.

Members Absent: George Born*, Natasha Burger, DJ Chagnon*, Tom DeYoung*, Ryan Falvey, Derick Snare*,

*Alternates

Others Present: Obadiah Arthur, Rebecca Lyn Capr, Eamon Cournane, Richard DiGirolamo, Kathy Dutra, John Horner, Ron & Linde Dynneson, Peter Kaplan, Ann Madden, Edward O'Donnell, Sun Sasongko, and Sue Thomas.

Proposed Alterations to Local Historic District Properties

9 Westwood Road (HPC 2014.050)	
Applicant:	Kevin Outterson
Property Owner:	Kevin Outterson
Application Date:	June 25, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Install vents and chimney cap.</i>
Recommendation:	Denial without Prejudice
Current Status:	Continuance requested until Tuesday, September 16, 2014
Decision	The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to continue the case until Tuesday, September 16, 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



56 Meacham Road (HPC 2014.052)	
Applicant:	Sun Sasongko
Property Owner:	Sun Sasongko
Application Date:	July 21, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Alter driveway and deck.</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, August 19, 2014
Presentation:	Sun Sasongko presented. He is gradually up-grading his property. The driveway is currently a mixture of dirt and gravel. He would like to pave it with bricks as can be seen on the sidewalk down the street in Cambridge and at 2 Waterhouse Street, Cambridge. The paving would continue around the back of the house for a patio which will not be visible from the public right of way. He also wants to re-orient the steps on the deck and reuse the railings.
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 Meacham Road/ Campbell Park Local Historic District; because no historic fabric will be altered and the proposed driveway material and alteration to the deck meet the HPC Guidelines for landscaping and porches. Therefore Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission grant 56 Meacham Road a Certificate of Appropriateness as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existing gravel and dirt driveway shall be replaced with Redland Brick Co. Brick type "KF" pavers. 2. The deck stairs shall be relocated to face the rear of the property. 3. The new deck railings will be located at the currently existing location of the stairs and shall match the existing railings.
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:	The Commission had some concerns about the range of colors presented. The sample bricks were darker and had more flashing than those shown on the web site for the same range. It was recommended that a range of color be used with more red rather than smoke be used for the paving. There were no comments on the relocation of the stairs.
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 existing gravel and dirt driveway shall be replaced with Redland Brick Co. Brick type "KF" pavers. 2. The deck stairs shall be relocated to face the rear of the property. 3. The new deck railings will be located at the currently existing location of the stairs and shall match the existing railings.

17-19R Aldersey Street (HPC 2014.053)	
Applicant:	Peter Kaplan
Property Owner:	RCG Aldersey LLC
Application Date:	July 29, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Demolish garage; install new fencing and bike racks</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, August 19, 2014
	Jillian Adams took the Chair as Abby Freedman, recused herself as an abutter to the project and took part as a neighbor.
Presentation:	Peter Kaplan presented. The existing concrete and masonry garage does not meet the needs of the tenants. They would like to remove the roof and walls down to grade. The remaining



