

**Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission**

July 2, 2015 - 806 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge Senior Center - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: William King, *Chair*; Bruce Irving, *Vice Chair*; Shary Page Berg, Chandra Harrington, Jo M. Solet, *Members*; Joseph Ferrara, *Alternate*

Members absent: William Barry, Robert Crocker, *Members*; Susannah Tobin, *Alternate*

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

Public present: See attached list.

Chair William King called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M. He made introductions and reviewed hearing procedures, then designated alternate Joseph Ferrara to vote on all matters.

Public Hearing: Demolition Review

**Case D-1364 (continued): 11 Kinnaird St. by 11-13 Kinnaird Street Realty LLC.** Consider mitigation plan to restore historic details of demolished house.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the state of the house at the time that the Inspectional Services department required work to stop. He reported that the Commission had determined at its last meeting that demolition had occurred outside of the process provided in the demolition ordinance. The hearing had been continued to allow for design development of a mitigation proposal. He showed slides of a double house at 37-39 Pleasant Street, with similar detailing to that of 11-13 Kinnaird Street.

James Rafferty, attorney for the property owner, summarized the facts of the case. He said the proponents had explored ways to make the outcome as good or better as if the project had come through for a demolition review hearing in the first place. He said the architect, Campbell Ellsworth, had met with the Commission staff about the proposed design. He asked the Commission to consider finding ~~that~~, in the context of the mitigation measures presented tonight, that the construction moratorium could be lifted.

Campbell Ellsworth, distributed printed copies of his Powerpoint presentation and drawing set. He described the mitigation design proposal, which included moving the door back to the west elevation, but recessed in order to maintain 10' clearance for the driveway. He described construction details for the windows, moldings, water table, entry pilasters, etc. He proposed a 2" corner board with a softened corner rather than a ¾ round corner piece.

Dr. Solet asked about the size and placement of windows, had there been any modification since the previous month? She referenced a letter received from neighbors Allison Crump and David Salomon objecting to the inappropriate double windows on the west elevation. She described a way to avoid raising the sill height of kitchen windows and still retain a usable countertop.

Mr. Rafferty answered that they had received the same letter and did study the window option. The current proposal balanced the public view with the functionality of the interior. Mr. Campbell added that the view of that pair of windows was oblique due to the 6' fence and narrow driveway.

Mr. Irving asked why two windows were eliminated from the second floor of the north elevation. Mr. Ellsworth answered that it had to do with furniture layout and ceiling slope.

Ms. Berg commented that the design showed progress. Would an architect be retained to ensure that the details would be correctly executed? Mr. Rafferty answered that a new set of permit drawings would be submitted to Inspectional Services with the specific details required by the Commission. Mr. Barsoumian agreed to retain an architect if that was a condition of the Commission.

Marilee Meyer, of 10 Dana Street, asked about the dormer and basement floor plan. Mr. Ellsworth answered that the width of the dormer would not change. The height of the ceiling in the basement was 6' 11".

David Salomon, of 9 Kinnaird Street, asked about the electrical service to the buildings. Mr. Barsoumian answered that the electric company had recommended that a post be located between the two buildings (8-10' away from each) and underground connections run from the new post to each building.

Mr. King asked where air conditioning condensers were proposed for location. Mr. Barsoumian indicated they would be located back about halfway along the east elevation. He noted that Inspectional Services had not stopped work on the rear building. He encouraged the two property owners to work cooperatively on details such as utilities and mechanicals.

Ms. Meyer said that she would like to see a meaningful punishment imposed because of the loss of historical building stock. The reconfiguration of the windows was not ideal.

Kalman Glantz, of 12 Kinnaird Street, said he was happy with the modifications made to the front building. He objected to the design of the new rear building, indicating that it had no detail and did not relate to the front building.

Mr. Rafferty argued that imposition of a full two year moratorium would not accomplish the ultimate goal of preserving the character of the original house.

Ms. Harrington commented that the mitigation plan was well designed.

Dr. Solet recommended that owners seek out Commission advice even when demolition permit review was not required. [Note, the applicant's architect did seek and receive the advice of CHC staff prior to permitting].

Ms. Crump spoke in favor of traditional fencing.

Mr. King read a letter from Daryl Janes of 45 Linnaean Street requesting criminal prosecution. He provided some possible language if one of the commissioners was inclined to make a motion. Dr. Solet suggested that language about the window arrangement be added to a motion. Mr. Sullivan reported that the window arrangement was acceptable, in his opinion, based on their location. Mr. Irving commented that the back windows were important and visible. The loss of an engaged dormer was regrettable. The corner treatment should be the  $\frac{3}{4}$  round detail. Mr. Ferrara agreed about the round corner detail. The eave detailing also needed to be carefully worked out.

