



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 Thursday, January 23, 2014

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

Members Present: Jillian Adams, Dick Bauer, Alan Bingham*, Ryan Falvey, Abby Freedman, and Todd Zinn*. Eric Parkes arrived at 7:00 PM. Abby Freedman arrived at 6:50 PM.

Members Absent: George Born*, Natasha Burger, DJ Chagnon*, Tom DeYoung*, Eric Parkes*, Derick Snare*, and Brad Stearns*.

*Alternates

Others Present: John Beauvais, Adam Dash, Richard DiGirolamo, Ting Fang, Mike Guigli, Rimma Pevsner, Kate & William Ragusa, and Howard Robinson.

Proposed Alterations to Local Historic District Properties

46 Mt. Vernon Street (HPC 2013.089)	
Applicant:	Ting Fang
Property Owner:	Ting Fang
Application Date:	November 18, 2013
Legal Notice:	<i>Alter roof materials and second means of egress.</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Thursday, January 23, 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



Presentation:	<u>Ting Fang</u> presented. She is the new owner. The house was advertised as a 2-family residence. She bought it with sitting tenants who finally moved out in September. It had been altered in 2003 from a 1-family. Unfortunately they never got a Certificate of Occupancy at that time. Inspectional Services has told her that she needs a second means of egress at least twelve feet from the primary stairs to the 3 rd floor. After consulting with the contractor on the Commission and Commission Staff, one location was found that had minimal impact on the house and was behind an ell that was viable for the second means of egress from the 3 rd floor. She would also like to replace her 3-tab asphalt roof with architectural shingles. Unfortunately the preferred type of shingle would be \$1000 more expensive and asphalt shingles only have a 25 year warrantee as opposed to 50.
Public Comment:	There was no comment from the public.
Staff Report:	<u>Staff</u> determined that the alteration for which an application for a Historic Certificate has been filed is in part appropriate for and compatible with the preservation and protection of the 46 Mount Vernon Street Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission grant Ting Fang, Owner a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a simple metal spiral fire escape behind the cross gable and situated as close to the inside corner as possible. Staff did not recommend that the Historic Preservation Commission grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of 3-tab asphalt shingles with Timberline architectural shingles. Staff recommended granting a Certificate of Appropriateness for an architectural shingle with regular right angle cuts and a larger scale. A Certificate of Non-Applicability has already been issued for replacement in-kind of 3-tab asphalt shingles.
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:	<u>Jillian Adams</u> noted that it was common to place this type of egress in the rear and was not unusual. <u>Abby Freedman</u> asked if the window altered for the egress was visible. It was not. A short discussion was held on the types of architectural shingles available and their relative costs. It was recommended that an appropriate type of architectural shingle be considered even though it would cost more. The <u>Commission</u> recommended that someone who would not have a financial interest in the roof, review the existing roof for condition. If the owner could hold off its replacement for a few years and had an income from the rental unit, she could afford the more expensive roof shingle. The contractor on the Commission and Staff would make arrangements to review the condition of the roof.
Decision:	The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (6-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for 1. The proposed simple metal spiral fire escape to be installed behind the cross gable and situated as close to the inside corner as possible. The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (6-0) to continue the discussion and decision about the architectural roof shingles to the next Commission meeting on February 18, 2014 to allow for the evaluation of the existing roof materials.

140 Highland Avenue (HPC 2013.095)	
Applicant:	Michael Guigli
Property Owner:	Michael Guigli
Application Date:	December 27, 2013
Legal Notice:	<i>Remove west chimney.</i>
Recommendation:	Deny Certificate of Appropriateness; <i>conditional</i> Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Thursday, January 23, 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