	portion of the walls would become the retaining walls for the hill around the resulting open parking area. A fence with a lattice top would be erected along the back wall and side of the driveway. A trellis and planters would be located along the back wall planted with vines to soften the effect.
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 Aldersey/Summit Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission grant Peter Kaplan, Project Manager a Certificate of Appropriateness for 17-19, and 19R Aldersey Street for the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 1927 garage shall be demolished to grade, retaining the portions of the garage that act as a retaining wall; 2. A 4' solid wood fence along driveway entry shall be installed to the edge of the front yard setback 3. A 6' wood and vertical lattice fence shall be installed along the parking area and the rear wall of the property; 4. Trellises shall be installed in a planting area along the rear portion of the fence to encourage climbing vines; 5. Seven bike racks shall be installed along the east side of the parking area along the 6' lattice fence; and 6. Eight <i>arbor vitae</i> or similar shall be planted to obscure and protect the bicycle racks along the east side of the parking area.
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:	Todd Zinn advocated for the retention of the garage. He believes that the stepped pedimented building balanced the carriage house on the other side of the lot. Both buildings spoke to the transportation needs of their respective eras. Todd asked if the surface could be something other than asphalt and could double as patio space. Jillian Adams stated that the garage would have been included in a modern Form B. The building tells the story of the introduction of the automobile into the neighborhood. Often such buildings were made larger than the owner's immediate needs and were space was rented to the neighbors. Jillian Adams noted that the fence provided a pleasing rhythm and set off the bicycle area. Eric Parkes noted that he was not a fan of <i>arbor vitae</i> , could they use another type of tree? Peter Kaplan replied that he would be willing to entertain another tree. They chose <i>arbor vitae</i> because of their upright and relatively controlled growth which would protect the bicycle racks placed in between them.. Alan Bingham was concerned about the condition of the garage and whether deterioration was the main reason for its removal. He noted that the buildings showed the progression from horse to car. Peter Kaplan said that the main problem was one of use especially in the winter when the doors were blocked by snow removed from the driveway and current parking area. The existing garden area serves well as open space for the units but he did want to soften the hardscape.
Decision	<p>The Commission voted unanimously (5-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness contingent upon the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 1927 garage shall be demolished to grade, retaining the portions of the garage that act as a retaining wall; 2. A 4' solid wood fence along driveway entry shall be installed to the edge of the front yard setback 3. A 6' wood and vertical lattice fence shall be installed along the parking area and the rear wall of the property; 4. Trellises shall be installed in a planting area along the rear portion of the fence to encourage climbing vines;



	<p>5. Seven bike racks shall be installed along the east side of the parking area along the 6' lattice fence; and</p> <p>6. Eight <i>arbor vitae</i> or similar shall be planted to obscure and protect the bicycle racks along the east side of the parking area.</p>
--	--

53 Columbus Avenue (HPC 2014.055)	
Applicant:	Peter Kaplan
Property Owner:	RCG Columbus Renewal LLC
Application Date:	July 30, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Replace two chimneys.</i>
Recommendation:	Deny without Prejudice
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, August 19, 2014
Presentation:	Peter Kaplan presented. He would like to remove the existing masonry chimney and replace it with a veneer chimney to match the existing. He would recreate it with shallow brick over a wood structure. As a part of their renovations of the house, they plan to rationalize the interiors to meet today's needs. They plan on market rate housing and need to capture more floor space for each of the three planned units.
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 Columbus Avenue Warren Avenue Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission grant RCG Columbus Renewal LLC, Owner a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of two brick chimneys with brick veneer chimneys on 53 Columbus Avenue as per plans and specs submitted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The veneer brick shall be Summitville thin brick installed with traditional setting and grouting procedures. 2. The color shall be a variegated dark red/brick.
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 did not want to see a Walt Disney version of the chimney and would like to see the existing chimney recreated. Changes over time should be expressed. Brad Stearns said that the clay liner protruding from the base effects the look of a chimney. The Commission discussed the general look of the chimney; whether it should be squared off or have a finishing detail. Eric Parkes wanted to see some samples of a more brick-like product than the one presented. Eric Parkes and Brad Stearns said they would be available for consultation.
Decision:	<p>The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness contingent upon the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The two chimneys may be demolished ; 2. Prior to demolition of the chimneys, the Applicant shall receive approval from the HPC with regard to the replacement/faux chimneys, which will have the same dimensions, a simple design, and the same location on the roof; and 3. The details of the replacement/faux chimneys shall be identified on a plan to be approved at a future date by the HPC. .



21-23 Elm Place (HPC 2014.056)	
Applicant:	Delio Corp.
Property Owner:	Edward Conley
Application Date:	July 31, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Alter front porch for ADA access.</i>
Recommendation:	Deny without Prejudice
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, August 19, 2014

Presentation:	There was no presentation.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<p>The information submitted to Staff for the project at 21-23 Elm Place is not sufficient for Staff to properly evaluate and make a recommendation to the HPC. Staff discussed with the contractor what materials would need to be submitted and the type of porch alteration that would be appropriate for a building that is a local historic district. Staff recommended that Owner and contractor meet to discuss the project.</p> <p>On 8/14/2014, the contractor explained that the Owner of the building will likely not be doing any alterations to the building. Staff recommended the Applicant submit a written request to withdraw the application. At this time, Staff has not received such request and therefore recommends the HPC deny the application without prejudice until such time when the Applicant submits sufficient information to process the application and make a recommendation to the HPC.</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:	There was no discussion.
Decision	The Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to deny without prejudice.