Mr. Ferrara moved to find that the proposed mitigation design was acceptable and, in the context of that design, that the Commission conclude that it was not in the public interest to continue a

moratorium on building activity; that the Commission determine that the ~~existing front~~ building was significant but not preferably preserved in the context of the mitigation design; and determine that the full premises of the lot be subject to the Commission's review with the goal of mitigating any impacts of site decisions for mechanicals, utilities, fences, and the like; determinations made subject to the condition that the corner treatment be  $\frac{3}{4}$  round and that the staff review construction details and retention of an architect throughout construction. Ms. Berg seconded the motion. Though there was discussion on the motion about the window configuration, the motion was not amended. The motion passed 5-1, with Ms. Harrington voting opposed.

#### 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.

Mr. Rafferty explained that the applicants for 113 Brattle Street requested a one month continuance. Ms. Berg moved to grant the continuance. Mr. Irving seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

**Case 3442: 48 John F. Kennedy St., by Tartarian, LLC.** Replace existing signs with 2 new internally illuminated blade signs.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the existing conditions. [Note: the applicant had applied vinyl decals with the new restaurant name on top of the old blade signs].

Jim Coven, representative of the applicant, explained that a new restaurant called Night Market had moved into the lower level space. He proposed replacing the existing blade signs with new, smaller blade signs of a different shape using the same brackets. The new blade signs would also be internally illuminated.

James Williamson said he had seen the new restaurant name on the signs and thought the blade signs had already been replaced before being approved.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the application, as presented. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

**Case 3444: 14 Craigie St., by Carol S. Green.** Demolish garage; construct new garage and attached conservatory; alter landscape structures.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the house, site, and views from public ways.

Matthew Simitis, architect, displayed a site plan and photographs. He said the house had been built in 1869 by Thomas Mickell, a ship captain, who may have had the help of some of his crew to build it. He said the construction of the house had many interesting and unusual details. The existing two bay carport dated to 1972 and was not of the same quality as the house. It was in disrepair. He proposed demolishing the carport and constructing a new two car garage and attached conservatory.

Matthew Cunningham, landscape architect, displayed the landscape plan and described proposed changes to walkways, the driveway, front steps, fences and gates. The walkway would be dry laid

bluestone. The driveway would be chip seal with a pea stone top surface and would have a cobblestone apron at the front, and the steps would be modified for a better proportion of rise and run.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there was a drawing of the proposed fences. Mr. Cunningham displayed the elevation and rendering.

Mr. Ferrara asked about the material for the gate. Mr. Cunningham answered that the posts would be granite and the leaves of the gate would be made of wood. The design of the gate was reminiscent of the cross braces on the porch railing.

Dr. Solet suggested a lighter color than black on the garage doors. She commented that the elegant pilasters on the garage may be overdesign for the utilitarian structure, to which Mr. Sullivan agreed.

Ms. Berg asked about dimensions of the driveway. She commented that the informal arrangement of the bluestone pavers was incongruous to the formality of the house. Mr. Cunningham said the walkway was existing but it would be more subtly executed than indicated on the rendering. Dr. Solet suggested a more symmetrical semicircle plan for the paving.

John Sanzone agreed with Dr. Solet that the garage detail had been overdesigned. The house should be the focus and the garage could be simple.

Ms. Meyer agreed that black garage doors would bring too much attention to them. She lamented that there would be a lot of backfilling. There would be no vista through to other properties. She suggested shifting the garage further to the left.

Mr. King closed the public comment period.

Dr. Solet asked about the visibility of the new conservatory. Mr. Simitis showed the line of sight indicating it would be largely out of view from any public way.

Mr. Ferrara said the scale of the garage was appropriate at just 14' to the ridge on a site that sloped down. The pilasters would not be overly prominent because they were not in great relief. He supported the proposal.

Mr. Irving said the black window sash and doors would recess from view. He deferred to Dr. Solet about the pilasters.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the application with the modification that the pilasters be removed from the front of the garage and that consideration be given to painting the garage doors a lighter color and on the condition that the construction details, including the posts, gate, and fence, be reviewed and approved by staff. Ms. Berg seconded the motion. The motion failed 3-3, with Messrs. King, Ferrara and Irving voting opposed.

Mr. Irving moved to approve the application, as submitted, with the condition that construction details be reviewed and approved by staff. Ms. Berg seconded the motion, which passed 4-2, with Dr. Solet and Ms. Harrington voting opposed.

**Case 3445: 40 Erie St., by BMR-40 Erie Street LLC.** Alter Waverly Street façade of building.

Mr. King ~~reported~~ noted that there had been very few Fort Washington Historic District cases.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the boundaries of the district. The building at 40 Erie Street was constructed in 1985.

