

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

**Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission**

February 3, 2022 – Meeting conducted online via Zoom Webinar (837 7351 2275) - 6:00 P.M.

Members present (online): Bruce Irving, *Chair*; Susannah Tobin, *Vice Chair*; Chandra Harrington, Liz Lyster, Caroline Shannon, Jo Solet, *Members*  
Gavin Kleespies, Paula Paris, Kyle Sheffield, *Alternate Members*

Members absent: Joseph Ferrara, *Member*

Staff present (online): Charles Sullivan, *Executive Director*, Sarah Burks, *Preservation Planner*, Eric Hill, *Survey Director*

Public present (online): See attached list.

This meeting was held online with remote participation and was closed to in-person attendance, consistent with the provisions set forth in the Act Extending Certain COVID-19 Measures Adopted During the State of Emergency, which was signed into law on June 16, 2021. The public was able to participate online via the Zoom webinar platform.

With a quorum present (Irving, Tobin, Harrington, Lyster, Shannon, Solet, Kleespies, Paris, Sheffield), Mr. Irving, the Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:08 P.M. He explained the online meeting instructions and public hearing procedures, then introduced the commissioners and staff. He noted that the applicant for Case 4716: 32 Church Street had requested that the hearing be postponed so that he could further engage with city departments and neighborhood groups.

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

**Case 4669 (continued): 711-727 Massachusetts Ave, by Gas Light Building LLC, owner c/o Chevron Partners.** Continued hearing relative to application to renovate the existing building and construct an addition at rear and above the existing building.

Mr. Sullivan provided background of the landmark study and application for certificate of appropriateness for a renovation and addition to the building. The Commission had approved the draft Standards and Guidelines for the landmark report on January 6, 2022. He showed slides of the building and briefly described its history and architecture.

Sarah Rhatigan, attorney for the applicants, said the proponents were happy to be at this point in the process when they could present their project in relationship to the draft Standards and Guidelines.

Marcel Safar of Chevron Partners offered some comments on behalf of the ownership group. He described the Planning Board process and modifications made as part of the design review by the Board and Community Development staff. He said the hotel company was working directly with local businesses and would promote those businesses to its clientele. The three retail spaces on the first floor would be handicap accessible. The project would be LEED Gold certified. They wanted to make the building come alive and be a community asset. The focus of the design would remain the historic building, with the muted presence of a rear addition.

Tony Hsiao of Finegold Alexander Architects shared his screen and showed examples of his firm's other preservation projects. He described the design in relation to the draft standards and guidelines to demonstrate how the design met the standards and guidelines. He noted that the project goals could not

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

be fulfilled within the existing building alone. The addition would have minimal impact on the historic interior spaces because of the structural design that would cantilever the addition over the historic, double-height vaulted interior. He noted that the addition would be set back from Massachusetts Avenue. He showed how the design of the addition related to the fenestration of the existing building. The bronze colored cladding of the addition would complement the limestone of the building. There would be no exterior architectural lighting on the addition.

Mr. Irving asked for questions from the Commission members.

Dr. Solet asked why removal of the roof had not triggered a demolition review case. Mr. Sullivan answered that the roof was not a visible element of the existing building because of the parapet wall. Dr. Solet asked why the vertical alignment of the bays of the addition did not exactly align with the existing building, noting that there was more setback on the east side of the addition than the west side. Mr. Hsiao said the addition would be flush with the west face of the building for structural and circulation reasons and the east side of the addition would be set back approximately three feet to allow preservation of the parapet wall along Temple Street. Dr. Solet said she did not see alignment of the window bays or any sense that they followed the same rhythm as the old. Mr. Hsiao said that they had aimed to be sensitive to the proportions and rhythm of the existing building. He noted that perspective views change how the windows appear to align.

Mr. Kleespies asked why the west façade was so much plainer than the other facades. Mr. Hsiao explained that there were no windows because it was a zero lot line (party wall) situation.