Presentation:	<u>Michael Guigli</u> presented. He gave an update on the previously approved work on the slate roof of the porch and the turret room. He would like to remove an unused chimney that had been rebuilt and did not resemble the other visible chimney. He would like to close up the thermal envelope. The chimney is a heat vent. The base of the chimney is deteriorating the Carrying beam next to the chimney is cracked. The mortar is OK but the flashing is questionable. <u>Michael Guigli</u> said that his father was a mason. If the chimney was not wanted he should just take it down to the roofline and not rebuild it. He would like to install the decorative red slate, make the needed roof repairs and close it up. Both chimneys were non-functioning. He would like to conserve energy. His heating bills were not low. The chimney would cost \$10-15,000 to rebuild. It would be over the top to rebuild it. He could just throw roofing cement on it but wants to do a better job than that.
Public Comment:	There was no comment from the public.
Staff Report:	<u>Staff</u> determined that the alteration for which an application for a Historic Certificate has been filed is not appropriate for and compatible with the preservation and protection of the 140 Highland Avenue Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission do not grant Michael Guigli a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of a prominent chimney because it did not meet the HPC Guidelines. However, based on precedent, a replicated chimney in lighter weight materials that match the existing in size, color and texture with appropriate structural support could receive a Certificate of Appropriateness as there would be no visible change to the Historic District. Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission grant Michael Guigli a Certificate of Appropriateness to <i>replicate the original intact chimney either with interior supports or in a lighter weight veneer to match in size, shape and texture.</i>
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:	<u>Alan Bingham</u> asked why he didn't just rebuild the chimney from the roof line. <u>Michael Guigli</u> responded that there was no added value to it for him. He just did not feel it was worth it. <u>Jillian Adams</u> noted that it was common for such buildings to have multiple chimneys and that the house would look lopsided without it. <u>Abby Freedman</u> commented that his stewardship was good. She agreed with <u>Jillian Adams</u> on the effect of the chimney removal on the character, massing and form of the building. They both noted that bring the chimney up to its original height would do a lot for the way the building looks. <u>Dick Bauer</u> read the standards for Hardship and stated that these standards are difficult to meet. The commission then held a short discussion on the relative differences between modern and historic brick citing size and texture as the most important. It was noted that the chimney is highly visible from the public right of way. <u>Alan Bingham</u> said that he thought in the long run, it would be financially better to keep the chimney.
Decision:	The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (6-0) to deny the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness because the removal of the chimney, a character defining feature did not meet Historic District Guidelines and was considered detrimental to the historic district.

72R Dane Street (HPC 2013.097)	
Applicant:	Rimma Pevsner
Property Owner:	Rimma Pevsner
Application Date:	December 18, 2013
Legal Notice:	<i>Add vinyl siding and replace windows.</i>
Recommendation:	None at this time
Current Status:	Request to withdraw application
Decision:	The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (6-0) to grant the request to withdraw her application.



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

www.somervillema.gov



Demolition Reviews***Determination of Significance***

24 Beacon Place (HPC 2013.094)	
Applicant:	E. John Beauvais
Property Owner:	E. John Beauvais
Application Date:	December 16, 2013
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Significance</i>
Recommendation:	Not Significant
Current Status:	Heard on Thursday, January 23, 2014
Presentation:	<u>John Beauvais</u> presented. He described his intent to retain and repair the building. As they got further into the investigation of the structure of the building for the need repairs from the fire last summer, the more obvious it became that the building was not salvageable. Alterations had been made in a slapdash method, in a hodgepodge and not up to code.
Public Comment:	There was no comment from the public.
Staff Report:	<p><i>For a Determination of Significance, the structure must be either (A) listed on the National Register or (B) at least 50 years old.</i></p> <p>(A) The structure is NOT listed on or within an area listed on the National Register of Historic Places, nor is the structure the subject of a pending application for listing on the National Register.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>(B) The structure, circa 1874, is at least 50 years old.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><i>For a Determination of Significance under (B), the subject building must be found either (a) importantly associated with people, events or history or (b) historically or architecturally significant.</i></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, <u>Staff</u> recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find 24 Beacon Place 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.</p> <p>While the subject building is associated with the broad architectural, cultural, economic and social history of the City due to its association with Irish workers in the last half of the 19th and early 20th century, no important associations were found to a particular wave of immigration.</p> <p>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, <u>Staff</u> recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find 24 Beacon Place historically and architecturally significant.</p> <p>The subject building was not found historically and architecturally significant due to its lack of association with any important historic figure or event and its lack of cohesive architecture. The building is unable to convey a coherent story of immigrant history due to its condition and numerous alterations.</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:	The <u>Commission</u> was well aware of the fire that devastated the adjacent buildings on Calvin Street and agreed with the Staff Report.



