



City of Somerville  
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
City Hall 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, 93 Highland Avenue, Somerville MA 02143

**MAY 10, 2022 MEETING MINUTES**

(Note, this meeting was a reschedule of the April, 19, 2022 HPC meeting which was continued due to lack of a quorum on that date.)

This meeting was conducted via remote participation on GoToWebinar.

The agenda with public GTW links can be found here:

<https://www.somervillema.gov/sites/default/files/2022-05-10-agenda.pdf>

NAME	TITLE	STATUS	ARRIVED
Eric Parkes	Chair	<i>Present</i>	
Robin Vice-Chair Kelly	Vice-Chair	<i>Present</i>	
Alan Bingham	Member	<i>Present</i>	
Ryan Falvey	Member	<i>Present</i>	
Dick Bauer	Member	<i>Present</i>	
DJ Chagnon	Alternate	<i>Absent</i>	

City staff present: Sarah White, Dan Bartman, Emily Hutchings (Planning, Preservation & Zoning)

The meeting was called to order at 6:50 p.m. and adjourned at 10:47 p.m.

**I. Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)**

**1. 1252 Broadway**

**Commission Discussion:**

Chair Parkes asks if there are any comments. Mr. Bingham and Chair Parkes confirm the building was demolished without a permit. Agreement was to reconstruct per the submitted plans to replicate the gothic style. Chair Parkes notes the front façade in particular was going to be retained, and the plan set appears to reflect that.

**Motion (who & what):**

Mr. Bauer motions to approve the MOA as presented. Vice-Chair Kelly seconds.

**Vote: (roll call)**

**5-0 unanimous** (Mr. Falvey – yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – yes; Mr. Bingham – yes; Mr. Bauer – yes; Chair Parkes – yes)

## **II. Alterations to Local Historic District (LHD) Properties**

### **1. HPC.ALT 2022.09 – 17-19 Aldersey Street**

Applicant: Paul Morgan

Owner: ZD Aldersey, LLC (Paul Morgan & Carrie Endries)

*The Applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter an LHD property by altering the masonry of the front façade, replacing the garage doors, and adding a roof deck to an existing detached garage.*

Vice-Chair Kelly states she is recusing herself from the Aldersey Street cases and goes offscreen.

#### **Comments from Applicant team:**

Damon Sidel, the architect, reviews the existing conditions, noting the damage to the masonry. He states there was some repair but that a structural engineer made recommendations for improvements. He states part of the project they are proposing to replace the front with similar concrete masonry and add a roof deck on top of the garage.

#### **Public Comment (name and address of commenters):**

Ronald Cavallo, 70 Victoria Street, Somerville: He notes the property is magnificent and he fully supports the restoration of the garage. The garages tend to be unsafe, and he thinks this is a benefit to the city.

No other comments, public comment is closed.

#### **Commission Discussion:**

Mr. Bauer states that he is comfortable with the the deck and the selected doors but doesn't like the chosen parapet. He asks if there are structural issues with rebuilding the stepped parapet.

Damon Sidel says he doesn't think it interferes with the functioning of the deck but it may impact the waterproofing of the steps. Mr. Sidel wanted to simplify the design by making the parapet and roof deck more harmonious, along with better waterproofing.

Mr. Bauer states that despite complications with waterproofing, he thinks the project would be more appropriate if parapet were reconstructed. Chair Parkes states his agreement, without the stepped parapet it is just a concrete garage. He would like to see the form replicated, and it could still last.

Chair Parkes also recommends a black rail so to provide less contrast. Damon Sidel says the reason for the white rail was to match the railing on the front porch, which has a similar baluster pattern. The goal of using the white rail was to make connection to front of the house.

Chair Parkes states given the distance he is alright with that rationale. Mr. Falvey states he is comfortable with the proposal.

Chair Parkes states he and Mr. Bauer feel the parapet should be stepped and asks if other commissioners have comments. Mr. Bingham thinks it may look odd but he understands the point. He asks if the garage can structurally support a roof deck if it is in such poor condition. He

notes such garages are not typically strong and asks to confirm that the applicant has consulted a structural engineer. Damon Sidel confirms they have, and that additional steel columns with full footings will be placed to support the beams above.