Mr. Irving asked for comment from members of the public.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place said she agreed with Dr. Solet that the windows and pilasters of the old and new did not align. She wanted to see a viewshed analysis walking up and down the streets to see the proposed addition from multiple viewpoints. She asked if the lighting impact of the very large windows on the addition had been considered. Mr. Hsiao noted that many hotel guests would have their blinds closed at night. Ms. Blier asked why the darker bronze color was selected rather than a lighter beige that would more closely match the limestone. Mr. Hsiao said the material samples would be mocked up and studied further.

Heather Hoffman of 213 Hurley Street asked about the view from Temple Street, a public way. Mr. Hsiao said it would be visible from Temple Street.

Dan Totten of 54 Bishop Allen Drive said that he was also thrown off by the elevations vs. the perspective views. At what angle would the bays align? Mr. Hsiao said it was both a matter of the height of the photograph and the setback of the addition that made a difference in the perspective views.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place asked if other uses for the building or as-of-right proposals were considered by the owners. Mr. Safar answered that a hotel was the desired use and the

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

additional square footage was needed to offset the construction costs of the project.

Lee Farris of 269 Norfolk Street asked why the proportions of the storefront openings of the ground floor and not the smaller windows of the second floor were used in the addition. Mr. Hsiao explained that the design approach of the addition was contemporary and did not try to mimic the existing building. Small windows would make the addition look heavier.

Carole O'Hare of 172 Magazine Street asked if there was a view of the addition from the apartment building on Temple Street. Mr. Safar displayed perspective views of the addition from near Temple Place apartments and from the end of Temple Street.

Mr. Irving asked for public comment, which would be limited to two minutes.

Ms. Blier said she had not seen any modification of the design since it was first presented last fall. She said the perspective problem was frustrating. The windows of the addition were overly large. The materials were not appropriate. The project would impact the area and influence future projects.

Emmet Sheehan of 237 Franklin Street said he was a neighborhood resident and daily walker in Central Square. He expressed support for the application. It was a sophisticated design that would bring Central Square up in reputation. The developers had shown respect for the building in their restoration of it and have reached out to the neighborhood. The project would be good for Central Square.

David Barlam of 906 Massachusetts Avenue said he supported the project. It would bring more foot traffic to Central Square. He said he was a restaurant owner. The developers had been patient and he asked the Commission to let the work go forward.

Mr. Totten said the intent of aligning the bays did not bear out; they still did not look aligned. The design was a far cry from a "harmonious whole" sought for in the guidelines. The addition was unlike other Cambridge examples. He noted that there had been over 120 signatures on the landmark petition, including 16 tenants of abutting buildings.

Kamal Kirpalani of 31 Crescent Street said the hotels in Porter Square had benefitted local businesses. The proposed design highlights the historic building without competing with it. It would not require parking. He said he was impressed and hoped the project could move ahead.

Ms. Hoffman said she was not opposed to modern features but did not see a harmonious relationship between the old and new in this proposal. Citizens did not have to give up their architectural heritage to provide a profit to developers. She asked that the Commission not approve the application.

Anthony Papantonis, a Needham resident, said he supported the project. The setback of the addition would obviously create different perspectives and views of the building, but the dominance of the historic building was maintained by the design. He said Chevron Partners was a reputable firm with good projects. They would be committed to quality and details. The building would be a long-term holding and contribute to Central Square. The project would reinforce the city goals for Central Square.

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

Marie Saccoccio of 55 Otis Street said the existing building could accommodate a hotel, but the proposal also included retail and offices. There would never be another building like this.

Ms. Farris said the building was in pretty good shape when purchased by these owners. The Planning Board decision was split and not overwhelmingly in favor. The design was not appropriate and did not meet the standards and guidelines. She called out standards 1, 9, 10 and 10a. The addition overshadows the historic building. The building's continued use was not in question before its purchase. The addition would radically change the building's defining features. The design arbitrarily introduces contrasting materials, scales and design vocabularies and does not respect the essential form of the historic building; it still dominates it and is highly incompatible. She asked that the design not be approved or that they be required to remove a story.

