



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, February 18, 2014**

Staff Present: Kristi Chase, Amie Hayes, and Brandon Wilson. Kristi Chase was recused from the hearings on 9-11 Aldersey Street and 30 Bow Street and left the room for those portions of the meeting.

Members Present: Jillian Adams, Dick Bauer, Alan Bingham*, DJ Chagnon*, and Eric Parkes. DJ Chagnon left and Eric Parkes arrived at 8:30 PM after the 9-11 Aldersey Street case had been heard and decided.

Members Absent: George Born*, Natasha Burger, Tom DeYoung*, Ryan Falvey, Abby Freedman, Derick Snare*, Brad Stearns*, and Todd Zinn*

*Alternates

Others Present: Dave Ahouse, Susan Ayers, Jim Baab, Anne & Nick Bonugli, Andrew Brandt, Robert Buchanan, Edward J. Lonergan, Dick Lourie, Janine Fay, Pauline McEachern, Jim McGinnis, Jeff Meese, Gerard Meehan, Tony Membrino, Deb Pacini, Sun Sasongko, Martina Schinke, Julie Schneider, Kelly Speakman, Corey Tedrow, Bonnie Tominack and Felicia Vargas.



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

www.somervillema.gov



Proposed Alterations to Local Historic District Properties

9-11 Aldersey Street (HPC 2013.082)	
Applicant:	Gerard Meehan
Property Owner:	Gerard Meehan
Application Date:	October 31, 2013
Legal Notice:	<i>Restore and alter the existing historic structure; construct two additional residential structures.</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness; Deny Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, February 18, 2014
Presentation:	<p><u>Jeff Meese</u> Presented The owners gave him the freedom to look at the site and develop his own ideas on how to develop it. He discussed the earlier approach which maximized what was allowed under current zoning His approach was different. The outcome was much smaller than what had been proposed using any metrics. He thought that Prospect Hill was unique in the City in that had an existing cultural landscape with civic structures and parks on top of the hill and looking in the other direction. It also had Prospect Hill Park with its dramatic vistas and tower</p> <p>This site is double width with an 1849 house in the center of it. He would not call it a farmhouse since it was not attached to a particular farm although there may have been grazing on the hill. While this section of the Hill was developed by Robert Aldersey Vinal, He could not put any particular significance to him beyond his membership in the social elite and enumerated the ways he found R.A. Vinal undistinguished. He found his brother Q.A. Vinal more interesting</p> <p>The house is a simple 1849 home that retains much of its original character despite several minor alterations. He emphasized that the house should be maintained and brought closer to its 1849 character as can be understood from the remaining physical evidence. Changes to the porch and the side stairs should be undone.</p> <p>His idea for the development of the site was to be deferential to the original building and design the new structures so that they only made sense in relationship to the original building. They would be plain and softer more delicate. He showed images of what inspired his design. He wanted the buildings he created to be smaller and refer to the centrality of the R.A. Vinal House He noted that the building would remain visible from all the public rights of way.</p>
Public Comment	<p><u>Susan Ayers</u> thanked the Commission and Staff. She found that the setbacks, although greatly improved from the previous plan shown, were still insufficient and should be pushed further back up the hill and behind the house. The massing and form was still too big, especially at the rear which does not step down. She did not find that the styles related to the earlier forms. The paving had not been reduced but still was too much on the lot. On the whole she did not find that the revisions achieved the goals set.</p> <p><u>David Ahouse</u> noted that he found that there was just not enough information given to make a decision. While the drawings were nice they really were unclear about the relative size and placement of the buildings. The size of the proposed dormers was unclear and did not match up.</p> <p><u>Felicia Vargas</u> exhibited map changes over time that demonstrated how this side of Prospect Hill developed. The Aldersey Summit Street Local Historic District retained the same density with little change from 1874. Pleasant Avenue and Grandview were much denser with turn of the last century development. 9-11 Aldersey Street is the cornerstone of the 1870s district.</p> <p><u>Bonnie Tominack</u> emphasized how the green space and landscaping were important. The proposed house visually divided the lot into 3 zones that would no longer make the</p>



