

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

August 6, 2015 - 806 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge Senior Center - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: William King, *Chair*; William Barry, Chandra Harrington, Jo M. Solet, *Members*; Joseph Ferrara, Susannah Tobin, *Alternates*

Members absent: Bruce Irving, *Vice Chair*; Shary Page Berg, Robert Crocker, *Members*

Staff present: Charles Sullivan, *Executive Director*; Sarah Burks, *Preservation Planner*

Public present: See attached list.

Chair William King called the meeting to order at 6:08 P.M. He made introductions and reviewed hearing procedures, then designated alternates Joseph Ferrara and Susannah Tobin to vote on all matters.

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 3443: 113 Brattle St., by Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Inc. Demolish 1959 classroom addition and construct new addition. Written request received from the applicant to continue hearing.

Mr. King reported that the Institute had requested to continue the case indefinitely. It would be re-advertised at such time that the proponents were ready to return. He explained the consent agenda procedure, reviewed the agenda, but no cases were proposed for approval as part of a consent agenda.

Case 3466: 22 Berkeley St., by Robert Straus. Remove deck and stair at SW corner. Construct new bay, deck, and stair. Change 2 windows.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the property and described the limited public views of the affected areas of the house.

Scott Kyle of Kyle Restoration displayed the design plans and described the proposed new bay, deck, and selected window changes. The cornice, brackets, and siding would all remain the same as existing. Most of the changes would be difficult to see from a public way, even in winter. The two windows on the side elevation would be visible. The new windows would make use of the same pediment design with the rosettes. The new windows would be all wood, simulated divided light, matching the same muntin width and profile.

Ms. Harrington clarified that the existing windows were two different sizes but that the new windows would ~~be~~-match each other in size.

Dr. Solet inquired if single pane, true divided light windows had been considered. She asked about the angled roof on the rear of the house. Mr. Kyle answered that the glass roof was existing and was there to keep snow off the deck.

Mr. Ferrara asked about the fence on Berkeley Place. Mr. Sullivan noted that it was the Commission's practice to consider fences as permanent and vegetation screens as ephemeral.

There being no questions or comments from members of the public, Mr. King closed the public comment period.

Mr. Ferrara said that if the new bay were more visible, he would suggest using double hung windows, not casements. He also suggested using a wood railing on the deck and a traditional lattice pattern.

Dr. Solet recommended using true divided light windows.

Ms. Tobin moved to find the proposed visible alterations to be appropriate and to approve a certificate of appropriateness for them; she further moved to approve a certificate of nonapplicability for the other changes, which were not visible from a public way, noting the design suggestions that were offered. Mr. Barry seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Case 3467: Radcliffe Yard, 10 Garden St., by President & Fellows of Harvard College. Install sculpture on east side of Fay House.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the location for the proposed sculpture.

Mark Verkennis, of Harvard Planning and Project Management, described the bronze and aluminum abstract figure titled, "Aspiring," which was somewhat larger than life size. The location was between Fay House, the main administrative building, and Byerly Hall, the center for Radcliffe Fellows and location of a new art gallery. He described the Commission's policy requiring the applicants meet with the Public Arts Commission (PAC) for comment. The PAC had commented on the landscape materials around the base, the siting in relationship to several vantage points.

Meg Rotzel, the Radcliffe Arts Coordinator, said that in response to the PAC comments, they planned to shave down the mounded landscape around the sculpture.

Dr. Solet asked about the base and if there would be an explanatory plaque. Ms. Rotzel clarified that it was diamond shaped and supported with Sonotubes. Plantings around the base would soften the appearance of its edges. There would be a low plaque with the artist, title, and date. No new lighting was proposed.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place said the statue should be moved back and asked about the artist. Ms. Rotzel said they planned to move it back about 6-8". She noted that the existing tree would be moved to a new location. The artist was Phlyssa Koshland, a 1971 Radcliffe graduate. Mr. Williamson expressed his opinion that the sculpture did not merit much interest and he was concerned it would not age well.

Ms. Harrington commented that the location was appropriate and the sculpture was beautiful.