Ms. O'Hare said the design was a klutzy addition to an elegant building. The architect's other works are better. The top is misshapen and inharmonious.

Mr. Williamson said the project would not help the affordability or diversity problems in Cambridge. Key elements of the historic building are the roof and cornice. The relationship to the Savings Bank building across the street is important. The proposal fails because of the desired program of a hotel.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Mr. Sullivan reviewed the standards and guidelines approved at the January meeting. From the general standards he called out the goals to preserve historic character and significant architectural features, repair features rather than replace them whenever possible, additions shouldn't radically change, obscure or destroy character-defining spaces, materials, features or finishes, additions should express understanding of the historic architectural character, the results should appear as a harmonious whole, additions should be considered in terms of their effect on the context of site, additions should be clearly differentiated but compatible, and should cause the least possible loss of historic materials.

Mr. Irving asked for discussion of the commission members.

Dr. Solet said the economic arguments were not relevant to the Commission's purview. She did not dislike modern architecture or additions, but she did not see a relationship between the historic building and the proposed addition. The pattern of the modern windows did not match and were not well suited to the historic base. The hat did not suit the head.

Mr. Kleespies said he could tell the architects had designed the project carefully, but he still considered the addition too large and heavy. It would be too visible from the street.

Ms. Lyster said it was a complicated project because of the order of events. Commissioners hadn't spent as much time talking about the specifics of the building that they had on the standards and guidelines.

Ms. Harrington said the project met some of the standards and guidelines and not others. The

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

addition was not clearly recessive (10a) and was not limited in size and scale in relation to the existing building. The design wasn't perfect.

Ms. Paris acknowledged the work done by the architects. She said the project did not appear as a harmonious whole.

Ms. Shannon said the back felt very much like a back. There was a clear break in the treatment of the cladding and design of the addition on those sides. The south elevation showed a lot of the metal panel alongside the historic materials. She was not concerned about the Mass. Ave. perspective. Standard 9 seems to have been met. The program couldn't fit inside without destroying historically significant interior spaces. How do the front, side and rear elevations work together to create a harmonious whole for the project? She was particularly concerned about the metal panel material.

Mr. Sheffield agreed with Ms. Lyster about the awkwardness of the order of the Commission's review. The Italian palazzo style is understood, and the front elevation made sense in that context. The upper floors of a palazzo are diminished in scale from the ground floor. The addition up-ends the logic of that. The architects should study the proportions of the floor systems carefully and see if the height of the addition can be reduced. Window patterns could be adjusted. He wondered if a limestone panel rather than metal would help. Pilasters are metal and speak more to the storefront system, which made sense to him. He said that it was a positive project but needed some adjustments.

Ms. Harrington said the project didn't address the guidelines sufficiently so that she would be comfortable issuing a certificate.

Ms. Paris agreed it was moving in a good direction, but it was not there yet.

Mr. Irving said he had heard subjective criticism, but he found that the two pieces of the project worked extremely well together. There's a subtle correct relationship between the mass of the historic building and the mass of the rear addition. He didn't want the addition to be tepid or overly recessive. It wasn't too big, and it had a clear, strong voice of its own. The proponents had presented a professional approach to a problem. He thought this could meet the guidelines sufficiently for approval, but he thought he might be in the minority in that opinion.

Ms. Lyster said she would like the Commission to offer specific suggestions and had appreciated those of Ms. Shannon and Mr. Sheffield.

Mr. Kleespies said he favored an addition, but this addition was too dominant.

Ms. Paris said she could support the concept, but the design needed improvement.

Ms. Shannon said she did not object to the massing. The seam between old and new was too evident on the side elevation. The detailing of the upper floors could be toned down. The horizontal louvers were too busy. The metal panels and the intersection of old and new needed to be refined.

Ms. Harrington said the addition looked heavy. Would another material look lighter?