:	<p>passer-by stop and think about how the area had been 150 years ago.</p> <p><u>Martina Schinke</u> said that everyone has a different take on what is important about the neighborhood and the proposed development. The one thing that they all agreed upon was the historic character of the neighborhood and how that historic character needed to be maintained. She thought that 19 Aldersey might have been later than the original house but it was much smaller than 17 and set well behind it. She also noted that more recently 8 Aldersey had been extended toward the rear with an addition that resembled a carriage house. New construction should not compete with or dominate the historic fabric. She said that the new proposal still did not allow the historic building to be the main focus.</p> <p><u>Jeff Meese</u> responded to the comments above. He believed that the work proposed for the house was architecturally OK. The question of what to do with the site and what made it significant was the main point. Having read the Staff Report, he found that some of the information regarding dimensional tables not to be appropriate to the considerations of the Commission but rather the Zoning Board. He said he looked at the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. There seems to be some interpretation relating to the idea of the view corridor. This concept is used for places like Appottomax and City Hall. He does not think it applies here. While the site is not totally without significance, it is not a cultural icon. He said the question still remains of who is this guy, why is he important, and how does this site fit in. He did not find R.A. Vinal to be significant, and tying the importance of the property to him did not make it any more significant. One can look at Prospect Hill Park and City Hall to see dramatic views. This was an area where they grazed sheep. He said he was at a loss to find a consistent interpretation of the concept. The Guidelines for additions also seem to be soft in regards to non-historic additions. They do not need to be on the rear He found several examples around the country with the additions being adjacent to the building.</p> <p>Staff read a letter received from <u>Joel Bard</u> supporting the Staff Report on behalf of the residents.</p>
Staff Report:	<p><u>Staff</u> determined that a portion of the project 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 the Historic Preservation Commission grant Gerard Meehan, Trustee for G&T Realty Trust, a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the existing clapboard porch rail and fire escape and to replace the railing with a style appropriate railing and balusters</p> <p><u>Staff</u> also determined that a portion of the project for which an application for a Historic Certificate has been filed, even with the proposed updates, is not appropriate for, nor compatible with the preservation and protection of the Aldersey-Summit Local Historic District. The proposed new structures would severely diminish the quality of the setting in which the historic Vinal house has been located since it was built, and therefore the new structures are fundamentally incompatible with the Aldersey-Summit Local Historical District. Therefore, Staff recommended the Historic Preservation Commission deny Gerard Meehan, Trustee for G&T Realty Trust, a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct two additional residential structures at 9-11 Aldersey Street.</p>
Documents:	<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>
Discussion:	<p><u>Dick Bauer</u> read the applicable sections of the Ordinance. <u>DJ Chagnon</u> had several questions about the changes in massing and form. He wanted to understand how much things had changed from the previous proposal as well as how the relationship between the massing of the buildings and the slope of the land affect each other. <u>Jeff Meese</u> spoke</p>



about how they wanted to keep the focus on the historic elements and less on the Zoning issues. Due to the slope of the ground, the rear portion of the building would be higher.

Jillian Adams noted that siting needs to have more discussion in the Staff Reports. The architect's perspectives and elevations would be clearer if they were drawn from the point of view of someone standing on the sidewalk. She said that historic significance is no longer viewed as being only about the higher classes of society. One should be cognizant that workers cottages are as significant but for different reasons than the homes of important people. This property gives the history. It is a reflection of the early history which Robert A. Vinal developed. He thought it was important not to develop further on his lot and to keep it large. The property is important in and of itself. The design needs to be focused on the Local Historic District requirements and the Historic Guidelines not the zoning requirements. The plans should start with the Local Historic District restrictions.

Alan Bingham stated that the Commission was chartered to look at the entire historic context and to preserve what was worth preserving, whether it be curb cuts, chimneys or the slope of the land. 9-11 Aldersey Street is the anchor within the District. Changing it would change the nature of the whole district. Putting in 2 modern faux houses on the lot would destroy the context. Once that is gone, it is gone. There is a small house on Beacon Street that needs a home and could be moved there. Short term gain for long term loss should not be considered. The Commission's charter is to preserve what is valuable to the community. He found the proposal incongruous with the nature of the lot and the District. It is the Commission's responsibility to future generations to preserve the history of this historic town and he would hate to see its loss.