Mr. Barry suggested making changes to the landscaping, to make it less static.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the Commission's review was of the sculpture's installation, size, materials, placement, etc. not an evaluation of the artistic merit of the piece. He recommended a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation, as described. Ms. Harrington so moved. Mr. Barry seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Case 3468: 25 Craigie St., by Katherine Ryan and Fred Horton. Change exterior paint colors.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized Susan Maycock's memo about the proposed paint colors for the house. He passed around color chips and recommended a certificate of appropriateness with approval of final color selections delegated to staff. The existing paint colors were appropriate to the

original construction date of the house and the proposed colors were appropriate to the early twentieth century when architect Lois Lilley Howe made an addition and alterations.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street remarked that she was interested in seeing a sample of the shutter color also.

There being no other comments, Mr. King closed the public comment period.

Mr. Ferrara moved to approve a certificate, as outlined in the staff memo. Mr. Barry seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Public Hearing: Demolition Review / Landmark Designation Procedures

Case D-1360: 9 Donnell St. 9 Donnell Street Realty Trust, owner. Hear update from applicant. Consider any further action including initiating landmark study or waiving remainder of delay in context of replacement proposal.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the house. Ms. Burks summarized the history and significance of the house as an example of a high basement worker's cottage in Murdock's subdivision settled by mostly Irish brickyard laborers.

Mr. Adam Costa, attorney for the Trust that owned the property, reported that he did not have a new design to present to the Commission and was not asking to waive the remainder of the six month delay. Two single family houses could be built on the site with relatively little zoning relief. He highlighted some of the structural conditions of the existing house including a sagging roof, sloping floors, deteriorated timber beams, powdery brick masonry, and a danger of collapse and fire. He said he was concerned about the ability to preserve the house, which had three owners in the last two years. It did not make financial sense to restore it. He noted that there were six other similar workers cottages on the street. He said the house had been built as a rental property and did not rise to the same level of significance as the city's 37 landmarked properties.

Peter Cohen of 11 Donnell Street said he had spoken several times to Charles Teague, the developer, since the March hearing. He said the engineer's report failed to mention whether the structural deficiencies could be corrected. If there were really an imminent concern of collapse or fire, why hadn't the owner done anything to address that? It was not impossible to renovate the house. The location of the house was just an obstacle to developing the back part of the lot. He said he was concerned about the lack of information about the owner's design intentions.

Doug Okun, an architect and neighborhood resident, recalled that two houses of the same vintage had been moved from the Gutman Library site and restored at their new locations. He asked if landmarked, could the house be rotated so as to access the rear yard?

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street said she was relieved that more time and consideration was being taken with regard to the property. She noted that she had been extremely concerned about the town house design proposed in March.

John Walker, an architect of 150 Whittemore Avenue, said he had been consulted about the project but was not hired to design the project. He said he was familiar with this kind of building. Renovations of these buildings could turn into stick by stick replacement as you get into the structure and realize that much of it needs to be replaced. He remarked that the house had not been constructed with quality materials. It was under-framed. Two new houses on the lot could add up to only a little more gross floor area than the existing. He said it was a tossup with time and money.

John Sanzone of 540 Memorial Drive remarked that the house probably did not rise to the landmark level of significance but he was concerned about the Commission losing the ability to review the replacement building. The engineer's report was hyperbolic and the house's condition was pretty typical for houses of that age in the neighborhood.

Lewis Hyde of 8 Donnell Street explained that he had renovated his workers cottage, but it had been a lot of trouble. It can be done but costs a lot. He expressed concern that requiring expensive renovations would eliminate some people from potentially moving the neighborhood. He commented that it was not a landmark house.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place said he was concerned that the replacement design had not been presented. It was hard to write off what might be worth preserving.

Heather Hoffman of 213 Hurley Street commented that she had been before the Commission for demolition and received positive recommendations for her project to the BZA because the Commission found it appropriate. She noted that other permits would be needed for this project on Donnell Street.

Mr. Costa confirmed that some zoning relief would be needed and it would be before another board. He asked if letters from John Fulop and Dexter Ames had been received by the Commission. [Note: letters were received from John Fulop, John & Pamela Hart, and Jan Devereaux and distributed to the Commission prior to the hearing].

Mr. King closed the public comment period. He suggested that the Commission ask the applicant if he would voluntarily extend the delay period for another few months and to present the plan for the replacement project.