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

Dr. Solet questioned why the windows of the addition were so exaggerated in the metal frames. Ideally the window pattern would be a mirror image of the existing building. The massing was shifted off center, which was problematic.

Mr. Sheffield respectfully disagreed about the windows. He appreciated the strong recession of the new windows.

Ms. Shannon said it was more important to preserve the parapet than to have the addition be exactly on center. The experience of a building in real space was very different from the perception of it in two dimensions.

Mr. Sheffield agreed that the asymmetry did not bother him because of where the addition was located at the end of the block with one party wall and one corner wall. The proposal was not incongruous with its surrounding context.

Mr. Kleespies said the floor heights should diminish on the upper floors.

Mr. Safar thanked the commissioners for their helpful comments. He said they could respond to the points about fenestration, color, and reduce the perception of the massing, but they could not remove a story and still have a feasible project. He said they were studying the mechanical system details and, if possible, would reduce the floor to floor heights.

Mr. Irving asked if they applicants would consent to a continuance. Mr. Safar replied they would agree to continue to March 3. He asked if there was a design committee they could meet with between hearings. Mr. Irving said there was the Architects Committee and that they should alert staff if they wanted to meet with them so that a notice could be posted.

Ms. Shannon moved to continue the hearing to March 3 or such time as the applicants would be ready to return, with the option of convening the Architects Committee for additional feedback on design changes. Dr. Solet seconded. Mr. Irving designated Mr. Kleespies to vote as alternate. The motion passed 7-0 in a roll call vote. (Shannon, Solet, Lyster, Harrington, Tobin, Irving and Kleespies).

**Case 4716 (continued): 32 Church St., by Harvard Real Estate, owner o/b/o Joe Cassinelli, tenant.** Alter entrance surround, replace select windows and redesign panels, install awnings and new signs, construct patio platform.

Mr. Sullivan reported that the applicants had requested to postpone the hearing to allow for more time to discuss the proposal with city departments and neighborhood groups.

Ms. Paris moved to grant the proposed continuation of the hearing. Mr. Kleespies seconded the motion. Mr. Irving designated Ms. Paris to vote. The motion passed 7-0. (Paris, Shannon, Solet, Lyster, Harrington, Tobin, and Irving)

**Case 4725: 199 Brattle St., by Jefferson M. Case & Elizabeth Green Case.** Replace windows, doors and skylights.

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and showed slides of the house, which had been designed by

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

architect Hugh Stubbins for his own residence in 1966. He showed photographs taken soon after the building had been completed as well as current conditions. He noted the vertical barn board siding was a significant architectural feature providing texture with its slightly varying thicknesses. He noted that a brick wall obscures part of the house and that a fence surrounds the property.

Lisa Green-Case, an owner, remarked that she was impressed by the level of detail considered by the Commission in their review of cases.

Jennifer Lyford of Hart Associates Architects described the current phasing of the project. She noted that due to the extremely long lead time for windows and doors, they were coming before the Commission with those aspects of the project first and would return later to address the siding and fences. She said she had reviewed Stubbins' drawings for the house. The single-pane doors, steel windows and skylights would be replaced. The new Hope Landmark windows would closely match the design of the existing Hope windows but with a thermally broken system with thicker sash. The door would be replicated, and one type of glass would be selected for the sidelights. The aluminum sliding doors would be replaced with new Hope doors that would be consistent with the window design. Three skylights would be replaced with low-profile Wasco powder coated aluminum skylights with insulated glass.

Mr. Sullivan asked if the exterior glass would be closer to the outside of the window frames. Ms. Lyford said the frame would remain in the same position in the opening, but the glass would be thicker.

Dr. Solet encouraged the owners to have operable skylights, which could help cool the house in the summer and lower energy costs.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the structure of the wall would change with the new windows. Ms. Lyford said the opening sizes would stay the same, but the glass area of the new windows would be somewhat smaller due to the bigger frame.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the color of the glass. Ms. Lyford said they had samples and wanted the glass to be as clear as possible. Mr. Sullivan said it should be less green than in one of the samples shown.

