



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

MICHAEL F. GLAVIN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

STAFF PRESENT
AMIE HAYES, PLANNER

MEMBERS PRESENT
JILLIAN ADAMS
RYAN FALVEY

Public Meeting for Preferably Preserved Structures
Recommendations and Minutes

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) held a public meeting at **6:30 p.m.** on **Thursday, March 6, 2014**, in City Hall, 3rd Floor Conference Room, 93 Highland Avenue, Somerville, MA.

The purpose of the meeting was to seek alternatives to demolition for structures determined by the Historic Preservation Commission to be Preferably Preserved and to make recommendations to the Historic Preservation Commission at a future Commission meeting on the following Preferably Preserved structure(s):

6:30 PM to 7:00 PM

8 Mt. Pleasant Street *HPC 2013.090*

Delay Period Ends: 10/23/2014

Building Description: c. 1841 suburban cottage, single-family dwelling

Significance: The structure is "Significant" due to the remaining historical integrity, location, retention of architectural details that note stylistic evolution, as an early example of the first subdivisions beyond the Charlestown Neck, and as a rare example that likely predates the division from Charlestown.

The structure is "Preferably Preserved" due to the level of integrity, association with the first wave of modest suburban expansion into Somerville, retention of several architectural details that note stylistic evolution, and as part of a collection of middle class workers housing.

This was the second time for this case to come to a Public Meeting for Preferably Preserved Structures. The Agent gave a brief overview of how the design of the new building had evolved, becoming a wholly separate structure. The new building took on a more historic tone with a gable roof and traditional fenestration while the historic structure lost a window bay on the north façade. The Architect explained this was necessary to allow for an appropriate amount of 'turn around' space for vehicles entering and exiting. This solution also provides more appropriate space for the windows of the adjacent residential dwelling as the masonry wall does not extend to the fullest height until further beyond the windows. The Commissioners recognized that the north façade was not necessary to reduce in length for the automobile needs and suggested adding this window bay back to the building and then stepping the new building back to still maintain appropriate spacing near the adjacent windows. This solution then returns the right side façade back to the original fenestration pattern, a character defining feature. Though the left side façade would be reduced in length, the fenestration pattern here had been previously altered.

The discussion then turned to the masonry wall, which is required in a TOD. The Commissioners questioned if the interpretation of this wall might take the historic structure further into account. Staff responded that this would be discussed internally. The Commissioners also explained that the original modern design was preferred as there would be less competition between the gabled rooflines, but that they appreciate what the Architect was trying to achieve. Going back to



the previous design for the new building, reconfiguring the right side façade, and flushing out the compatibility of materials should prepare the Applicant for an MOA to be signed at the March HPC meeting to be used. The Commissioner also requested that the new building not cover the historic building at the roofline.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:10.