Decision:	The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (5-0) that the building was not significant.
-----------	--

Determination of Preferably Preserved

82 Highland Avenue (HPC 2013.083)	
Applicant:	Gabriel & Gladys Ragusa
Property Owner:	Gabriel & Gladys Ragusa
Application Date:	October 22, 2013
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Preferably Preserved</i>
Recommendation:	Not Preferably Preserved
Current Status:	Heard on Thursday, January 23, 2014
Presentation:	<u>Richard DiGirolamo</u> presented. He gave an overview of the reasons for the proposed demolition and a short history of the ownership of the building. He presented the structural engineer's report stating that the building is unsound. Stairways had been relocated, walls removed and the foundation had voids in it. The building is under agreement with LaRosa Properties. <u>Howard Rap</u> , agent for LaRosa presented the initial plans for the site. They intend to construct a mansard roofed building with Hardie siding.
Public Comment:	Former Alderman <u>Tom Taylor</u> called to say that he would like the Commission not to find the building 'Preferably Preserved'. He did not think it merited the honor.
Staff Report:	<p>The Commission found the subject parcel 'Significant' because the c. 1869 structure was more than 50 years old and 'importantly associated ... with the broad architectural, cultural, political, economic or social history of the City.' The 20th Century businesses in the building exemplify the economic and social history of the City as typical of those serving the neighborhoods in which they occurred and architecturally 'Significant' in the context of a group of buildings in which the ground floor had been altered for commercial uses. It demonstrates a typical early 20th Century alteration found throughout the City at corners where the street cars stopped. Homes were altered rather than razed. The building also retains its roofline, dormers, bays and essential massing above the ground floor demonstrating the character and style of a 19th century Mansard home.</p> <p>The many alterations to the Mansard are such that it could never be returned to its original state. The information provided and consideration criteria (a-e) listed above convey that this type of dwelling is common in many neighborhoods throughout the City, as is the associated streetscape, and has minimal remaining architectural detail, other than form.</p> <p>In accordance with the Demolition Review Ordinance (2003-05), Section 4.D, <u>Staff</u> 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 dwelling and associated streetscape within the City, minimal remaining detail, number of enclosures and additions, and the location of the structure on Highland Avenue, Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission do not find 82 Highland Avenue '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:	The <u>Commission</u> discussed how the age of the building was a factor in their considerations. <u>Jillian Adams</u> said that she did not find the structural report convincing. Foundations are held together by soft mortar that periodically needs to be repointed. The picture of decayed lumber was unclear. The use of lally columns is not an indication of a failed structure. She would like to have more technical information. She would also like to see sketches of where the structural walls had been and where the supports had been added. She would have liked more information about the load-bearing walls. <u>Abby Freedman</u> said that the entire front of the building had been removed at the ground floor level and the west side. The form of the east side had also been altered by addition of the external staircase. The brackets, cornice



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

www.somervillema.gov



	and window surrounds were also gone. She felt that there were not enough details or form left. The history of the building could not be seen. She said she was glad that the replacement building was a step in the right direction. <u>Jillian Adams</u> noted that the proposal was in-keeping with the neighborhood. <u>Alan Bingham</u> asked if there was anything left to save. <u>Kate Ragusa</u> said that all the changes that the building had gone through while they owned it were due to necessities and were responses to emergencies such as a truck driving through the window and doors on Saint Patrick’s Day.
Decision:	The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (6-0) to not find the building ‘Preferably Preserved’.