Mr. Falvey notes that Mr. Bingham stated the fence railing appears to be directly behind the building and says the fence directly behind the parapet appear busy. Damon Sidel states the parapet will be floating on the roof, from bay to bay, and will not be fastened through the membrane. It will be close to the front facade, only a few inches behind.

Mr. Falvey expresses concern that the design will appear busy, whereas the proposal with the removed parapet will be cleaner.

Chair Parkes states the deck appears to be driving the design as opposed to being an accessory. He asks if the vertical posts will align with what is below. Sidel states it would be a pre-fabricated railing system and they would be restricted to what is available.

Mr. Bauer states in his opinion, the parapet is important, and there is no structural reason it shouldn't be rebuilt. Mr. Bauer continues that if the railings were black, it would reduce the business of the design. Chair Parkes agrees the stepped parapet is important to the style and design. Damon Sidel asks if it would be appropriate to use narrower balusters for the railing. Chair Parkes states he would be more comfortable with narrower balusters on the railing and showcasing the parapet. Mr. Bauer agrees that would be more appropriate.

Chair Parkes proposes the application could be approved with conditions of a stepped parapet with either black railing or sleeker balusters. Damon Sidel notes that time is of the essence with the project and asks whether they would need to come back, and states he is hesitant to saying yes outright. He is comfortable with saying yes to the stepped parapet as it is the same material, but he has concerns about the railing condition as he hasn't researched what is available for materials.

Preservation Staff asks for confirmation about conditions for the stepped parapet and to address the railing. Staff clarifies how the conditions of the project function for the benefit of the architect.

### **Motion**

Mr. Bauer motions to approve the roof deck. Mr. Bingham seconds the motion.

Motion to approve with the inclusion of conditions of a stepped parapet and using a dark colored railing as reflected in the minutes.

### **Vote (roll call):**

**4-0 unanimous** (Mr. Falvey - yes, Mr. Bingham – yes, Mr. Bauer – yes, Chair Parkes – yes)

## **2. [HPC.ALT 2022.20 – 17-19 Aldersey](#)**

Applicant: Paul Morgan

Owner: ZD Aldersey, LLC (Paul Morgan & Carrie Endries)

*The Applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter an LHD property by replacing windows and doors, installing vents, and enclosing windows.*

**Comments from Applicant team:**

Paul Morgan, the Applicant, presents the application. He states he believes the changes to the windows will be an improvement, and that although he has done weather caulking and made other improvements, the windows are still wobbly and difficult to weatherstrip. He states he doesn't think storm windows will acceptably compensate for the energy loss.

**Public Comment (name and address of commenters):**

Ron Cavallo, 70 Victoria Street. He thinks the selected windows are appropriate. He fully supports the applicant's request.

Brian Clancy, Pella Windows. He states he is sales rep from Pella Windows helping the applicant. He assisted the neighbors across the street, and states he is present if there are any questions.

**Commission Discussion:**

Mr. Bingham states that he has no issues with the doors, but it would be nice to restore the original windows.

Chair Parkes agrees the doors are an improvement. He sees concerns with the windows: the Commission has accepted all wood windows in the past, but the Commission should consider whether the windows are restorable and whether the applicant has consulted with a professional on the subject. Chair Parkes continues that although the windows are less visible than others, allowing the replacement windows may provide an argument for replacing more visible windows in the future.

Mr. Bingham asks about the windows on the rest of the house, as he sees a mix of windows on different parts of the house, and that there appears to be a lack of consistency.

Chair Parkes asks about the location of the 6/6 windows. The Applicant states they are on the north side, which is not visible from any public right of way. He has since been provided a Certificate of Non-Applicability, and the 6/6 windows are no longer relevant to the application.

Mr. Bauer states concerns about setting a precedent of removing existing windows and losing part of the historic fabric of the house.

Chair Parkes asks for clarification on the proposed window material. Brian Clancy from Pella Windows states the proposal suggests clad windows because that was what was done (and approved) across the street a few years past.

Chair Parkes states the intent of the historic district is to retain the historic fabric unless it cannot be salvaged, and that there should be a process to determine such before new windows are approved. Mr. Bingham agrees and states that most windows can be reclaimed, and that issues also come with vinyl windows.

Chair Parkes asks if the Commission would consider approving the doors and continuing the windows, requesting the Applicant review the possibility of restoring the windows.

The Applicant states he isn't sure how long it would take to do that research, and suggests the Commission just reject the windows and he could reapply when he gets all the documentation. Mr. Bingham suggests that Staff could provide some names of professionals who do such window review.