Demolition Reviews

Determination of Significance

20 Kent Court (HPC 2014.054)	
Applicant:	Keith Glover & Attila Javor
Property Owner:	Elizabeth Caira
Application Date:	July 30, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Significance</i>
Recommendation:	Significant
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, August 19, 2014
Presentation:	Richard DiGirolamo conceded that the building would be determined significant.
Public Comment:	Several of the neighbors had comments. Ann Madden, Eamon Cornane, Kathy Dutra and John Horner were concerned that the character of their neighborhood was eroding. They find that the way it is, charming. There were already a couple of large ugly buildings being constructed and do not want to see more development. It was noted that a neighboring house was also for sale. Eamon Cornane noted that the windows were unique.



<p>Staff Report:</p>	<p>The subject structure, likely c.1850, is a 1½ story gambrel-roof, gable-end dwelling in an unknown style. Remaining features include the simple form and massing, which includes an uncommon gambrel style roofline. Most other features appear to have been either removed or are covered over in modern materials. In addition, a small collection of mid nineteenth century structures along this south side of Kent Court appears to remain existent and relatively intact, which illustrates, at minimum, a moderate degree of historical significance and architectural integrity for this collection as a whole.</p> <p>(a) In accordance with the historic information obtained from <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, such as <i>Somerville Past and Present</i>, Staff find 20 Kent Court to be <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>The subject building is found importantly associated with the broad architectural, cultural, economic and social history of the City due to retention of form and massing, which includes an uncommon gambrel style roofline; as an early to mid-nineteenth century example of working class housing, and as part of an early to mid-nineteenth century collection of housing associated with the early development and industry of Somerville.</p> <p>The subject structure retains a moderate level of historical and architectural integrity due to the likely mid-nineteenth century date of construction; retention of form, massing, and fenestration, which illustrates an uncommon gambrel roofline within the City; and as part of a small collection of mid nineteenth century working class housing the represents the early development and industry of Somerville.</p> <p>(b) 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 53 Kent Street historically or architecturally significant.</p> <p>The subject dwelling is found historically and architecturally significant as a representative of mid-19th century working class housing stock due to the remaining integrity of the structure with regard to original form, massing, and visible fenestration pattern. In addition, due to the location of the structure within a small collection of structures that represent the same cultural context, this dwelling is significant within the context of the group of buildings which, together, represent the early development and industry of Somerville.</p>
<p>Documents:</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Discussion:</p>	<p>Abbey Freedman noted that the neighborhood has been targeted for development. The Commission agreed that the character of the neighborhood was important. Despite alterations the building did appear early.</p>
<p>Decision</p>	<p>At the public hearing a public hearing on Tuesday, September 16, 2014, the Historic Preservation Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to determine 20 Kent Court ‘Preferably Preserved.’ Per Section 4.2.D, “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 to the roof form, side-gable orientation, potential early date of construction, and context of associated structures</p>