Mr. Sullivan recommended that the Commission take no action. The delay was intended to allow time for a preservation solution to be studied. No such solution had been brought forward. The ordinance provided that a demolition permit could not be issued until permit approvals for the replacement project were in place. He did not consider the property to be a plausible landmark to present to the [City Council](#). Ms. Harrington asked if there were any workers cottages represented on the list of landmarks. Mr. Sullivan answered that there were not, but this property was not one he would suggest for designation.

Dr. Solet recommended that utility services be cut off for safety reasons. Mr. Barry agreed and added that the owner had an obligation to protect the building from harm during the delay. He suggested that perhaps there were ways to improve the demolition delay ordinance or the application requirements

to best inform the Commission on cases such as this. He agreed with Mr. Sullivan's suggestion and moved that the Commission not initiate a landmark study for the property. Dr. Solet seconded the motion. Mr. King said he was sorry the process time was not continued, but agreed that the house was not a likely landmark prospect. The motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Cohen pointed out that an as-of-right by zoning option could be brought forward by the owner for a single building thereby removing the need for any further public participation in the design process.

Mr. King called for a short recess. He reconvened the meeting at 7:52 P.M.

Case D-1370: 137-139 Walden St., by Samuel (Matt) Hayes. Demolish two family house (1893).

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the house, which had been built in 1893 as a single family and converted to a two-family in 1913. He noted the enclosed sleeping porch on the second floor at the front of the building. He noted that the Commission had a hearing about four years earlier on a demolition application for a neighboring building at 151 Raymond Street and found it not preferably preserved. He recommended that the 137-139 Walden Street building be found significant for its associations with the New England Brick Company subdivision near the Raymond Street brickyard and in the context of the predominantly pre-WWI residential neighborhood of Walden and Raymond streets.

The applicant distributed a revised handout to the Commission. Mark Nielson, of Peter Quinn Architects, displayed Powerpoint slides corresponding to the handout. He described the footprint of the proposed new two-unit building. The front parking spot would be screened with a fence and landscaping. The proposed height of 35' would be lower than both adjacent buildings. He described the proposed materials including fiber cement board and batten on the upper floors, mahogany or ipe wood paneling, aluminum frame windows with awning, casement and French casement types. The first floor would feature horizontal board siding and large areas of glazing.

Dr. Solet asked about the roofing material. Mr. Nielson replied that it would be asphalt shingles. He noted the third floor decks at Walden Mews as precedent for proposed decks on the new building.

Mr. Barry asked how the proposed replacement building would relate to the neighborhood in its massing, use, and details. Mr. Nielson explained that it would be similar to 151 Raymond Street with two front doors facing the street and in footprint. The roof pitch was low, the style was contemporary. He likened the style to the midcentury Tech Built homes of Karl Koch. The materials were contemporary products but related to traditional wood and stone materials.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the front setback and proposed parking spot forward of the front wall of the house. He commented that parking forward of the house was not popular in Cambridge and seemed an anti-urban concept. The project otherwise had a lot to recommend it.

Matt Hayes, the owner, said they had paid close attention to screening the parking with a fence and plantings. They had first looked into parking below grade, but the high water table did not support that approach.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked if the existing house was structurally unsound. Was 151 Raymond Street designed by the same architect? Mr. Hayes replied in the negative to both questions.

Charles Teague of 23 Edmunds asked if they had considered building a garage at the front of the lot. Mr. Hayes replied in the negative.

Carole Perrault of 9 Dana Street asked if the house had been purchased as a tear down. Mr. Hayes said he was living there at present and had bought it with the intent to live there temporarily and apply for demolition.

John Sanzone of 540 Memorial Drive commended the applicant on the overall architectural design. He agreed with Mr. Sullivan, however, that the parking in the front of the house was inappropriate to the street and the city at large. Most houses would ordinarily have a front walkway from the street to the front door. The screening of the parking spot also hid the entry to the house. Could the site plan be adjusted to accommodate two cars?

Ms. Meyer indicated that the building's design had merit but was not contextual to the neighborhood in its materials, roof forms, or proportions. There were a lot of materials proposed.

Mr. Nielson said several site plans were considered including one building with no offset and two detached buildings but neither was preferred. The first instinct was not for front yard parking, but it can be mitigated and look good. He said they could study it further, but wasn't sure they'd come to a different conclusion.

Mr. Teague expressed his approval for the design with the narrow side of the building facing the street. He cited Hilliard Street as an example of where front yard parking occurs. The Mews project next door had more than enough clapboards for the area.