Chair Parkes states that if they vote against an application the Applicant could not apply for a certain period of time and continuing the windows would allow more flexibility.

**Motion (who & what):**

Mr. Bauer motions to approve the replacement door and vents as proposed, and to continue the replacement windows. Mr. Bingham seconds. 4-0. (Vice-Chair Kelly not present).

**Vote (roll call):**

4-0 unanimous (Mr. Falvey-yes, Mr. Bingham – yes, Mr. Bauer – yes, Chair Parkes – yes)

**Vice-Chair Kelly returns at 7:47 PM.**

**3. [HPC.ALT 2022.16 – 9 -11 Campbell Park](#)**

[Applicant: ACE Residential Solar, LLC](#)

[Owner: Eugene Mirman](#)

*[The Applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter an LHD property by installing solar voltaic cells on the roof.](#)*

**Comments from Applicant team:**

The Applicant, Kavin Shah, an Engineer for ACE Residential Solar, presents the project proposal.

**Public Comment (name and address of commenters):**

Preservation Staff states they received a letter from Ron Cavallo.

Ron Cavallo, 70 Victoria Street. States he wrote a letter on the subject. He cites Somerville's 2050 goal of being net-zero and that it is unlikely to happen. He notes there is a federal mandate to support solar, and if the City is going to reach net-zero, they will need to embrace solar technology.

**Commission Discussion:**

Chair Parkes notes he doesn't believe the Commission has ever disallowed solar panels, and that in this case the solar panels would be fully reversable and wouldn't damage the historic fabric. Chair Parkes continues that in this case he doesn't have an issue with the location of the panels.

Mr. Bingham agrees that they haven't turned down any proposal for solar.

Mr. Bingham notes that he thinks the solar panels are a good idea. Vice-Chair Kelly agrees and states she has no concerns about the panels. She asks about whether there is any flexibility for the

location of the conduit, as it appears very close to the sidewalk on the plans. The Applicant states the utility company, and the location of the meter mandates the location of the conduit.

Vice-Chair Kelly states that in the report there is discussion of moving conduits to locations that aren't visible from a right of way. She asks for confirmation that this isn't viable and asks for staff recommendations. Preservation Staff recommends that the Commission should strike that condition and note the condition number, so as not to impede the utilities.

**Motion:**

Vice-Chair Kelly moves to accept with conditions noted in report, striking the condition that the conduit should not be visible from the public right of way. Mr. Falvey seconds. 5-0 unanimous.

**Vote (roll call):**

**5-0 unanimous** (Mr. Falvey – yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – yes; Bingham – yes; Bauer – yes; Chair Parkes – yes)

**4. HPC.ALT 2022.19 – 50a Spring Street**

Applicant: Jeff O'Neill & Claire Decoux O'Neill

Owner: Same as applicant

*The Applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter an LHD property by altering existing window openings, the addition of a Juliet balcony, the extension of a first-floor porch, and the addition of a second-floor porch with pergola on the left elevation.*

**Comments from Applicant team:**

Christopher Brown is the representative for the Applicant and asks for questions from the Commission. Jeff O'Neill is present as the applicant and owner.

**Public Comment (name and address of commenters):**

None.

**Further comments from the Applicant team:**

The Applicant asks to make some comments. The Applicant states that the staff report did not recommend approval, but he believes the examples of Gothic Revival architecture, as submitted, support the proposed changes.

**Commission Discussion:**

Vice-Chair Kelly thanks the Applicant for sharing his perspective and notes one of her concerns is that the proposed alterations will stand in contrast to the remainder of the house and the changes will be obvious compared to the rest of the house. It also focuses all the proposed details on a small section of the property, interrupting the rhythm and overwhelming and busy where the rest of the house has a serene, simple feel.

Mr. Bingham states he appreciates the proposed changes, as they take an average-appearing home and make improvements.

Chair Parkes asks if the proposed balcony is custom woodwork or stock. Mr. Brown states it would all be custom. Mr. Brown proceeds to ask for guidance from the Commission on the rail and balustrade if the Juliet balcony were approved.

Chair Parkes states his agreement with Vice-Chair Kelly, and he doesn't believe the proposed details would have been on a house of this style, as it is more simple. He is skeptical about whether the details would work with the house.