Determination of Preferably Preserved

4 Milk Place (HPC 2014.041)	
Applicant:	City of Somerville
Property Owner:	Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Application Date:	June 19, 2014
Significant:	July 15, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Preferably Preserved</i>
Recommendation:	Not Preferably Preserved
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, August 19, 2014
Next Steps:	The HPC discussed potential components to include in a Memorandum of Agreement with City Staff at the Preferably Preserved public meeting on 8/7/2014. If determined Preferably Preserved, the City is prepared to put forth an MOA for a vote the same evening.
Presentation:	George Proakis presented with additional information given by Edward O'Donnell and Sue Thomas.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<p>This is a fairly common mid-19th century building type that is represented in multiple locations across the City. The building is mostly intact; however, the surrounding historical context has been altered, specifically on the remaining area of this parcel. The association with George Bonner is significant, but he is not known to have lived at this location. Last, due to the undesirable uses that have taken over the Prospect Street thoroughfare and drastically altered the urban landscape, the City has identified this area of blight as an urban renewal district, which will be developed to provide light rail transit to the Square. Upon consideration of these criteria, it is in the public interest to demolish.</p> <p>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 frequency of this type of residential building within multiple neighborhoods, the loss of historic context, category of association with George Bonner, and due to the level of blight in the surrounding area as well as location within an identified urban renewal district, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find 4 Milk Place Preferably Preserved.</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:	Eric Parkes noted that the building is located in the D-2 block and a development site with up to 100' high buildings. This is a situation where context is important. If it were located somewhere else, he would consider the building to be preferably preserved, but not in this case. Abby Freedman said that it retained its form but nothing else, even the foundation was not original. Eric Parkes reminded everyone that it had never been a fancy house. Jillian Adams said that the City has taken steps to find out as much as possible about the building. Once they are erased, the fabric is gone as is the opportunity to learn more.
Decision	The Commission voted ((Jillian Adams, Alan Bingham*, Abby Freedman, Brad Stearns*, Todd Zinn*)5-1(Eric Parkes)) to determine 4 Milk Place not 'Preferably Preserved,' in accordance with Section 4.2.D of the Demolition Review Ordinance 2003-05. The Commission did not find that demolition of the structure would be detrimental to the heritage of the City and, therefore, is not in the best interest of the public to preserve or rehabilitate due to the frequency of this type of residential building within multiple neighborhoods, the loss of historic context, category of association with George Bonner, and due to its location within an identified urban renewal district.
26-28 Prospect Street (HPC 2014.042)	
Applicant:	City of Somerville
Property Owner:	Somerville Redevelopment Authority
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



Significant:	July 15, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Preferably Preserved</i>
Recommendation:	Not Preferably Preserved
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, August 19, 2014
Next Steps:	The HPC discussed potential components to include in a Memorandum of Agreement with City Staff at the Preferably Preserved public meeting on 8/7/2014. If determined Preferably Preserved, the City is prepared to put forth an MOA for a vote the same evening.
Presentation:	George Proakis presented with additional information given by Edward O'Donnell and Sue Thomas.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<p>This is a fairly common mid-19th century building type that is represented in multiple locations across the City. The building is mostly intact; however, the surrounding neighborhood is drastically altered in building type and use. The association with Clark Bennett is significant, but he is not known to have lived at this location nor does this building represent his longstanding contribution to the City by filling in the River. Last, due to the undesirable uses that have taken over this major thoroughfare and drastically altered the urban landscape, the City has identified this area of blight as an urban renewal district, which will be developed to provide light rail transit to the Square. Upon consideration of these criteria, it is in the public interest to demolish.</p> <p>In accordance with the Demolition Review Ordinance (2003-05), Section 4.D, Staff find 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 frequency of this type of residential building within multiple neighborhoods, the loss of historic context, category of association with Clark Bennett and his filling of the River, and due to the level of blight in the surrounding area as well as location within an identified urban renewal district, Staff recommend that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find 26-28 Prospect Street Preferably Preserved.</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:	It was noted that 26-28 Prospect Street had more architectural details worth salvaging. Eric Parkes said that he had the same issues with the nomenclature used to describe the area as blighted. Abby Freedman said that she felt the building was more unique. Its siting was unusual. Its form was intact and its intact structure offered much to learn. Brad Stearns noting that the purview of the Commission was limited to the exterior and that the asbestos siding did not give much information thought that there was little left of the original material and saw no value in preserving the building. Eric noted that if it were not for the context, the pressure of the arrival of the T, and the frequency of relatively rare buildings, he would not be so concerned.
Decision	The Commission voted ((Jillian Adams, Alan Bingham*, Brad Stearns*, Todd Zinn*)4-2(Abby Freedman, Eric Parkes)) to determine 4 Milk Place not 'Preferably Preserved,' in accordance with Section 4.2.D of the Demolition Review Ordinance 2003-05. The Commission did not find that demolition of the structure would be detrimental to the heritage of the City and, therefore, is not in the best interest of the public to preserve or rehabilitate due to the frequency of this type of residential building within multiple neighborhoods, the loss of historic context, category of association with Clark Bennett and his filling of the River, as well as location within an identified urban renewal district.

