

MINUTES OF THE MID CAMBRIDGE NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION DISTRICT COMMISSION
APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 8, 2018 HEARING

Monday, October 10, 2017, 6:00 PM, 4th Floor Meeting Room, City Hall Annex, 344 Broadway, Cambridge

Commission Members present: Nancy Goodwin, *Chair*; Lestra Litchfield and Monika Pauli, *Members*; and Margaret McMahon, *Alternate*

Commission Members absent: Tony Hsaio, *Vice Chair*; Sue Ellen Myers, *Member*; Charles Redmon, *Alternate*

Staff present: Samantha Elliott

Members of the Public: See attached list.

Ms. Nancy Goodwin, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM. She reviewed the agenda as well as meeting procedures. She announced that all alternates present would be voting.

MC-4945 modification: 330 Harvard Street, by 330 Harvard St Realty, LLC. Modification of original approval to include masonry retaining wall and change in grade.

Mrs. Samantha Elliott, staff, showed photos and gave an overview of the structure, past application and the modification before the Commission. She noted that this was a binding review.

Ms. Lestra Litchfield, Commissioner, asked if the work had been completed in its entirety. Mr. Mark Boyes-Watson, architect for the project, replied yes. He handed out updated plans which included landscaping details. He gave a brief presentation on the retaining wall and grade change, noting that there were other walls in the immediate area. He said that the goal was to prevent the dirt from washing out and to allow for more plantings.

Ms. Goodwin asked how the grade was changing. Mr. Boyes-Watson replied that it was already higher near the house and that they were bringing up the yard from the sidewalk to be closer to the level of the house. He drew a small sketch to show the Commissioners.

Ms. Monika Pauli, Commissioner, asked if the concrete wall on the property line between 330 and 334 Harvard Street belonged to them. Mr. Boyes-Watson responded no.

Ms. Lestra Litchfield, Commissioner, asked if the foundation was repaired on the house. Mr. Boyes-Watson replied that yes it was repaired and due to the original construction of the foundation and large stones, the way it appeared was the best they could do without rebuilding the entire foundation.

Ms. Goodwin asked for questions from the public. There were none. She asked for comments from the public; there were none.

Ms. Litchfield made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Margaret McMahon seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.

MC-5284: 40 Myrtle Avenue, by Plum Properties, LLC. Remove chimney.

Mrs. Samantha Elliott, staff, showed photos and gave an overview of the structure and the request before the Commission. She noted that this was a non-binding review.

Mr. Alan Savenor, an owner and representative from Plum Properties, introduced himself and elaborated on the request. He said that the structure was a two family and they wanted to create more space in the third floor bedroom which they were hoping to achieve through the demolition of the chimney as the boiler and water heater were both direct vented.

Ms. Litchfield asked if he was proposing to demolish both. Mr. Savenor replied he hoped to in the future but was focusing on the one unit for now.

Ms. Goodwin asked for questions from the public. There were none. She asked for comments from the public. There were none.

Ms. Litchfield noted that the Commission did not prefer to see chimneys removed as they contributed to the character of the structure and the historic street scape.

Ms. Goodwin noted that the Commission supported the construction of faux chimneys with veneer above the roofline. Mr. Savenor replied that the subject property was abutting industrial uses.

Ms. Litchfield reminded the applicant that this was a non-binding review and that the Commission was consistent in their recommendations to preserve chimneys where possible.

Ms. Pauli made a motion to reject the application as submitted and recommended he construct a faux chimney above the roofline. Ms. McMahon seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.

MC-5285: 39-41 Roberts Road, by John Antonopoulos. Remove artificial siding and original siding, where existing, to install new artificial siding.

Mrs. Elliott showed photos and gave an overview of the structure and the request before the Commission. She noted that this was a non-binding review.

Mr. Apostolos Antonopoulos, the owner, introduced himself and outlined his request. He noted that the structure was covered in aluminum siding, asphalt siding and a stone-like product. He noted that they did try to explore to uncover the original siding but elements had been removed or were far beyond repair with a lot of rotten or split boards. He added that they did have the dimensions of some remaining trim and cornerboards that would be used as a guide. Mr. Antonopoulos then showed photos of other projects he had completed in the area with the same material he was proposing called Boral.