Chair Parkes is most concerned with the Juliet balcony and the triple windows, which is a significant change. The Applicant states the Juliet balcony is more important to him and he is okay with letting go of the third window.

Mr. Bauer states he is more concerned with the windows than the balcony. He reviews the side porch, which appears not to be original to the house and may have been an addition. Vice-Chair Kelly agrees, and notes that the second-floor portion with the pergola doesn't appear to make sense in the context of the house.

Chair Parkes doesn't think the existing porch is original. He speculates on what was original material versus added later. Vice-Chair Kelly states the proposal appears very cluttered, which appears in contrast with the remainder of the house.

Mr. Falvey agrees with Vice-Chair Kelly's concerns about the porches; extending the porches would encroach on the entryway, and that the proposal is quite busy. He reviews the existing building, and states putting in the Juliet balcony would alter the appearance of the three gable ends with identical windows.

Mr. Bingham states he likes the applicant's proposed Option 1 for the decorative trusses and believes that the trusses changes the focus rather than distracts from the house.

Chair Parkes asks if it would be appropriate to have the upper level without the pergola. He states that if the Commission goes with one option he would prefer Option A with the vertical brackets.

Mr. Bauer states he doesn't like the proposed windows, as they change the character, but he is less opposed to the porches although the pergola seems out of character. He would prefer keeping the existing roof and remove the pergola.

Mr. Bauer comments that the current porch is very narrow, and applicant has proposed expanding the porch to allow greater utility. Chair Parkes states that the rim of the porch is shown as being flush with where the Juliet balcony would go, and it should be pulled back a few inches. Christopher Brown states that is not the intention, and that they will follow up on the matter.

Preservation Staff states there doesn't appear to be consensus among the Commission, and that there are several items that the applicant should address within their plans. She recommends that, as the Commission is having difficulty coming to a decision, the Commission may consider giving some direction to the applicant regarding changes they would like to see and suggest a continuance.

Chair Parkes agrees that sounds appropriate and he personally is concerned with the Juliet balcony. The Applicant states he is comfortable with continuing. Chair Parkes suggests removing the center window. Vice-Chair Kelly states the triple window on the front is also problematic. She also has concerns with the Juliet balcony as it stands out from the front windows. She has concerns about the pergola and is unclear about the porch doors on the second floor. She recommends paring the proposal down and simplifying the proposal.

**Motion (who & what):**

Mr. Falvey moves to continue the item to the June 21, 2022 meeting. Vice-Chair Kelly seconds.

**Vote (roll call):**

**5-0 unanimous** (Mr. Falvey – yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – yes; Mr. Bingham – yes; Mr. Bauer – yes; Chair Parkes – yes)

**5. HPC.ALT 2022.21 – 78 Sycamore Street**

Applicant: Daniel Macheras

Owner: Same as Applicant

*The Applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter an LHD property by installing tracking lines for a ductless split system on the right elevation.*

**Comments from Applicant team:**

The Applicant states he purchased the property in December 2021, whereupon he had an energy audit on the property completed. He states the proposal is a result of that energy audit. The Commission reviews the application and clarifies the location of the proposed tracking lines. They confirm the materials.

**Public Comment (name and address of commenters):**

Ron Cavallo, 70 Victoria Street. He confirms it is the Tufts House. He states he is in opposition to the proposal, and that although he strongly approves of energy efficiency, the house should be maintained as pristinely as possible. He states there are other installation methods that would render the system effectively invisible.

**Commission Discussion:**

Chair Parkes states that he thinks the unit would be minimally visible. He asks if there are alternative options. The Applicant confirms they have explored options and that they cannot run the lines inside the house.

Vice-Chair Kelly states the lines would not permanently alter the structure, which is also set back from the street. She thinks the proposal is a good solution. Mr. Falvey states he agrees, and due to the angle, the lines and system would be minimally noticeable. Chair Parkes agrees that what is proposed is an entirely reversible addition to the side of the house. It could be painted to match the siding.



Vice-Chair Kelly agrees it is reversible, and as long as it matches the siding, she has no issues. Commission members review how to condition the color of the system match the color of the house.

**Motion:**

Vice-Chair Kelly motions, Mr. Bauer seconds. Motion to approve with the condition that the system be painted to match the color of the house.

