



**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  
KRISTI CHASE, PRESERVATION PLANNER

**MEMBERS PRESENT**  
JILLIAN ADAMS  
ABBY FREEDMAN  
ERIC PARKES

**Minutes for 4/03/13 Public Meeting**

The Somerville Historic Preservation Commission held a public meeting on **Wednesday, April 3, 2013**, at **10:00 a.m.** in City Hall, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Executive Conference Room, 93 Highland Avenue, Somerville, MA.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss an amendment to an existing Memorandum of Agreement regarding 360 Mystic Avenue and 95-101 Wheatland Street.

The new and updated plans illustrate that the building currently known as 360 Mystic Avenue is 8 bays in length along both the Wheatland Street façade and the interior courtyard façade. These plans also illustrate a corner board separating the reconstruction with the new construction; a modified brick façade that notes an asymmetrical fenestration pattern with no recess above the façade (although the façade still projects from the reconstructed building two feet in depth); the recessed arches in the brick foundation have been reduced to approximately two feet in height; and the elevator shaft projects from the interior façade approximately 2½ feet. The Commissioners agreed that these changes were appropriate. The change to 8 bays enables the two roof planes of the reconstruction to be consistent with the existing and will house rooftop mechanicals such as condensers.

The Commissioners requested that a shallow roof be added to the elevator shaft, possibly a low hip roof. They also prefer that the doors beneath the awning, which is attached to the elevator shaft, are composed of a black material to blend into the shadows beneath the awning.

The Commissioners also suggested a parapet above the new constructed building toward the rear, to help differentiate rooflines between the reconstructed building, currently known as 360 Mystic Avenue, and the new construction. This suggestion can be looked into further; however, because this suggestion concerns the new construction, the Design Review Committee should be the entity to entertain this idea at a later date. The cornices between these two buildings should also be modified to create more of differentiation between the buildings.

Lights on the building should also be addressed; however, the Architect for the Applicant explained there would be no lighting on the building, but that the property would continue to be lit with lamp posts, as is currently. Dryer vents shall be painted to match the façade of the building and, when possible, the infrastructure should be combined to reduce the number of vents as well as relocated to the roof.



Seven recessed brick arches shall be added to the foundation of the interior courtyard façade. These arches will then be “infilled” to create a feature similar to the existing.

The new windows shall replicate, in proportion and size of the opening, the existing windows on the building, which is currently known as 360 Mystic Avenue.

The Applicant explained that for bank purposes, the cost of the exhibit needs to be more specific. The Applicant proposed \$10k and the Commissioners agreed that this was sufficient; however, the language in the Addendum will be modified to explain that while the cost of the exhibit will not exceed \$10k, the total cost will reflect all components including installation of the exhibit.

The Applicant was also concerned about the requirements specified to obtain a Certificate of Occupancy, with regard to obtaining financing from the bank. The discussion then addressed how the Commission can ensure compliance with the MOA Addendum and not cause the bank concern, nor later issues with the recording of this document at the Registry of Deeds. Therefore, it was decided that the language would be modified to reflect that a demolition permit would not be issued if the requirements were not met prior to the demolition sign off. However, since the “Intent of Design” section is not able to be complied with prior to the issuance of a Demolition Permit, the compliance with this item will be tied to the Special Permit final sign off which is required prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy (CO). (Staff determined after this meeting that compliance with the “Interpretive Exhibit” section would also need to be tied to the Special Permit final sign off.) In addition, prior to being granted a Special Permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals, the HPC will recommend that one of the conditions would ensure that the Applicant is in full compliance with the Addendum at the time when Planning Staff does the final sign off. In an effort to address later issues that may arise as a result of this Addendum being recorded at the Registry of Deeds, Historic Staff will issue a “Certificate of Compliance,” with regard to the subject Addendum, once all items have been fully complied with, which may then also be recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

The meeting concluded at approximately 11:15 a.m.