Ms. Perrault said she would expect to see a house of this style in the mountains but not Cambridge. It was incongruous to the cultural landscape of Cambridge and she lamented the loss of the existing building.

Mr. King noted that sometimes projects requiring zoning relief could end up with a better design.

Mr. Barry said the roof pitch looked squashed in order to meet the 35' restriction. There were some nice design gestures but it did not try to fit in with the neighborhood. The proposed materials had a different size exposure than clapboards or shingles.

Mr. King called for a motion with regard to the existing building's significance.

Matt Hayes commented that if the building were to be found significant for its relationship to a former New England Brick Company site then most houses in North Cambridge would be significant for the same reason.

Ms. Harrington moved to find the building significant as defined in the ordinance and within its context of the predominantly pre-WWI neighborhood of Walden and Raymond streets. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Mr. Sullivan said he found the design refreshing, except for the front yard parking spot. He commented that the house did not need to have wood clapboards or traditional styling. He noted that the Commission's review in demolition cases was not the same as its design review within the historic district. He said he was generally inclined to give contemporary architecture a chance, to let the city evolve with contemporary design. There was room for architectural experimentation in an urban context.

Mr. Barry said he wished it had a steeper roof. The front unit's entry was apparent.

Dr. Solet said circular driveways, though not common, were an example of front yard parking. The car would likely not be there during much of the day. The parking arrangement alone would not stop her from accepting the design proposal.

Mr. King said the mitigation with the fence and plantings was successful.

Mr. Barry moved to find the existing house preferably preserved in the context of the replacement design but acknowledging that with some modification he could find it acceptable. He suggested that the proponents seek a steeper pitch to the roof and to change the scale of the horizontal and vertical elements for greater variety. Dr. Solet seconded the motion.

Mr. Ferrara suggested a flat roof to avoid the look of a chalet. He said the textural materials were okay and it didn't have to have clapboards or shingles.

The motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Tobin left the meeting.

Mr. King called for a short recess and reconvened the meeting at 9:14 P.M.

Cases L-100-101-102 (continued): 238, 264 and 292 Main St., MIT Investment Management Co., owner. Consider requested conclusion of landmark study or forward to City Council for designation.

Mr. King announced that Charles Teague had requested to video record the meeting.

Mr. Sullivan explained that the three properties in Kendall Square had been the subjects of a landmark study since 2011. The Institute had agreed to extend the protections of the study several times to allow for more time for the public and internal planning processes for Kendall Square to be completed. At the July meeting it was suggested that MIT consider entering into a reciprocal agreement with the Historical Commission similar to the protocol established with Harvard University in 1986 that allows the staff to review alterations to significant university-owned buildings beyond what are formally designated under local ordinances.

He went on to say that the purpose of the landmark study was to ensure preservation of the three buildings, two of which were originally proposed for demolition, and to protect the character of this last remaining stretch of traditional streetscape in Kendall Square. MIT had presented their master plan for six

Kendall Square properties at the July meeting. That master plan included the preservation of the three historic buildings, demolition of the Eastgate residential tower, and construction of several new buildings. In response to the Commission's suggestion for a protocol, the Institute had drafted a letter that would arrange for such a staff review process for its buildings listed on the State Register of Historic Places. The staff response to the draft was that number of eligible buildings was small and outdated (the National Register study had been undertaken in 1978) and should be expanded to include a) commercial properties determined to have high levels of significance in a 2002 survey and b) academic buildings considered to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in an updated survey. That kind of survey process could not happen overnight but MIT had indicated its willingness to do that study over the course of the next year. Alterations to significant buildings included in a protocol arrangement would be subject to staff review and their status would not be used as the basis for a landmark or district designation. He said there were presumably dozens of buildings that could be included and would represent a significant additional leverage for historic preservation concerns. He gave examples of Harvard projects that he had reviewed as part of the Harvard-CHC protocol.

He summarized the proposal before the Commission: to terminate the landmark study for the Kendall Square group of three buildings, and to adopt a protocol arrangement that would allow for staff review of ongoing design for the three Kendall Square buildings as well as other significant campus and commercial buildings that would be identified and agreed upon for the protocol inventory.

Mr. King reviewed the sequence of events that had transpired from the July meeting to the present including meetings between Commission and MIT staff and the exchange of draft letters for consideration by the full Commission at this public hearing.