Mr. Sheffield noted that the plastic skylight had been installed with mastic; it was remarkable that it had lasted so long.

Mr. Irving asked for public questions of fact or comments, but there were none made. He closed the public comment period.

Mr. Sullivan noted that fences and plantings were considered ephemeral and not permanent screens to visibility. The Commission's window guidelines favored repair over replacement but were not written with twentieth-century windows in mind. Exterior storm windows, which were normally encouraged, were not really an option with this type of opening. The question was whether the deterioration of the original windows required replacement.

Mr. Sheffield said steel window replacement was challenging. It was difficult to preserve single-

glazed steel windows. The frames often bow out over time. Exterior storms were not an option. He did not object to the use of insulated glass on both types of windows. The glass selection and door/sidelight details could be delegated to staff. He recommended the skylight frames either match the Hope window color or the roof shingles.

Dr. Solet asked if original glass could be salvaged for the sidelights from the garage.

Ms. Paris noted that Hugh Stubbins had also designed the Peabody School on Linnaean Street, now called the Graham and Parks school, that she had attended as a child.

Ms. Lyster agreed with the suggestion for operable skylights. She asked if the window profile was square or angled. Ms. Lyford said it was square.

Ms. Lyster moved to grant a certificate of appropriateness for the application as presented, with details of the color and texture of the glass delegated to staff. Dr. Solet seconded. Mr. Irving designated Mr. Sheffield to vote on the matter. The motion passed 7-0 in a roll call vote. (Lyster, Solet, Shannon, Harrington, Tobin, Irving, and Sheffield)

**Case 4726: 27 Craigie St., by Karl Iagnemma, Trustee of 27 Craigie Street Nominee Trust.** Alter windows, construct addition at side and rear of house, add doors to carriage house, extend driveway, re-build pool, alter landscape features.

Mr. Sheffield recused himself from the matter because of a previous professional relationship with the applicant. He turned off his audio and video from the webinar.

Mr. Sullivan shared his screen and showed slides of the property. He briefly described the architecture and history of the house, carriage house, and background on the original owners. The design of the house was based on the Palladian villa form but used wood cladding and trim to replicate stone.

Mark Boyes-Watson of Boyes-Watson Architects introduced the owner, Karl Iagnemma, and the landscape architect, Troy Sober of Gregory Lombardi Design. Mr. Boyes-Watson shared his screen and described the existing site plan. He noted the mature landscape, curving driveway, and combination of iron and wood fencing. He proposed a new material for the driveway, removal of asphalt from the courtyard between the house and the carriage house, and addition of garage doors to the east side of the carriage house. He described the existing features of the house that would be preserved, including a bay window at the kitchen and the front porch. He described the proposed changes to the west elevation (new door and steps down to the lawn) and the rear elevation (add windows and a rear loggia connecting to a new garden pavilion room). The new windows would bring light to the stair hall, which was rather dark. He displayed perspectives drawings of the back courtyard, which would be like an outdoor living room. He described the design of the loggia and pavilion. He noted that the swimming pool would be re-configured but would remain in the same location on the site.

Mr. Irving asked for questions from the Commission.

Ms. Lyster asked about the view of the west side from Sparks Street. Mr. Boyes Watson showed



**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

photographs of that area from inside the fence. She asked about the new door on the west elevation and the design of the chimney at the pavilion. Mr. Boyes Watson showed the existing and proposed west elevations with the new door and steps. The design of the pavilion was intentionally whimsical and was treated as a garden feature.

Dr. Solet asked about the center window on the second floor of the Craigie Street elevation. Mr. Boyes Watson explained that an interior wall divided that window in half, so it had been built as a faux window with closed shutters. They now wanted a real window there. It would improve the interior space in the new plan. Dr. Solet said the existing house had a sturdy quality to its construction and she was unsure the feathery design of the loggia and pavilion were consistent with that. Would the chimney bring smoke into the second floor windows?