Jim Batchelor, of the Arrowstreet architectural firm, described the proposed changes to the Waverly Street elevation of the building, which was in the district. The height of the building would not change, but the brick knee wall and sloping glass at the first floor would be changed to accommodate a full height first floor and a second floor balcony looking toward the park. The balcony could have a sunshade, depending on project costs. He described changes to the wall finishes in the gabled portions of the building. The materials would consist of a combination of vision glass, spandrel glass, aluminum and zinc panels. It would be a soft mix of gray and green colors. He shared preliminary design ideas for landscaping of the corner open space, but noted that portion of the property was outside the district. The lamp poles would be retained and the bulbs replaced. The balcony might have some decorative lighting but would not cast light out toward the street.

Dr. Solet commended Mr. Batchelor on the design. It would be a great improvement to the neighborhood. She asked how he would prevent water penetration from happening again. Mr. Batchelor replied that his office was working on the construction details to make sure the building would be water tight and the exterior easy to shovel.

Ms. Harrington noted that the doorway design wasn't shown. Mr. Batchelor explained that the door locations were not finalized and would depend on the tenants of the building.

Mr. Sanzone asked if there was anything special about the brick pavilions and their dimensions. Mr. Batchelor replied that the design intent was to save the features that worked well and were technically sound but to remove what was performing poorly. The building would be given a new look and would perform better. The pavilions (gabled portions) had a residential scale and was an architectural statement that he considered worth keeping.

Mr. Williamson asked if there was a problem with the brick knee walls. Claes Andreasen, of Arrowstreet, indicated that the knee walls and sloped glass were taking in water at the header and sill.

Ms. Meyer said the double gables mimicked residential houses. The proposed balcony would keep that residential scale. She complimented the design and said she appreciated that they were not maximizing the allowable density on the site.

Mr. Williamson suggested keeping the brick between the first and second floors. He said the sunshade was preferable.

Mr. King closed the public comment period.

Ms. Berg asked about trees and landscaping. Mr. Batchelor said there were a good number of street trees along Waverly Street and they would be retained.

Dr. Solet moved to approve the application, as presented. Mr. Irving seconded the motion. Mr. King said he had viewed the site from within the park and considered the proposal to be a great improvement. The motion passed 6-0.

Public Hearing: Landmark Designation Procedures

**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 introduced the matter, which dated back several years to a previous design proposal by the Institute that would include demolition of one or two of the three buildings in the center of Kendall Square. The Commission had initiated a landmark designation study, which had been extended several times with the consent of the Institute to also extend the study protections of the three buildings.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the three landmark study group buildings. He described each building briefly. He explained that his objective had been to allow a revitalization of the first floor retail while preserving the architectural integrity of each building. He described the six development sites that the Institute had included in its master plan for Kendall Square. He summarized his staff memorandum about the impacts of the proposed master plan on buildings in the square and including the preservation of the three buildings in the landmark study group. He described options available to the Commission for resolving the landmark study including entering into a protocol with M. I. T. in a similar arrangement to the protocol the Commission had worked out with Harvard University in 1986, in which the staff is consulted on any significant changes to National Register listed or eligible properties owned by Harvard. He indicated that if such a protocol could be established with M. I. T., he would feel comfortable terminating the landmark study and consulting with M. I. T. in the same way that he does with Harvard.

Michael Owu, of M. I. T., made introductions and displayed a Powerpoint presentation to further describe M. I. T.'s master plan for Kendall Square. It would provide for a more active public realm in Kendall Square during day, night, and weekends. The three landmark group buildings reflected a long history of Kendall Square as a place for innovation. He showed the site plan for the six development sites, and emphasized that the Eastgate property was a critical component of the proposal, allowing for the preservation of the three landmark group buildings by providing for a separate development site. Graduate student housing would be moved to a new tower behind and above the Hammett building. Eastgate would not be demolished until the new housing tower was completed.

Robert Brown, of Perkins & Will Architects, showed renderings of a new building that would connect to and extend behind the Kendall Square Building. The entry to the combined building would be through the existing front entry of the Kendall Square Building.

Nader Tehrani, of NADA Architects, described the public open space component of the master plan. Originally planned for the site of the Suffolk Building, the open space was now behind the landmark

group of buildings. The new tower above the Hammett Building was oriented north-south for the best views and least shadow impacts. He indicated they wanted to preserve the original skylights of the Suffolk Building. Retail uses would be accommodated at the ground floor and innovation uses would be housed above.

Mr. Owu said that at grade parking would be replaced with active open space. Parking would all go underground.

