

## Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

February 4, 2016 - 806 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge Senior Center - 6:00 P.M.

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

Members absent: Bruce Irving, *Vice Chair*; Shary Page Berg, William Barry, *Members*

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

Public present: See attached list.

Chair King called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M. He made introductions and designated alternates Ms. Tobin and Mr. Ferrara to vote on all matters. He explained the Consent Agenda procedure and recommended Case 2836 for consideration on the consent agenda. No members of the public, commission, or staff requested a full hearing on that case.

Mr. Crocker moved to approve **Case 2836 (Lehman-Dudley House, 8 Harvard Yard, by President & Fellows of Harvard College**, to renew a temporary certificate for seasonal canopies) per the consent agenda procedure and subject to the review of details by staff. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

### Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

**Case 3544: 29 Highland St., by Christian Nolen & Sue Denny.** Restore house in existing location; move carriage house forward; build connecting structure.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and summarized the history of the demolition review, subsequent proposals for the site, and initiation of a landmark study. He reported that the current proposal was to restore the house in its existing location, move the carriage house near the house and to construct a connector. He noted that the carriage house was covered with wood board and batten cladding; it been altered and converted to a residence around 1970 and currently had three garage bays.

Mr. King welcomed City Councilor Devereux. He then described the hearing procedures and asked that testimony be limited to no more than 3 minutes.

David Stern of Stern McCafferty Architects described the current proposal. The house would stay in its current location and be restored. The carriage house would be relocated from the northeast corner of the lot toward Appleton Street but would retain its current orientation. It would be attached to the house with a new connector. He showed plans and elevations and described other aspects of the design. The paving would be removed and landscaped. A new smaller driveway and court would be constructed off Appleton Street in front of the relocated carriage house. The board and batten cladding of the carriage house was in bad shape and would be replaced in kind. The eave brackets were in better condition and would be preserved and repaired. The connector exterior would be glass and copper. He displayed the CHC survey photo that showed a small hood over the original carriage bay and indicated that his design had a similar feature over the new garage bays. He described each of the proposed elevations. He noted that the neighbors across Highland Street who had opposed earlier proposals were now in support.

Ms. Harrington asked about the enlarged dormer and dormer windows on the rear of the house. Mr. Stern described the changes. She asked for clarification of the treatment of the south elevation where the barn would meet the connector. Mr. Stern showed the elevation.

Dr. Solet commented that in her experience copper could retain its sheen for 25 years. Mr. Stern said that untreated copper would turn a dull brown very quickly. Mr. Sullivan concurred.

Mr. Ferrara asked about mechanicals. Mr. Stern said they planned to explore geo-thermal heating and cooling but it had not been studied in detail yet.

Mr. King asked if the structural integrity of the barn had been evaluated. Would it sustain the move? Mr. Stern said that it would be braced during the move and building moving companies were confident it would not be a problem.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked why the carriage house was to be angled and the material of the foundation. Mr. Stern replied that it was currently angled that way and he wanted to respect that orientation. The foundation was mostly brick.

Mr. King opened the public comment period.

Ms. Meyer commended the proponents for thinking through the design and listening to feedback. She said it would be a good project.

Mr. Sullivan summarized letters of support from Annette LaMond and Joseph Moore of 7 Riedesel Avenue, Leslie Jeng and Jon Biotti of 43 Appleton, and William and Lois Edgerly at 32 Highland Street. He summarized comments from absent commissioner Bill Barry.

Mr. King closed the public comment period. He explained that the property was currently under study for landmark designation and was also included in the neighborhood/historic district study area. He commended the owners and architects for going through the process and coming up with what he thought would be a special addition to Cambridge. The landmark study would no longer be needed once the project got underway. Mr. Sullivan agreed, saying the landmark study could terminate upon the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. He agreed with Mr. Stern's evaluation of the board and batten as severely deteriorated and needing to be replaced and that the sleeping porch needed to be rebuilt. He recommended that a certificate be conditioned on staff review and approval of construction details including mechanicals, site plans, and landscaping plans.

Mr. Ferrara recommended that the carriage barn come no closer to the street than was shown on the proposed site plan.

Dr. Solet moved ~~to find~~ that the proposal to restore the house, renovate and move the barn to the location shown on the plan, and construct the connector substantially as shown on the plans submitted be found ~~to be~~ appropriate to the context and the character of the property. She further moved to issue a certificate of appropriateness subject to staff review and approval of construction details, materials, landscape design, and mechanicals. Mr. Crocker seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

Ms. Harrington moved to terminate the landmark study upon issuance of the certificate of appropriateness on the grounds that the interim protections of the study were no longer needed in the context of the approved plans and the ongoing district study. Mr. Ferrara seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Nina Pickering Cook of Anderson & Krieger asked what would happen if the proponents withdrew their application. Mr. King explained that they would have to return to the Commission in order to make any other changes outside of the approved plans and what had been delegated to staff. The landmark study could always be reinitiated if necessary.

**Case 3545: 134 Brattle St., by P.C.M. Teunissen.** Exterior restoration. Remove door and landing to 134A. Rebuild rear deck. Remove 4 rear-facing windows and replace with doors and larger windows.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the double house built in 1857 and enlarged ca. 1891. The house had been built on the edge of a peat bog. This eastern half of the double house had settled severely to the left and rear. He pointed out the 1891 apartment door to be removed and the corner of the existing deck that was visible from Brattle and Sparks streets. He showed slides of the existing curb cut and driveway and the visibility of the rear elevation from Sparks Street.