Mr. Irving asked for questions from the public.

Marilee Myer of 10 Dana St. asked about the railing material at the new west stairs. Mr. Boyes-Watson answered that he proposed a simple wrought iron stair rail to not compete with the more ornate wood railing at the front porch. There would be divided lights in the new door. They would use peastone in the courtyard and pavers around the pool. Two trees would be removed.

Mr. Irving asked for public comment.

Ms. Meyer cautioned against adding too much detail on the new structures that could distract from the strong, bold architecture of the original design. She noted that most of the new work would not be visible from a public way.

Laura Nash of 11 Buckingham Street noted that she had sent a letter with her written comments. She said she was concerned about the number of new windows on the back wall of the house and the light pollution that would come from those windows to surrounding properties. She said the second and third floors would not look historic. She asked about tree protection during construction.

Ben Abbett of 136 Brattle Street asked if there was precedent for new additions in the Old Cambridge Historic District or on Brattle Street. Mr. Sullivan reported that major additions had been approved from time to time in the district.

Mr. Irving closed public comment.

Mr. Sullivan asked what was proposed for the windows.

Mr. Boyes-Watson said they would like permission to install new sash with insulated glass with hidden balances so the existing weight pockets could be insulated and storm windows removed. The sills, casings and trim would remain, but the sash would be new.

Mr. Sullivan noted that this had not been part of the application. The Commission's window guidelines emphasized repair of historic wood windows rather than replacement and the use of exterior storms to provide protection and energy benefits. He recommended preserving the historic sash. He also

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

recommended keeping clapboards on the rear wall of the house and preserving the flush board siding on the other three walls. He suggested delegating paint color approval to staff and noted that he had recommended that the applicants have the existing paint analyzed to determine original colors.

Mr. Irving asked for discussion by the commission members.

Dr. Solet noted the railings on the new stairs on the west elevation were very different in character from the wood railing on the front porch. She asked about mechanicals. Mr. Boyes-Watson showed the location of HVAC units, one by the garage and four by the pavilion. They would be low to the ground and screened with plantings.

Mr. Kleespies moved to approve the application and issue a certificate of appropriateness with the following conditions: that the type of cladding remain the same as existing, that the existing window sashes be restored rather than replaced, and to delegate remaining construction details and paint color to staff. Ms. Shannon seconded the motion. Mr. Irving designated Ms. Paris to vote. The motion passed 7-0 in a roll call vote. (Shannon, Lyster, Solet, Harrington, Tobin, Irving, and Paris)

Public Hearing: Landmark Designation Proceedings

**Case L-141: 194-196, 194R Prospect St.** Consider initiation of a landmark study for the Maria Baldwin House (#196), which has recently been offered for sale, and the attached dwellings at 194 and 194R Prospect Street, three units which are separately owned.

Mr. Sheffield returned to the meeting with audio and video.

Mr. Sullivan introduced the case. The Maria Baldwin house at 196 Prospect Street had recently been advertised for sale. A number of interested buyers had called with questions about what could be done on the property.

Survey Director Eric Hill summarized the staff memo about the history and architecture of the Greek Revival house. Maria and her brother Louis Baldwin had lived in the left side of a double house. The other side was now a separate parcel and there were two units in the historic house and a third unit added in a new attached building at the rear. Maria Baldwin had hosted weekly study sessions for Black Harvard students in the home. This student group included W.E.B. DuBois.

Dr. Solet asked if the owner was eligible for a preservation grant. Mr. Sullivan said a grant project had been discussed but she had never applied.

Mr. Irving asked for questions of fact from the public.

Ken Field, an owner of a condo unit at 194 Prospect Street, corrected the record as to the division of space in the right side of the house and the new unit at the back. He noted the addition as well as the larger building on the lot behind had been built by David Aposhian. He said Aposhian had tried to renovate 196 at the same time, but his offer had been refused.

Ms. Meyer spoke in favor of preservation of both sides of the house. Would landmark designation affect zoning in the future?