Mr. King laid out several options for the Commission including giving a green light to the master plan without landmarking, taking a landmark recommendation to the City Council, or working out a protocol with M. I. T. as described by Mr. Sullivan. The letter from the Institute was a good first step toward a protocol. Mr. Owu indicated that the arrangement for ongoing staff consultation described in the letter was in the context of just the three landmark buildings. He went on to explain that it had become the Institute's practice to consult with Mr. Sullivan and work closely with him on building details when projects involved historic buildings. He indicated a willingness to work on a written protocol if that was desired by the Commission in order to resolve the landmark study in Kendall Square.

Mr. King asked for questions of fact.

Carole Perrault, of 9 Dana Street, asked when the public could get involved in reviewing the designs for the new buildings. She said she had a problem with the proposed cantilevering of a tower over the Hammett building. Where would the public input come in? Mr. Sullivan answered that all the projects envisioned in the master plan would need Planning Board approval. Public participation would happen at the Planning Board hearings. He indicated that he would participate at that level also. Other work on the three landmark study buildings, such as masonry repointing and the nitty gritty details might be reviewed by him with no public process component. Ms. Perrault said the Commission needed to have interaction, debate, and public participation on major issues, and not just pass it all off to the staff.

Mr. Williamson asked what view there would be of the clock tower of the Kendall Square Building from behind. Mr. Owu answered that it would not be visible from the rear.

Ms. Meyer said she was overwhelmed by the scope of the whole master plan.

Ms. Perrault spoke in favor of landmark designation for the three buildings so that there would be public hearings on the details of the treatment of those three buildings and not just staff review. The buildings represented the only remnant of a traditional streetscape in Kendall Square. She read from the purpose statement of the local historic preservation ordinance. She noted that 2016 would be the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act, which had passed as a response to the urban renewal projects of the 1960s. She said she had serious reservations about the M. I. T. master plan.

James Williamson read an email from Fred Salvucci, urging deferral of the MITIMCo proposal. He also read a portion of a letter by Jane and Larry Stabile about the Volpe Building site before making his own comments. He said more space should be for graduate student housing and less for commercial

space. The clock tower should be visible from all sides. The Rinaldi Tile Buildings should be preserved. He spoke in support of landmark designation of the three buildings. He indicated he would send written copies of the referenced letters to staff for the record.

Mr. Sullivan said that discussion about M. I. T.'s plans for Kendall Square had been ongoing since 1998. The preservation war for these three significant buildings had been won because they would be preserved in the current proposal when the initial proposal had been to demolish all but one. The uncertainty that remained was in the design interaction between old and new, not whether the old buildings would be preserved. The preservation goal had been met. The Planning Board would be where the action would be in reviewing the designs of the new buildings.

Mr. King suggested not abandoning the option to landmark until a protocol was drafted. He recommended a continuance. Mr. Sullivan agreed a continuance was needed.

Mr. Owu expressed M. I. T.'s preference to terminate the landmark study based on its letter guaranteeing a protocol for the three buildings in Kendall Square. However, he agreed to continue the hearing and protections through the September 3 with an anticipated hearing August 6.

Dr. Solet so moved. Ms. Harrington seconded, and the motion to continue passed 6-0.

#### Minutes

Mr. Irving noted that he had recused himself on May 7 from the 29 Highland case. Mr. King corrected a typo on page 4 of the May 7 minutes. Dr. Solet offered an addition to page 5. [Dr. Solet left the meeting].

For the June minutes, Mr. King emphasized that the commission's action to accept the petition for NCD study was effective as of October 1, not just the initiation of the two studies. Ms. Burks read Dr. Solet's written corrections to the June minutes.

Mr. Irving moved to approve the May and June minutes, as corrected. Ms. Harrington seconded, and the motion passed 5-0.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks  
Preservation Planner



**Members of the Public  
Who Signed the Attendance List on July 2, 2015**

Ara Barsoumian	152 Bellevue Rd, Watertown 02472
Campbell Ellsworth	267 Norfolk St
Joh Koch	3 Leonard Ave
Matthew Cunningham	Melrose
Carol Green	14 Craigie St
Joe Green	14 Craigie St
Jim Covenor	151 P Street, Boston 02127
Allison Crump	9 Kinnaird St #1
David Salomon	9 Kinnaird St #1
David Beller	357 Medford St #2, Somerville 02145
John Hawkinson	<a href="mailto:jhawk@mit.edu">jhawk@mit.edu</a>
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Pl
Kalman Glantz	12 Kinnaird St
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana Street #404
Carole Perrault	9 Dana St, #41
Jim Batchelor	Arrowstreet, 10 Post Office Sq, Boston 02109
Claes Andresasen	Arrowstreet, 10 Post Office Sq, Boston 02109
Stuart Pitchel	236 Pearl St, Somerville 02145
Troy Stac	
John Sanzone	540 Memorial Dr.

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.