Thayer Donham of MIT's facilities department agreed it would be in the best interests of MIT and the city to have a new survey of the campus to determine what was significant. The 2002 survey was done by two consultants and took about a year to complete (six months for the survey and research and six months for a committee to evaluate). The end of 2016 would be a reasonable time frame for completion of the new study.

Mr. King said the relationship between Commission and MIT staff in recent years had been collaborative despite the lack of a formal protocol to date. This was an opportunity for a major expansion of the protections the city would have for MIT historic properties. He described the protocol as one of four major preservation tools in Cambridge. He acknowledged a letter received from Fred Salvucci encouraging the Commission to move forward with landmark designation of the three Kendall Square buildings and not to settle for staff review.

Mr. Barry asked if there were times when properties included in the Harvard-CHC protocol inventory did come before the full Commission. Mr. King replied that yes, if the properties were in the

Old Cambridge Historic District or Harvard Square Conservation District or if an application triggered the demolition delay ordinance, then those cases come to the full Commission.

Dr. Solet asked if there was a record of staff meetings held under the protocol. Mr. Sullivan answered that he kept track of projects he reviews in his monthly Executive Director's Reports. The reports were public record and could be made available online if there was interest.

James Williamson of 1000 Jackson Place asked why the draft letter referenced properties listed on the State Register of Historic Places and not the National Register of Historic Places. Mr. King responded that he had asked the same question of the staff and was told that the State Register includes all National Register listed properties as well as those determined Eligible for listing on the National Register, and additional properties such as those protected by preservation restriction or designated as Local Landmarks. Mr. Williamson asked who initiated the idea of a protocol. Mr. Sullivan replied that Mr. King had suggested it. Ms. Donham added that the subject had first come up in 2002 but the then Executive Vice President of MIT wasn't interested in listing things at the time. Mr. Williamson asked if Eastgate would be exempted from demolition review as part of the protocol. Mr. Sullivan answered in the negative. He would find it significant and it would come to the full Commission for a regular demolition hearing. Mr. King added that the CHC response letter does indicate that the Commission wouldn't anticipate landmarking Eastgate though it would not bind future members of the Commission by that statement.

Mr. Teague asked whether the cutting down of trees at the Philip Johnson House on Ash Street had been reviewed by staff under the Harvard-CHC protocol. Mr. Sullivan answered that Harvard had agreed to add the Philip Johnson House to the protocol inventory when it bought the property. He said he had not objected to the removal of the trees when asked because the trees were planted after Johnson's residence in the house and were not in good health. When the property had gone on the market, the Commission had considered landmarking it but only those architectural features visible from a public way would have been protected with landmark status and those consisted of the fence and windowless exterior walls. However, the protocol allowed for staff participation in interior changes and landscape. Though interiors were not usually reviewed under the protocol, they were in this case.

Ms. Perrault said she was concerned about modifications to the three Kendall Square buildings including additions, alterations, and the impacts of new buildings to the historic buildings. Mr. Sullivan acknowledged the importance of those things but said the topic had been addressed in the public planning discussions and staff meetings held over the last four years. Some changes would be necessary to make two former industrial buildings function in a modern urban environment. The rationale for MIT preserving the buildings was to incorporate them into a vibrant streetscape and make them more active at the street level. Ms. Perrault said that cookie cutter placemaking was proposed in the design and it would negatively affect the integrity of the buildings. The first she had heard about it was in spring of this year.

Ms. Meyer asked, what was the benefit of not designating the three buildings as landmarks? As she saw it, the staff would get to review the details but the public would get left out. Bexley Hall was demo by neglect. MIT's priority wasn't preservation but to move ahead with their programming. She said she did not trust that the protocol would work. When Mr. Sullivan was not around, where would be the paper trail to document agreements made between staff? How would the city make sure the agreements would be kept?

Mr. Sullivan replied by noting that when the historic survey was done in the 1970s, MIT had no sense of any of their buildings being historic. Now the Institute had been in Cambridge for a century and its history was easier to grasp. He agreed that Bexley was an example of demolition by neglect, and MIT had admitted as much. MIT was now addressing a backlog of maintenance issues with a billion dollar facilities program. Ms. Donham herself was an example of how MIT as an institution now understood the importance of historic preservation. The recent DuPont Gymnasium restoration was a first class masonry restoration as had been Metropolitan Storage. The three Kendall Square buildings were being preserved and he did not think they would be trivialized. They would be an active part of the streetscape and would not have survived had it not been for the landmark study process. There had been a meeting of the minds about those buildings. MIT was moving in a positive direction. Mr. King said that Lesley University also was regularly consulting staff about its campus projects.