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

Mr. Totten suggested a historic marker be added at the house about Maria Baldwin. Ms. Burks noted that a marker identifying Baldwin as a suffragist would be installed at the sidewalk in front of the house later this year. A marker about Baldwin was also located at the Baldwin School at Sacramento and Oxford streets.

Cecily Miller, an owner at 194 Prospect Street, said she had been very pleased to learn that Maria Baldwin had lived in the house. She had first become familiar with Maria Baldwin when she worked at Forest Hill Cemetery and read that she had been the teacher of e. e. cummings.

Dr. Solet moved to initiate a landmark study for the property and to schedule a public hearing for the next meeting at which there could be full discussion and a vote whether to confirm the study. Ms. Harrington seconded. Mr. Irving designated Mr. Sheffield to vote. The motion passed 7-0 in a roll call vote. (Solet, Harrington, Shannon, Lyster, Tobin, Irving, and Sheffield)

Minutes

The Commission reviewed the draft minutes of December 2021. Dr. Solet corrected the title for Ms. Harrington on page 4. Mr. Kleespies moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Dr. Solet seconded. Mr. Irving designated Mr. Kleespies to vote. The motion passed 7-0 in a roll call vote. (Kleespies, Solet, Harrington, Shannon, Lyster, Tobin, and Irving)

Mr. Kleespies moved to adjourn. Ms. Lyster seconded the motion, which passed unanimously in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Shannon, Solet, Sheffield, Tobin, Irving)

The meeting adjourned at 11:51 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks  
Preservation Planner

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED  
OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

**Members of the Public  
Present on the Zoom Webinar online, February 3, 2022**

Jennifer Lyford	Hart Associates, 50 Church St, Belmont
Sarah Rhatigan	12 Marshall St, Boston
Marcel Safar	100 Summer St, Boston
Katherine Hansberry	Boyes Watson Architects, 30 Bow St, Somerville
Mark Boyes Watson	Boyes Watson Architects, 30 Bow St, Somerville
Tony Hsiao	Finegold Alexander Architects
Karl Iagnemma	27 Craigie St
Kate Martin	Hart Associates, 50 Church St, Belmont
Gavin Mullan	100 Summer St, Boston
Elizabeth Green Case	27 Craigie St
Heather Hoffman	213 Hurley St
Troy Sober	2235 Massachusetts Ave
Erika Matt	134 Brattle St
Bill Cunningham	6 Newtowne Court #166
John Hawkinson	Cambridgeday.com
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Pl (Jefferson Park)
Steve Hart	50 Church St, Belmont
Laura Nash	11 Buckingham St
Yuting Zhang	100 Memorial Dr, #5-15C
Jessica Griffith	Waltham
Kevin O'Connor	525 Massachusetts Ave, Suite 204
Betty Saccoccio	55 Otis St
David Barlam	906 Massachusetts Ave
Carole Perrault	29 Lewis Rd, Belmont 02478
Nicola Williams	8 Brewer St
Anthony Papantonis	10 Kearney Rd, Ste 307, Needham
Phyllis Bretholtz	65 Antrim St
Carol O'Hare	172 Magazine St
Marc Levy	3 Potter Park #1
Ken Field	108 Pleasant St #3
Suzanne Blier	5 Fuller Pl
Emmet Sheehan	237 Franklin St
David Brookes	27 Craigie St
Mike Monestime	4 George St
Cecily Miller	108 Pleasant St
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana St, #404
Dan Totten	54 Bishop Allen Dr, #2
Marie Elena Saccoccio	55 Otis St
Glenna Wyman	55 Essex St
Ben Abbett	136 Brattle St
Fred Horton	25 Craigie St

**DRAFT Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission—THIS DRAFT HAS NOT YET BEEN REVIEWED  
OR APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION**

Lee Farris	269 Norfolk St
Andrew Strassman	328 Harvard St, #4
Kamal Kirpalani	31 Crescent St
Monty Montero-Elliott	Sidney St

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.