8 Mt. Pleasant Street (HPC 2013.090)	
Applicant:	Lolastar LLC
Property Owner:	Remo Avellani
Application Date:	October 22, 2013
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Preferably Preserved</i>
Recommendation:	Preferably Preserved
Current Status:	Heard on Thursday, January 23, 2014
Presentation:	<u>Adam Dash</u> presented. He gave a description of the building’s location and the planned development on adjacent parcels. He said that he and his clients recognized the historic value of their building at 8 Mount Pleasant Street and agreed with the ‘Preferably Preserved’ status that they were sure the Commission would determine.
Public Comment:	There was no comment from the public.
Staff Report:	In accordance with the Demolition Review Ordinance (2003-05), Section 4.D, Staff found the potential demolition of the subject structure detrimental to the heritage of the City, and consequently in the best interest of the public to preserve or rehabilitate. Therefore, due to the level of integrity, association with the first wave of modest suburban expansion into Somerville, likely prior to the town division, and retention of several architectural details that continue to illustrate the Greek Revival style as well as later details that note style updates in the Gothic Revival and Queen Anne styles, <u>Staff</u> recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission find 8 Mt. Pleasant Street 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:	<u>Abby Freedman</u> noted that the building was the lone survivor of its pre-Somerville era and that there were homes of wealthier residents around the corner on Perkins Street. It was still part of a collection of working class housing of a later period on Mount Pleasant Street. She described several of the other buildings on the street and how they related to #8.
Decision:	The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (6-0) to find the building ‘Preferably Preserved’ because it is “listed on the National Register of Historical Places, 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 both: <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, and 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 importantly associated with people, events or history of the City due to the retention of several architectural details that continue to illustrate the Greek Revival style as well as later details that note style updates in the Gothic Revival and Queen Anne styles, as an early c.1841 example of a modest cottage associated with the first subdivisions beyond the Charlestown Neck for Boston businessmen, and as a rare surviving</p>



Decision:	structure was also determined historically and architecturally ‘Significant’ due to the retention of original architectural features, later added features, and the high degree of historical integrity due to the original form, massing, and fenestration pattern, which are characteristic of the period of construction, as well as location, which represents the first wave of modest suburban expansion into Somerville, likely prior to the town division.
-----------	--

De-Designation Request

72R Dane Street (HPC 2013.096)	
Applicant:	Rimma Pevsner
Property Owner:	Rimma Pevsner
Application Date:	December 13, 2013
Legal Notice:	<i>Request to de-designate 72R Dane Street</i>
Recommendation:	Recommend de-designation to Board of Alderman
Current Status:	Heard on Thursday, January 23, 2014
Presentation:	<u>Rimma Pevsner</u> presented her request for de-designation to the HPC. She purchased the house as part of a 4-unit lot in 2000, which consisted of a triple-decker and a small house at the rear and not visible from Dane Street. She was aware that the small house was older but not aware of a historic designation. They began what they considered improvements, such as the replacement of drafty windows and the installation of vinyl siding. They hired a contractor whom they told to get the necessary permits for the work and to begin the project while they were on vacation. She returned to find a Stop Work Order had been posted and the work was $\frac{3}{4}$ completed. The contractor had neglected to get the needed permits from Inspectional Services. Since then, she has been working with Staff to untangle the situation. She is familiar with historic buildings and lived in a nice Victorian in another town. She does not believe this building is of historic merit as it has undergone structural alterations by a prior owner of the property due to a fire in the late 1990s and is documented in City files. This included a dormer and raising of the roof to allow for a second floor.
Public Comment:	There was no comment from the public.
Staff Report:	The City of Somerville is composed of a number of historic resources that visually describe the history of the City. Adopting the 1985 Historic District Ordinance, a number of historic resources were designated as local historic districts, which is an acknowledgement that these buildings are of special importance to the history of the City. The intent of this Ordinance is to “Protect, enhance and preserve cultural and historical resources...Safeguard the City’s historical and cultural heritage ... [and] Enhance the City’s image to residents, visitors and tourists...” As the Historic Preservation Commission administers this Ordinance, the Commission is responsible for establishing the standard of integrity and significance that is to be conveyed by properties given historic designation status. These standards serve to protect, enhance and preserve designated properties and the Commission is then responsible for upholding these standards throughout the City for all designated historic properties and to defend these standards as tools used by the Commission to accomplish the intent and purpose of the Ordinance. Regulating the integrity of local historic districts, as in the ability of these districts to convey significance, serves to enhance the City’s image by preserving the heritage of the City. Similarly, if a building within a local historic district is no longer composed of integrity, and is no longer able to convey significance, such building should be de-designated as a local historic district. Maintaining designation for buildings that do not uphold the established standard devalues the importance and purpose behind historic designation and compromises the intent of the Historic District Ordinance; therefore, <u>Staff</u> recommended the Historic Preservation Commission support the de-designation of 72R Dane Street.
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, various historical maps and atlases and site visits.