30 Prospect Street (HPC 2014.043)	
Applicant:	City of Somerville
Property Owner:	Somerville Redevelopment Authority
Application Date:	June 19, 2014
Significant:	July, 15, 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>Determination of Preferably Preserved</i>
Recommendation:	Not Preferably Preserved
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, August 19, 2014
Next Steps:	The HPC discussed potential components to include in a Memorandum of Agreement with City Staff at the Preferably Preserved public meeting on 8/7/2014. If determined Preferably Preserved, the City is prepared to put forth an MOA for a vote the same evening.
Presentation:	George Proakis presented with additional information given by Edward O'Donnell and Sue Thomas. He stated that the building was not in the area needed by the T for the Green Line Station but directly adjacent. Because of concerns about the building, a subcommittee will be formed. A consultant has been hired to photograph and report on the concerns expressed at the last Commission meeting; the buildings will be photographed and new reports written; materials salvaged where possible; the wall-papers saved; and any other items that might be considered as part of a memorandum of agreement in order to expedite the process.
Public Comment:	Francis Fahey, resident of 30 Prospect Street, and the 3 rd generation in his family to live there, would like to stay for at least another 6 months on the property and would like a way to be found through the historic process to do so.
Staff Report:	<p>This is a very common late-19th century building type that is represented in various locations across the City. The building is mostly intact; however, the surrounding neighborhood is drastically altered in building type and use. The association with Clark Bennett is significant, but his death preceded the construction of this building and this building does represent his longstanding contribution to the City by filling in the River. Last, due to the undesirable uses that have taken over this major thoroughfare and drastically altered the urban landscape, the City has identified this area of blight as an urban renewal district, which will be developed to provide light rail transit to the Square. Upon consideration of these criteria, it is in the public interest to demolish.</p> <p>In accordance with the Demolition Review Ordinance (2003-05), Section 4.D, Staff find 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 frequency of this type of residential building within multiple neighborhoods, the loss of historic context, category of association with Clark Bennett and his filling of the River, and due to the level of blight in the surrounding area as well as location within an identified urban renewal district, Staff recommend that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find 30 Prospect Street Preferably Preserved.</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:	Eric Parkes asked to go over how blight was determined since the building appeared to be inhabited and in reasonable condition. George Proakis said that the buildings were within the boundaries of an area that met the State requirements for blight. Ed O'Donnell discussed Chapter 121B and how the finding was made by the Somerville Redevelopment Authority. They discussed the industrial functions of the site. Abby Freedman said that she had trouble with the term 'blighted'. Jillian Adams stated that it was a technical term. The zone was blighted and had ground pollution. Ed O'Donnell said that this was consistent with the industrial uses of the site and that remediation was imminent. He said that the relocation documents had all been signed. The site needed to be made available soon. Jillian Adams asked if the materials to be salvaged had been identified by the consultant. It was noted that salvage had been discussed at the recent site visit by the Staff and consultant. A complete list would be made. On hearing that there was some concern that the site would lie vacant for some time, George Proakis said that the City was no planning to land bank any of the area but quite a bit of time was needed to do the necessary remediation and to plan for the reuse of the entire site. Brad Stearns said that the Commission needed to focus on the specific buildings and not the entire site. He found that 30 Prospect Street was not unique and in fact fairly common throughout the City and beyond.