Stacey Krieg of Ruhl Walker Architects indicated that the owners had taken on a large project with significant structural deficiencies to correct. The foundation reconstruction was a major part of the project but with a change in floor level of 10" in the house, it had to be fixed. She described the proposed work on each elevation including rebuilding the front bay, removing the steps and door to the former apartment, removing the existing deck and constructing a new deck, new sliding doors (a Nano Wall product) on the rear to the deck, contemporary railing system on the deck, a change of two windows on the south elevation and installation of two French doors at grade, and the restoration of other windows, siding, and trim.

Joe Carreiro of SeaDar Construction described the engineering of the foundation repairs, which would include helical piers that would work like corkscrews down about 25' to stabilize against any further movement. He said it was a tight site but they were trying not to disrupt the neighbors and to make it a smooth process. He proposed re-painting the whole building in coordination with the abutter, but colors had not been discussed yet.

Mr. Sullivan asked why new tri-part windows were proposed rather than double hung to match the rest of the house. Ms. Krieg replied that they would bring in more light and the modern window was preferred over introducing a faux historic window. He asked if there would be doors under the deck. Ms. Krieg replied in the affirmative explaining that they would be for trash and recycling storage, as was existing at the current deck. He asked if the proposed parking pad conformed to zoning. Mr. Carreiro replied in the affirmative. The paving would be dense gravel. Ms. Krieg indicated that there would be room for two small cars and the tree would not be touched.

Mr. King opened the public comment period.

Alan Dworsky of 8 Mercer Circle expressed concern about frequency of use of the new deck and the possibility of light spilling over to his property.

Suzanne Dworsky of 8 Mercer Circle and Carin Knoop of 136 Brattle Street asked a number of clarification questions about the proposed deck.

Ms. Meyer asked about the driveway configuration, reconstruction of the bay window, and the deck railing. Ms. Krieg described the proposed horizontal cable and post railing system. Ms. Meyer asked if there would be an apartment in the basement. Mr. Carreiro said no. Ms. Meyer expressed her concern that the driveway would take up too much green space and could negatively impact the trees.

Ms. Knoop said she was having difficulty visualizing what it would look like but said she was excited to have the Teunissens as neighbors.

Mr. Sullivan suggested lowering the deck by two steps to make it less visible. He said he was concerned about the opaque material on the side of the deck.

Ms. Burks summarized a letter received from Elizabeth Houghteling and Richard Balboni of 132 Brattle Street, who had concerns about the materials and contemporary styling of the deck, windows, and doors.

Mr. Sullivan recommended continuing the hearing until March but with the permission granted to allow the foundation work, bay window, and removal of apartment door to proceed in the meantime. He recommended the applicant return in March with revisions of the rear fenestration and deck details. Ernst Teunissen, an owner, agreed to the continuance as described.

Mr. Ferrara suggested that the proponents consider true divided light double-hung windows and lowering the deck. He made a motion to continue, as framed by Mr. Sullivan. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

#### Public Hearings: Demolition Review

**Case D-1384: 207 Cambridge St., by Mark Lechmere LLC.** Demolish 3-story multi use building (1857). *Request received for one month continuance.*

**Case D-1385: 227 Cambridge St., by Mark Lechmere LLC.** Demolish commercial bank building (1917). *Request received for one month continuance.*

Mr. King noted that the applicant had requested to continue the cases for one month.

Mr. Crocker moved to continue the cases to March 3. Mr. Ferrara seconded, and the motion passed 6-0.

#### New Business

**31, 33 and 35 Follen St.** Install handrails to front doors.

Ms. Burks explained that two owners of these modern townhouses said they had fallen and broken bones at their front steps. She anticipated receiving applications for a simple handrail at the separate recessed entries.

Dr. Solet moved to delegate approval of a Certificate of Hardship to the staff, subject to ten day notice requirements. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

**1326 Massachusetts Avenue.** Alter storefront.

Mr. Sullivan described the elaborate tiled interior installed in 1913 by the Waldorf Lunch chain that was recently uncovered by Clover in the former Yenching Restaurant space. The tiled walls had been covered up when the Hayes Bickford Co. took over the space in the 1920s. Storefront changes were still in the works, but the proponents wanted to open up the non-original brick bay on the side to create some windows for counter seating. Clover had a tight deadline to vacate Holyoke Center, so he was hoping to get approval from the commission to delegate to staff approval the changes to the side bay.

Mr. King said he observed no disapproval on the part of the commissioners and said it was the sense of the meeting to allow the changes be delegated to staff.

Mr. Ferrara suggested that interior lighting not be too bright because it would be magnified by the white tiles.

Mr. King reported that the public toilet at McArthur Square would be unveiled on February 19.

Mr. Ferrara moved to adjourn, Mr. Crocker seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 8:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks  
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public  
Who Signed the Attendance List on February 4, 2016**

Diane Gray	Harvard University, 1350 Mass. Ave.
Michael Kuchta	Harvard University, 1350 Mass. Ave.
Alan Dworsky	8 Mercer Circle
Suzanne Dworsky	8 Mercer Circle
Jan Devereux	255 Lakeview Ave
David Stern	46 Waltham St, #302, Boston, MA 02118
Chris Taylor	46 Waltham St, #302, Boston, MA 02118
Stacy Krieg	20 Calvin St, Somerville 02143
Keith Case	44 Radcliffe Rd #1 Somerville 02145
Chris Lennhoff	46 Waltham St, Boston 02118
Ernst Teunissen	134 Brattle St
Joe Carreiro	44 Flagg Swamp Rd, E. Freetown 02717
Carin Knoop	136 Brattle St
Jacob Albert	136 Fifth St
Toby Fairbank	221 Mt Auburn St #705
Arthur Michaud	344 Cambridge St
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana Street #404
Christian Nolen	29 Highland St

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.