**Vote (roll call):**

4-1-0 (Mr. Falvey – yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – yes; Mr. Bingham – abstains; Mr. Bauer – yes; Chair Parkes – yes)

**III. Determinations of Historic Significance (STEP 1 IN THE DEMOLITION REVIEW PROCESS)**

**1. HPC.DMO 2022.09 – 57 Trull Street**

Applicant: Rich Ducott

Owner: Tim Buntel & Cynthia Graber

*The Applicant seeks to demolish a principal structure constructed a minimum of 75 years ago.*

**Comments from Applicant team:**

Tim Buntel, the Owner, attempts to share his screen but is unable due to technical difficulties. Mr. Buntel is present with his wife, Cynthia Graber. They have been residents for over 10 years and purchased the property in 2018. He reviews the changes that have been made and states extensive changes were made in the mid- to late-20<sup>th</sup> century and no visible historic details remain. He explains that when they purchased the property, they hoped to retain historic features, but, after walking through with their architect and builder, none were found.

**Public Comment (name and address of commenters):**

Chair Parkes confirms the Commission has received three letters of support from neighbors.

Ron Cavallo, 70 Victoria Street. He supports the demolition. Considers the house marginal and considers it a benefit to the city to have the structure removed and believes this is an example of a smaller project that would benefit the city.

Luc Schuster, 60 Trull Street. Lives directly across the street and supports the project. This is the first time he has joined such a meeting, and he has heard stories of how the City makes it difficult for property owners to make these types of improvements, and he hopes that is not the case for this project.

Thomas Halls raised his hand but was unable to unmute himself to provide comment.

Chair Parkes closes the public comment portion of the hearing.

### **Commission Discussion:**

Vice-Chair Kelly states there is no historic material present and doesn't see historic or architectural merit to save the building from demolition. Chair Parkes notes that he walked down the street, and although he is typically deferential to even the massing it lacks a connection and integrity other than the overall gable shape. He is not inclined to find the building significant.

Mr. Bauer states he agrees there is not much detail left, but the basic envelope is intact and it is near 200 years old. Mr. Bauer continues that the Commission has determined other buildings with no more special features as significant and that there is enough to determine it significant. Vice-Chair Kelly states the alteration of the fenestration, and 1950s bathroom and mudroom additions that have changed the massing as reasons that she doesn't think there is enough there to be saved.

Chair Parkes states that if it had its original foundation or original rhythm, or even if they know when it was built, he would be more inclined to consider it significant. He acknowledges Mr. Bauer's point, but states he is leaning toward not significant.

Mr. Bingham states the structure has lost its character and has been successively modified in a poorly done manner. He considers it an insignificant building, which was moved to the location. They don't know exactly when the building was constructed, and it isn't associated with any persons or activities of note.

Mr. Falvey agrees it is not significant.

### **Motion:**

Vice-Chair Kelly motions to find the property historically significant. Mr. Bingham seconds.

### **Vote (roll call):**

1-4 (Mr. Bauer – yes; Chair Parkes – no; Mr. Falvey – no; Vice-Chair Kelly – no; Mr. Bingham - no)

**RESULT:** Property determined **NOT** Historically Significant

### **Findings:**

It does not contribute to the streetscape, is not associated with any persons or activities of historical significance.

### **Vote (roll call):**

1-4 (Mr. Bauer – no; Chair Parkes – yes; Mr. Falvey – yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – yes; Mr. Bingham - yes)

## **2. HPC.DMO 2022.10 – 3 Prescott**

**Applicant:** Damian & Penny Mangino

**Owner:** 3 Prescott St Nominee Trust

*The Applicant seeks to demolish a principal structure constructed a minimum of 75 years ago.*

**Comments from Applicant team:**

Damian Mangino, the Applicant, reviews the project and states his parents purchased the building. They own the building next door, where they have lived since 2001. The Applicant plans to build a net-zero two-family building that will be custom made.

**Public Comment (name and address of commenters):**

Ron Cavallo, 70 Victoria Street. He supports this proposal, including the demolition of the building and the proposed construction of a net-zero two-family, which will create revenue for the city.

**Commission Discussion:**

Mr. Bingham states he doesn't see any architectural merit in the building, and as a concrete block building with metal windows, doesn't see it as a significant structure. Vice-Chair Kelly agrees with Mr. Bingham. Chair Parkes agrees and notes that it appears the brickwork on the side has been replaced and there are no remaining details. Mr. Bauer agrees.