D.J. Chagnon said that he had heard what the public and Jeff Meese had to say about the site and whether or not it was significant. He noted that Jeff Meese had said that there was not a lot of precedent for what to do. This was because there aren't many remaining sites like this one left and hasn't been for a while. There is a comparable lot and structure down the street which has a little better than average detailing but no context. Whether 9-11 Aldersey Street was remarkable in its time is moot. It has survived in a fairly intact condition. It is a blessing that it is here to be discussed. He said he is not aware of many other properties with this scale of development on this sort of site and context, particularly in Somerville or similar communities. This section of Prospect Hill was a little more loosely developed; the lots are larger. They speak to the history of the time and are a snapshot of it. It is a reflection of the broader values of the time, the broad development patterns can be seen in the density of the build-out. He noted that the site plan seems better than it was but does not believe it to be buildable as currently drawn once all the considerations are factored in, for example the vehicular circulation around the rear of the western building does not appear to provide enough turning radius. The crux is the centrality of the historic building. Almost any development will box it in. Both the buildings proposed are larger than the existing. The developers appear to be trying to fit more into the lot than can be accommodated without radically altering the character. They should be looking at the precedents and plan something that fits into the historical pattern of development. In reference to earlier comments about outbuildings related to the main house, he noted that while there might have been other buildings on the site when R.A. Vinal lived there, none were shown on the existing maps, and the proposed buildings are too large to reference outbuildings or subservient structures. The proposed density seems out of character with the historical pattern of development. One should consider the context and relationships between the various buildings in the entire district.

Jillian Adams said that there was no way to frankly argue that there would be no impact on the historic district.

Dick Bauer emphasized the attention the Commission paid to the site context. The character of the land is essential to the site. He spoke about the number of times the Commission had asked the developer to make the proposed alterations smaller with less of an impact and their lack of respect for the Commission's charter. Each time they submit something minimally smaller than the previous application. They have gone from a 7600 SF footprint to one of about 5900 SF. He did not find the current proposal to be good enough. The



	<p>proposal was made smaller by about 1/5 and was still much larger than the historic structure. He said he is troubled by the applicant referring each time to what is allowed under the current zoning as a justification for the size of the development. The Commission is permitted by the Ordinance to make further requests for deeper setbacks. He said that the site is in and of itself important. The addition of 2 big buildings and a larger driveway would destroy the historic character of the site.</p> <p><u>Jillian Adams</u> thanked the Public for keeping on topic and helping the Commission on topic. Having attended many such meetings in other cities, she found it unusual to not hear about issues that were not related to the matter at hand. <u>Dick Bauer</u> added his thanks. He then iterated that his previous comments to the Applicant were not directed at the presenter.</p> <p><u>Jeff Meese</u> stated that he spoke about zoning as a point of reference because he feels that it is a tangible way to understand the issues. Zoning is inherently conservative. In designing new structures for the site, he had looked at HPC Guidelines and at the Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines. In reference to cultural landscapes, he found that it was a relatively new concept being discussed nationally. The proposal was for residential buildings in a residential neighborhood. He had been taught that there were several levels of significance. On the highest level, places such as Mount Vernon and the Longfellow House were untouchable. On the middle and lowest levels, there was some latitude in what could be done. In this situation, he has heard that they should not touch the site. He said that he does not think that this property rises to the highest level. He understood from the comments that out-buildings as a style might be OK. <u>D.J. Chagnon</u> noted that there are carriage houses in the city that have been adapted as residences. <u>Jeff Meese</u> went on to say he had tried very hard to design buildings that would not compete with but would refer back to the historic building. He said he sees the full width and depth as visible and interpretable, He sees as varied. In the neighborhood these are moderately sized buildings.</p>
<p>Decision:</p>	<p>The Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness on the existing historic house contingent upon the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove only the portion of clapboard that encloses the lower portion of the porch; 2. Remove the fire escapes located on the front and rear façades; and 3. Replace the clapboard railing with a style appropriate railing and balusters. <p>The Applicant did not propose a style of railing and balusters within the application or supplemental information. Therefore, while the HPC does grant permission to replace this feature, the Applicant still requires HPC approval to determine that the style to be proposed is appropriate to the historic structure.</p> <p>In accordance with the application for 9-11 Aldersey Street, regarding the remainder of the application which requests to construct two additional residential structures on the property next to the original house, the Commission upheld the Staff recommendation outlined in the <i>Updated Alteration to a Historic Property Staff Report</i> and voted unanimously (4-0) to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness to the Applicant, G & T Realty Trust.</p> <p>This Certificate of Appropriateness was Denied due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The diminished quality of the setting to which the historic Vinal house is located upon construction of two additional residential structures. <p>Findings for this denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The visibility of the proposal is such that while the new structures are aligned with the existing historic building, located approximately 45’ from the street edge, the new structures will continue to block side and rear views of the existing historic dwelling, which alters the open feel of the parcel. The proposed structures will be highly visible along Aldersey Street, as well as Summit Avenue and Walnut Street due to bulky massing of the rear components of these buildings.