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

www.somervillema.gov



Discussion:	<p><u>Abby Freedman</u> found the Staff Report very interesting, particularly the section on chimneys. She wondered if there was evidence of a central chimney. Staff clarified that there was no visible evidence in the basement. The location and saw markings on the floor joists did not identify themselves to be original but a combination of early and later replacements. <u>Jillian Adams</u> asked if scorch marks were visible anywhere because they could be an indication of the locations of hearths that might have been removed. Staff did not find evidence of this type of mark. <u>Abby Freedman</u> also asked about roof pitch as an indication of age. Staff noted that the pitch of the roof is due to the size and massing of the building.</p> <p><u>Jillian Adams</u> stated that she did not want to question previous members of the Commission, but in her opinion they permitted alterations that the current Commission would not approve. A discussion between <u>Alan Bingham</u>, <u>Jillian Adams</u> and <u>Abby Freedman</u> then discussed the integrity of historic structures and the responsibilities of the Commission. The fire in 1997 led to a series of modifications to the structure. The responsibility lay with the previous Commission to ensure that the alterations did not affect the architectural and historical integrity of the building. <u>Alan Bingham</u> stated that de-designation is a huge step and should not be done for properties where small incremental changes had been made that devalue the inherent value of the historic property, especially not to reward such actions. <u>Jillian Adams</u> pointed out that the biggest alterations were undertaken just after the fire with Commission approval and were not the fault of the current owner. She stated that the Commission needs to uphold standards that meet the intent of the Ordinance, that the current Commission needs to set a high bar for the integrity of designated properties, and that she believes this building no longer holds integrity.</p> <p><u>Abby Freedman</u> noted that the request to de-designate followed the issuance of a Stop Work Order. Is there a way to impose fines for unapproved alterations? <u>Staff</u> said that no fines had been issued for any historic properties with unauthorized work. <u>Staff</u> would look into whether one could impose fines for the work undertaken without permits in this case.</p> <p><u>Staff</u> noted that the form of the building has been highly modified. The installation of vinyl siding over wood shingle siding was the most recent alteration. <u>Staff</u> reminded the Commission that they are responsible for upholding the intent of the Ordinance and this building does not have the integrity necessary to demonstrate its original significance; therefore, this structure cannot be justified as a local historic district. A discussion between Commissioners regarding when alterations are appropriate and become part of the historic evolution of a house was tabled for another time. <u>Staff</u> explained that the integrity, defined by form and massing, original materials, fenestration patterns and setting are all characteristics that had been altered from the alleged date of construction. <u>Dick Bauer</u> said that he was torn and while the integrity is impaired, 100% in all categories was not a requirement for local historic designation. He looks at integrity as a factor along with age and other considerations. If the building is pre-Civil War, it would be exceedingly rare. If it were circa 1900, it would have to be pristine. He said he does not find architectural integrity on its own enough to be the deciding factor; if the basic bones are visible underneath the alterations. <u>Abby Freedman</u> said she wanted more information even though what was presented was extensive. <u>Brandon Wilson</u> found the de-designation request disturbing, especially the re-evaluation of prior commissions. Decisions are based on the interpretation of the law. There have been changes over time in the stringency of interpretation. She said that the issue here is that alterations have been made to a local historic district and the question is 'are they so significant that the building is no longer valid as a District?' Fire is generally an extenuating circumstance which undermines the structural integrity of a building. The Commission should think hard about the consequences of this precedent setting case, given that there may be cases where work was done by homeowners and contractors without permits that could undermine the integrity of a building and use that as</p>
-------------	--