Dr. Solet said an enormous turn around in institutional thinking had occurred under Charlie's leadership. How could the Commission be sure that the person who inherits his role would have the same care and commitment for the city's architecture?

Mr. Williamson said he was frustrated that rich people from MIT were on vacation and were not present but he had given up his summer to attend public meetings. He had asked MIT to bring its model of Kendall Square to the meeting but they didn't do that. Ms. Burks had not distributed his letter to the Commission, who were co-recipients addressed on the letter. The three Kendall Square buildings should absolutely be landmarked. The landmark ordinance would give more authority to the Commission than the protocol. The protocol was not formal enough. He said he did not have confidence that Mr. Sullivan could handle everything on his own. The protocol was not advantageous. It would be detrimental to have lots of big new buildings around the three historic Kendall Square buildings. The view corridors would be negatively impacted. Democratic powers should be strengthened not taken away. The protocol was the wrong approach.

Heather Hoffman of 213 Hurley Street said many of MIT's buildings were just investment properties. No decision maker was around forever. The master plan proposal did not necessarily enhance the historic buildings but that would be in the Planning Board's hands to review. She said she had lived in East Cambridge for a long time and the clock tower, and the Hammett Building were important to her. She did not want to see the streetscape of the square turned into Disneyland.

Dr. Solet said she understood the public's concern. The Planning Board's considerations would be different from those of the Historical Commission. She suggested posting the monthly director's reports. She asked when the protocol would go into effect if a campus survey would take time to complete. Mr. King said the protocol would be effective right away for the buildings identified on the map and would be expanded to include additional properties after they survey was completed.

Mr. Ferrara asked if members of the public could still petition the Commission to ask it to initiate a landmark or district study. Mr. Sullivan replied affirmatively. Mr. King said there were many undesignated landmark-worthy properties in the city but there was no time or resources to designate them all individually. The designation process was usually limited to occasions when there was a clear threat to a property and was not used indiscriminately.

Dr. Solet moved to authorize the Chair, after consulting with the Executive Director, to sign a letter on behalf of the Commission to establish an historic preservation protocol with MIT, and that upon signing the landmark study for the Kendall Square group of three buildings would be terminated. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed without further discussion 5-0.

New Business

Case 3471: 16 Longfellow Park, by Bancroft Littlefield. Change exterior paint colors.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized the application for changes to the exterior paint colors of the house.

Mr. Ferrara moved to approve the colors, as recommended in the staff memo and subject to a ten day notice to the neighbors. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

Preservation Grants

PG 15-1: 27 Tremont St., by Just-A-Start Corp. Strip and reside; windows. Consider increasing grant to \$37,000.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the property. The Commission had offered a \$27,000 grant for work estimated at \$32,000. The new estimated costs were \$37,000 and the request was to increase the grant to \$30,000 total. Dr. Solet so moved. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 5-0.

Minutes

Dr. Solet and Mr. King described proposed corrections and edits to the minutes on pages 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7. Dr. Solet moved to approve the July minutes, as corrected. Ms. Harrington seconded, and the motion passed 5-0.

Ms. Harrington moved to adjourn. Mr. Barry seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 10:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public
Who Signed the Attendance List on August 6, 2015**

Charles Teague	23 Edmunds St
Scott Kyle	15 Clifton St
Heather Hoffman	213 Hurley St
Meg Rotzel	10 Garden St
Maureen McCaffrey	MIT
Thayer Donham	MIT
John Walker	150 Whittemore Ave
Mark Verkennis	1350 Massachusetts Ave
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana Street #404
John Hawkinson	jhawk@mit.edu
Lewis Hyde	8 Donnell St
Adam J. Costa	9 Damon Mill Sq, Concord 01742
Peter L Cohen	11 Donnell St
John Sanzone	540 Memorial Dr.
Mark Nielson	Peter Quinn Architects
Matt Hayes	139 Walden St
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Pl
Carole Perrault	9 Dana St, #41

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.