The primary purpose of the Preservation Ordinance is to encourage preservation and high design standards in Local Historic Districts, in order to safeguard the architectural heritage of the City. Guidelines have been developed to ensure that rehabilitation efforts, alterations, and new construction all respect the design fabric of the districts and do not adversely affect their present architectural integrity.

- The proposal does not coincide with the General Approach set forth in the Design Guidelines.
- The design approach of the proposal is such that the parcel will be significantly altered as well as the Aldersey streetscape. This street is short and the dwellings located on the south side of the street are setback approximately 15' while the dwellings on the north side are setback significantly farther, more than 30' feet. Siting two buildings on the north side of the lot with a 45' setback will modify the north side of the streetscape due to locating additional dwellings within the streetscape, which alters the open plan of the parcel. However, this proposal does grant more visibility of the side elevations than the previous submission.
- The preservation of existing or later landscape features is such that the proposal would eliminate the green open space that currently surrounds the historic structure and helps to identify the original historic context of a farmstead. While the surrounding area originally included orchards and gardens, and these features are no longer existent, the remaining open space on the parcel articulates that later subdividing took place, which created Aldersey Street and the present residential context of the southern slope of Prospect Hill.
- The changes to accommodate new conditions and transitions between historic and new landscape features is such that the proposal would eliminate the open space, removing any recognition for the original historic context as a farmstead. Therefore, the landscape, which is green open space, would not be a transitional feature, it would simply cease to exist. The updated plan, while providing more front yard space still includes a significant new footprint for both structures and driveways.
- The proposed alterations to the site circulation are such that the addition of parking for 12 vehicles and the amount of space devoted to vehicular movement would significantly alter the circulation of the site. Staff recommends significantly reducing or even eliminating the surface parking as well as to remove one of two driveways in an effort to maintain as much existing open space on-site as possible. While any changes to the site will likely negatively affect the integrity of the site, and therefore the historic structure, reducing the on-site parking and hardscape minimizes the reduced integrity of the site and structure.

In the case of new construction or additions to existing buildings or structures, the Commission shall consider the appropriateness of the size and shape of the building or structure both in relation to the land area upon which the building or structure is situated and to buildings and structures in the vicinity, and the Commission may in appropriate cases impose dimensional and set back requirements in addition to those required by applicable ordinance or by-law. The Commission shall not make any recommendation or requirement except for the purpose of preventing developments incongruous to the historic aspects or the architectural characteristics of the surroundings and of the historic district.

- The proposal does not coincide with the Guidelines for Additions and Infill Construction.
 - The height of the proposed structures may not exceed the height of the historic structure; however, the grade change locates this building higher on the site. The intensity of the development that is proposed still continues to overshadow