Ms. Goodwin asked if Mr. Antonopoulos brought a sample with to the hearing. He replied no. Ms. Goodwin asked if he was proposing to use a smooth finish board. Mr. Antonopoulos replied yes. Ms. Goodwin asked how long the product had been around. Mr. Antonopoulos replied about 5-10 years. Ms. Litchfield said it would be great if he could drop a sample by the office so they could familiarize themselves with the product. He said he would.

Ms. Pauli asked if it came primed. Mr. Antonopoulos replied that it did not come primed and the manufacturer said that priming or sealing the edges was not required but his team still did it as they were used to doing that.

Ms. Litchfield asked if the product had issues holding paint because it was impervious to moisture. Mr. Antonopoulos said no, the manufacturer tested it with a variety of paints and said all could achieve a good adhesion.

Ms. Goodwin asked if they were installing Tyvek. Mr. Antonopoulos replied yes.

Ms. Goodwin asked for questions from the public. There were none. She asked for comments from the public. There were none.

Ms. Goodwin stated she felt it was an improvement. She asked if they were keeping or removing the stone. Mr. Antonopoulos replied that they had not decided what they were going to do with the stone and asked if he was required to keep it. Mrs. Elliott clarify that it was not original to the house and they were not required to keep it. She added that if he did decide to remove it, he would need to follow up with staff to work out the details of what was going back. Ms. Litchfield added that the Commission would support the removal of the non-historic siding material.

Ms. Litchfield clarified that the Commission was not in support of a non-historic siding material but they did support replacing the original siding. She added that she had additional apprehension as they were not familiar with the product.

Ms. Pauli asked the owner to review window trim details with staff. Mr. Antonopoulos replied he would.

Ms. Litchfield made a motion to approve the wholesale replacement of the siding and trim under the conditions: (1) that the applicant use a wood product rather than a composite product; and (2) the applicant shall follow up with staff regarding the details of the trim, railings, non-historic stone-like siding and other construction details. Ms. Pauli seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.

MC-5286: 1446 Cambridge Street, by Brynn Jafry. Construct new pedestrian egress door.

Mrs. Elliott showed photos and gave an overview of the structure and the request before the Commission. She noted that this was a non-binding review.

Ms. Brynn Jafry, an owner, said she purchased it from a woman who was a dentist lived in the house and rented the upstairs but the previous owner did not close off the stairwell so there was no privacy between the two units. Ms. Jafry noted that she hoped to add a second egress to provide safe access to second unit and privacy for first floor unit.

Ms. Litchfield asked what door was proposed. Mr. Giovanni, the contractor, replied a wood door to match the front door with a window above the door to match header height. Ms. McMahon asked if it they were proposing a functional window. Mr. Giovanni replied yes. Ms. Goodwin asked if they were open to a transom versus a sash. Ms. Pauli added that it did not need to open and that a three-over-three was more appropriate than a six-over-six window.

Ms. Litchfield recommended that the lintel/sill below the transom be removed so it would truly read like a transom window. Mr. Giovanni replied ok.

Ms. Litchfield made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the recommendation that they use a three-over-three transom window, the lintel over the door is removed to have the window read like a transom versus a sash. Ms. McMahon seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.

Other Business

Ms. Litchfield stated that she hoped to discuss fencing and the importance of reviewing landscaping plans as to how they would impact the historic character and streetscape. The other Commissioner's agreed and hoped to discuss it more thoroughly for future applications.

Ms. Litchfield made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. McMahon seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0 and the hearing was adjourned at 6:50PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Samantha Elliott
Preservation Administrator

**Members of the Public
(who signed the Attendance list)**

Apostolos Antonopoulos	Owner/Engineer	39 Roberts Road
Alan Savenor	Plum Properties/Owner	71 Martin Street, #4B
Ara Barmousian	Owner/Developer	152 Belleview Road, Watertown
Brynn Jafry	Owner	46 Meadow Road, Bolton
Giovanni Perira	Contractor	[blank]
Mark Boyes-Watson	Architect	30 Bow Street, Somerville
John Antonopoulos	Owner	39 Roberts Road

Note: All addresses are located in Cambridge and/or Massachusetts unless otherwise noted.