Decision	The Historic Preservation Commission voted (6-0) to determine 30 Prospect Street not 'Preferably Preserved,' in accordance with Section 4.2.D of the Demolition Review Ordinance 2003-05. The Commission did not find that demolition of the structure would be detrimental to the heritage of the City and, therefore, is not in the best interest of the public to preserve or rehabilitate due to the frequency of this type of residential building within multiple neighborhoods, the loss of historic context, category of association with Clark Bennett and his filling of the River, as well as location within an identified urban renewal district.
----------	--

204 Morrison Avenue – wood garage only (HPC 2014.047)	
Applicant:	Linde & Ronald Dynneson
Property Owner:	Linde & Ronald Dynneson
Application Date:	June 23, 2014
Significant	July, 15, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Preferably Preserved</i>
Recommendation:	Not Preferably Preserved
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, August 19, 2014
Presentation:	Ron Dynneson presented the plans to develop the property as a Bed and Breakfast Inn. The garage does not figure in the plans. It is in poor condition. The supports are compromised and have long diagonal braces attempting to hold it up. The garage as it is located where it will interfere with the ADA access. The contractor does not believe that he could actually move the building.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	The building has structural failure but still retains historical integrity due to materials and form. The building is of local significance and a variety of better examples existing within the city. In accordance with the Demolition Review Ordinance (2003-05), Section 4.D, Staff find the potential demolition of the subject garage/shed 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 frequency of this type of building within multiple neighborhoods and existing structural conditions, Staff recommend that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find the garage/shed at 204 Morrison Avenue Preferably Preserved.
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:	Eric Parkes said he always found the building interesting. The exact age of the garage building and its purpose was discussed. It appears on some maps and not on others. Its size and shape do not suggest that it originally had an automotive or stable use.
Decision	At the public hearing on Tuesday, August 19, 2014, which reviewed the initial determination of 'Significance,' the Historic Preservation Commission voted ((Jillian Adams, Dick Bauer, Alan Bingham*, Abby Freedman, Brad Stearns*, Todd Zinn*)6-1(Eric Parkes)) to determine the garage/shed at 204 Morrison Avenue not 'Preferably Preserved'. This vote is in accordance with Section 4.2.D of the Demolition Review Ordinance 2003-05; the Commission did not find that demolition of the garage/shed would be detrimental to the heritage of the City and, therefore, is not in the best interest of the public to preserve or rehabilitate due to the existing structural conditions.

Other Business

- CPA update (Dick Bauer & Amie Hayes)

Amie went over the proposed guidelines for the CPC determination and explained their derivation and how they were different from those used for demolition.



Vote to adopt Guidelines for a Determination of Significance for CPC projects
 CITY HALL • 93 HIGHLAND AVENUE • SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS 02143
 (617) 625-6600 EXT. 2500 • TTY: (617) 666-0001 • FAX: (617) 625-0722

www.somervillema.gov



Mystic Waterworks Pumping Station Housing Project	
Applicant:	Albert Rex, MacRostie Historic Advisors
Property Owner:	Somerville Housing Authority
Description:	Mystic Waterworks Pumping Station Housing Project
Action:	Vote to approve Letter of Support for MA Tax Credits, Round 10
	The Commission voted (7-0) unanimously that they continued to support the project.

Minutes:	July 15, 2014 - HPC
Minutes:	July 22, 2014 – Union Square LHD
Minutes:	August 7, 2014 – Preferably Preserved
	The Union Square minutes were unanimously approved by those attending the meeting. The July HPC and the August Preferably Preserved Minutes were not complete and therefore not reviewed.

Structures within Demolition Review Period

350 Medford Street (HPC 2014.031)	
Applicant:	City of Somerville
Property Owner:	City of Somerville
Significant	June 18, 2014
Prof. Preserved	July 15, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Preferably Preserved</i>
Recommendation:	Execute Memorandum of Agreement
Current Status:	Meeting on Preferably Preserved Structures held on Thursday, August 7, 2014
Presentation:	George Proakis, Director of Planning presented on behalf of the City. He had met with City Staff and the members of the HPC to discuss potential components to include in a Memorandum of Agreement at the Preferably Preserved public meeting on 8/7/2014.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Documents:	Proposed Memorandum of Agreement
Discussion:	Jillian Adams asked an additional item be included requesting that the City notify the HPC where the elements would be stored and again if they should be moved.
Decision	The Commission voted unanimously to approve the Memorandum of Agreement as amended.

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