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

www.somervillema.gov



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ the historic building due to the large massing of the proposed buildings, but is less intense than the previous submittal, due to relocating the buildings 45 feet from the street edge. These buildings will extend deep into the lot and eliminate the green open space that is the only remaining component that identifies this parcel as once part of a farmstead. Typically, buildings would step down as they progress toward the rear of the lot as well as become slightly reduced in massing; the proposed buildings step up slightly in height and do not reduce their massing, which serves to enclose the historic structure and thereby reduces the historic integrity. ➤ The fenestration patterns and proportions of the proposal are less compatible than the previous submission, due to the elimination of front entry doors, two-bay reduced width of the primary façades, and one bay recessed porch. The proposed buildings are 2½ stories in height and have two-bay wide primary façades, which are not consistent with surrounding structures. The narrow façade along the streetscape leads to an overall disproportionate building as the building gains massing and extends so far into the rear of the lot. ➤ The materials of the updated proposal were not included as part of the updated submission, Staff recommends that these materials be solid, front to back. ➤ The height to width ratio of the proposal is less compatible than the previous submission due to the two-bay reduced width of the primary façades. Each façade has a general rhythm that can be easily understood and is maintained throughout the building. There are some portions of the side façades that do illustrate paired windows or doors, but as these façades are expansive, include significant garage entrances, and extend to the rear of the parcel, these paired windows or doors are not prominent features. However, the East Building has paired windows on the front façade with a recessed porch, which creates an unbalanced two-bay elevation. While the solid to void ratio is similar to that of nearby dwellings, the effect is less because the sheer size of the proposal is not respectful to neighbors within the local historic district. Further increasing the setback, reducing the footprint, and stepping down the rear massing of each new structure would be more compatible with the district and retain the integrity of the parcel and the historic structure. ➤ The proposal includes a number of detail elements such as window hoods and sills, entrances with porches and balustrades, cornice lines with architectural detailing, and gables. Further detail is still needed. • The precedent set by the HPC for infill development on parcels designated as local historic districts is such that the new development is significantly setback both from the street and the existing historic structure, is approximately a 10% increase in the size of the footprint on the lot and increases the total gross square feet by approximately 50%. While the subject parcel is significantly larger than the parcel where infill development has been previously approved by the HPC, the proposed buildings are aligned with, and not behind the existing historic structure and increase the footprint by 18%. In addition, the previously approved infill developments are considered to contribute to the integrity of the district as the location, scale, and massing are consistent with the HPC guidelines and do not encroach within the sightline along the streetscape.
--	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overarching concern about the subject proposal, which differentiates this project from the previously approved infill projects, continues to be the resulting overall intensity of the development. While current City zoning allows dimensional requirements to be maximized, these dimensions are not subject to the typical development standards of a local historic district. The proposal significantly reduces, if not eliminates, the remaining integrity of the lot by eliminating a vast majority of the surrounding green open space, which is the only component of the original historic context that remains. The proposal also significantly reduces the integrity of the historic structure due to the location, scale and large massing of the proposed development. The http://www.ci.somerville.ma.us/departments/historic-preservation-commission intensity of the development that is proposed still continues to overshadow the historic building due to the location of the structures which obstructs side and rear views (though less so than the previous submission), eliminates the open green space, and grows in building mass as the structures extend toward the rear of the parcel. Reworking the auto-oriented nature of this development plan, such as eliminating one driveway, would increase the open space, which would serve to help maintain the integrity of the parcel. The narrow primary façade, one-bay recessed porch and elimination of front entry doors also lead to a disproportionate building, which in turn does not allow the building to be understood appropriately within the streetscape and, therefore, negatively impacts the historic district as a whole.
--	--

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.</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions
Current Status:	Request to continue until Tuesday, March 18, 2014
Decision:	The Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to continue the hearing until Tuesday, March 18, 2014.

81 Benton Road (HPC 2013.093)	
Applicant:	Gordon Swartz
Property Owner:	Gordon Swartz
Application Date:	November 27, 2013
Legal Notice:	<i>Add second doorway and replace doors</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Request to continue to Tuesday, March 18, 2014
Decision:	The Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to continue the hearing until Tuesday, March 18, 2014.