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

www.somervillema.gov



	<p>an excuse. <u>Staff</u> noted that this building does not maintain its integrity and that each case would be evaluated on the same criteria as they come forward. The Board of Aldermen would look more favorably on the Commission if they understood the HPC standards are being upheld and that the Commission would be willing to de-designate properties that no longer uphold these standards. <u>Abby Freedman</u> said fines should be levied for work done without approval by the Commission. It was noted that the contractor was the one responsible for the work and that he had not pulled a building permit. <u>Rimma Pevsner</u> said that she could not ask him to pay for the mistake. In her experience, the contractor had always done a good job and followed the rules. <u>Staff</u> noted that once CitizenServe was up and running, no permits for historic properties could be issued without Staff approval; however, this system will not solve the problem of contractors working without permits. The <u>Commission</u> then spoke about what further information they might need to make a decision on the Report. <u>Abby Freedman</u> and <u>Dick Bauer</u> asked about what more information maps could provide regarding possible pre-1900 origins of the house which was likened to workers cottages found on Dane Avenue and in North Cambridge. Staff explained that extensive research had been done using available documents and site visits, short of investigative demolition and thorough deed research which would be unlikely to give any more information. <u>Abby Freedman</u> reiterated that she would only recommend de-designation if the reason was due to changes caused by the 1997 fire.</p>
<p>Decision:</p>	<p>The <u>Commission</u> voted 4-2 (with Jillian Adams and Todd Zinn voting not) to continue the discussion of de-designation, based on the Preliminary Study Report, until the February 18, 2014 HPC meeting.</p>

Other Action Items

- Authorize Staff to make Significance Determinations for Significant structures only.

There are cases wherein the determination of ‘Significance’ is a foregone conclusion, such buildings already on the National Register or have high integrity. Staff would like to eliminate the need for long discussions of these cases at Commission meetings and move directly to the decision of whether a building should be ‘Preferably Preserved’. If the Staff can make this decision as the designee of the Commission the process would be more efficient. The Commission discussed the ramifications of this. The research findings would be incorporated into the report for ‘Preferably Preserved’. The research and letter to the applicants for the demolition of a ‘Significant’ property would be reviewed by officer(s) of the Commission prior to issuance of the letter. The Commission voted unanimously (6-0) to authorize Staff to make determinations of ‘Significance’ on behalf of the Historic Preservation Commission as its designee as long as officer(s) of the Commission have the opportunity to review and comment upon the research and the letter of the finding.

<p>Minutes:</p>	<p>November 19, 2013 HPC Minutes</p>
<p>Minutes:</p>	<p>December 5, 2013 – Public Meeting of Preferably Preserved Structures</p>
<p>Minutes:</p>	<p>January-December 2013 – Design Guidelines</p>
<p>Minutes:</p>	<p>December 19, 2013 – Union Square</p>
<p>Minutes:</p>	<p>January 9, 2014 – Union Square</p>
<p>Decision:</p>	<p>Minutes were not reviewed due to time constraints.</p>

Other Non-Action Items

- 2014 Preservation Awards - tour of nominees Sunday, January 26, 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