56 Meacham Road (HPC 2014.002)	
Applicant:	Sun Sasongko
Property Owner:	Sun Sasongko
Application Date:	January 9, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Replace basement windows with insulated dark-pigmented synthetic windows.</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, February 18, 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:	Sun Sasongko presented He had recently purchased the property and has begun making repairs The basement windows are in poor condition They are cracked, rotted and are differing types from awning to hopper and have different numbers of divisions Having read the Staff Report, he noted that the vinyl siding was very old and would probably need to be replaced He would like to eventually bring the house into a more historic style and would like to have the windows match that The existing windows are a dark green but he would also consider another color if the Commission had particular ideas about what would be most authentic. He does not want to use any pressure treated wood on the framing since it would buckle and twist.
Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<u>Staff</u> 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 the windows are not on the main façade, are visible obliquely behind a fence or down the driveway, do not alter the window opening, and will have a permanent color similar to the existing as discussed under the Guidelines Therefore Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Commission grant 56 Meacham Road a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of the mixture of original and replacement basement windows with simulated 3 part divided light awning sash in a <i>dark color with dark spacers set behind the existing brick mold.</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>Jillian Adams</u> noted that the siding will eventually need to be removed. Often there is nothing major wrong about the siding beyond the need for paint. Many people think that that vinyl siding makes regular maintenance of a building unnecessary. She said that dark window sash was typical of the period. <u>Eric Parkes</u> asked about the materials used to replicate the old sills and brick mold. <u>Sun Sasongko</u> said that he was planning on mahogany.
Decision:	The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (4-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness contingent upon the following conditions: The proposed windows along the driveway and side yard shall be set behind mahogany brick mold and on wood sills to match the existing in form, texture and dimensions. The proposed replacement pigmented synthetic simulated divided-light awning windows shall be of a dark color to be approved by Staff.

30 Bow Street (HPC 2014.005)	
Applicant:	Mark Boyes-Watson
Property Owner:	Mark Boyes-Watson
Application Date:	January 27, 2014
Legal Notice:	<i>Construct brick veneer replica chimney.</i>
Recommendation:	Certificate of Appropriateness
Current Status:	Heard on Tuesday, February 18, 2014
Presentation:	<u>Kelly Speakman</u> presented for the Applicant who was unable to attend. Got permission to replace in kind. When the house was renovated about 10 years ago, the chimney was removed from the interior but not from the roof. When it rained, it would leak especially if it was heavy. They had received a Certificate to replace in-kind. The contractor demolished the chimney and rebuilt it as a box with veneer , thin set mortar, and the same number of courses.



Public Comment:	There was no public comment.
Staff Report:	<u>Staff</u> 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 Bow Street Local Historic District; therefore Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Commission to grant Mark Boyes-Watson a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a brick veneer chimney and add a chimney cap at 30 Bow Street that is consistent in size, shape, and brick color to the original.
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>Dick Bauer</u> noted that if it had been rebuilt with brick that would have been in-kind. Eric Parkes if it was water-struck brick. Kelly Speakman noted that the veneer bricks are visually similar in style, color variation and texture.
Decision:	The <u>Commission</u> voted unanimously (4-0) to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness contingent upon the following conditions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The brick veneer shall be consistent to the original in size, shape, and color of brick; and 5. The chimney cap shall be replaced.

Demolition Reviews

Determination of Significance

None this month

Determination of Preferably Preserved

47 Hunting Street (HPC 2013.070)	
Applicant:	James J. McSweeney
Property Owner:	FUD LLC
Application Date:	September 26, 2013
Legal Notice:	<i>Determination of Preferably Preserved</i>
Recommendation:	Not Preferably Preserved
Current Status:	Request to continue until Tuesday, March 18, 2014
Decision:	The Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to continue the hearing until Tuesday, March 18, 2014.

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:	Request to continue until Tuesday, March 18, 2014
Decision:	The Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to continue the hearing until Tuesday, March 18, 2014.

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



53 Kent Street (HPC 2013.048)	
Applicant:	Kent Street Partners LLC
Recommendation:	Review & Execute MOA
Current Status:	Delay Period over June 17, 2014
Decision:	The Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to execute the 53 Kent Street MOA

Other Action Items

Minutes:	November 19, 2013 - HPC
Minutes:	December 5, 2013 – Public Meeting of Preferably Preserved Structures
Minutes:	January 2013 - January 2014 – Design Guidelines
Minutes:	December 19, 2013 – Union Square & HPC
Minutes:	January 9, 2014 – Union Square
Minutes:	January 21, 2014 - HPC
Minutes:	January 23, 2014 – Union Square
Minutes:	January 23, 2014 - HPC Minutes
Minutes:	February 6, 2014 – Union Square
Minutes:	February 6, 2014 – Public Meeting of Preferably Preserved Structures
	The minutes were all approved with a few amendments.

Other Non-Action Items

- 52 Meacham Road – Staff error regarding legal notice sent for property not historically designated.



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

www.somervillema.gov