**Motion**

Vice-Chair Kelly moves to find the building historically significant.  
Mr. Bingham seconds.

**Vote (roll call):**

5-0 unanimously against (Mr. Falvey – no; Vice-Chair Kelly – no; Mr. Bingham – no; Mr. Bauer – no; Chair Parkes – no)

**RESULT:** Building **NOT** Historically Significant

**Findings:**

Not associated with historical time, person; lacks integrity; does not contribute to the streetscape.

Vice-Chair Kelly moves to adopt those findings. Mr. Bingham seconds. 5-0, unanimously approved.

**Vote (roll call):**

**5-0 unanimous** (Mr. Falvey – yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – yes; Mr. Bingham – yes; Mr. Bauer – yes; Chair Parkes – yes)

**3. HPC.DMO 2022.11 – 9 Union Square**

Applicant: Hamilton Construction Management, represented by Michael Sambuceti

Owner: Union 2 Associates, represented by Carol Rash

*The Applicant seeks to demolish a principal structure constructed a minimum of 75 years ago.*

**Comments from Applicant team:**

Michael Sambuceti, representative for the Applicant, explains that this demolition is for the rear portion, the four garage bays, only. He reviews the building and states he doesn't see any discernable style other than mid-20<sup>th</sup> century commercial.

**Public Comment (name and address of commenters):**

Ron Cavallo, 70 Victoria Street. He doesn't think the building is historically significant and thinks the proposal would bring revenue to the city, as well as an energy efficient building.

**Commission Discussion:**

Chair Parkes states that no letters or emails from the public were submitted.

Mr. Bingham notes he doesn't see much architectural merit, and no redeeming qualities, and it isn't associated with any people of note. Vice-Chair Kelly agrees with Mr. Bingham, and states the structure is devoid of architectural style and there is nothing to be salvaged. Mr. Falvey agrees. Mr. Bauer states he has nothing to add.

**Motion:**

Vice-Chair Kelly moves to find the building historically significant. Mr. Bauer seconds.

**Vote (roll call):**

5-0 unanimously against (Mr. Falvey – no; Vice-Chair Kelly – no; Mr. Bingham – no; Mr. Bauer – no; Chair Parkes – no)

**Findings:**

Does not possess historic significance due to architectural style, association with any person; doesn't contribute to the streetscape; doesn't retain adequate integrity to be historically significant.

Chair Parkes motions, Vice-Chair Kelly seconds.

**Vote (roll call):**

5-0 unanimous (Mr. Falvey – yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – yes; Mr. Bingham – yes; Mr. Bauer – yes; Chair Parkes – yes)

#### **IV. Determinations of Preferably Preserved (STEP 2 IN THE DEMOLITION REVIEW PROCESS)**

##### **1. HPC.DMO 2022.13 – 32 White Street**

Applicant: SGL Development, Inc.

Owner: Gary F. Shea & Teresa A. Grove

*The Applicant seeks to demolish a principal structure constructed a minimum of 75 years ago.*

##### **Comments from Applicant team:**

Attorney for the Applicant, Adam Dash, 48 Grove Street, reviews the proposal for the property. He provides a presentation, showing Porter Square and the property in question, as well as the other properties that are proposed to be demolished as part of the project, including 40 and 44 White Street. He explains that although the Applicant conceded historic significance, he requests the Commission determine the property not preferably preserved.

##### **Public Comment (name and address of commenters):**

Ron Cavallo, 70 Victoria Street. Mr. Cavallo supports the demolition although with the condition that the gothic break boards be preserved offsite. He states he is fully supportive of the demolition of the two adjacent buildings as well and emphasizes the benefit of the area's redevelopment to the city.

##### **Commission Discussion:**

Vice-Chair Kelly states that while she agrees the property is historically significant and retains important details, she doesn't see it as preferably preserved. She agrees that if it is possible to save the break boards, that would be a benefit.

Mr. Bingham agrees with Vice-Chair Kelly, and he doesn't see the building as related to any important persons or events and it does not contribute to the streetscape, and the barge boards are just a fancy addition. He doesn't see the property as significant given the guidelines the Commission works with.

Mr. Bauer agrees, that although the building retains enough historic fabric to be significant, it doesn't retain enough to be preferably preserve. Mr. Falvey agrees with the rest of the Commission.

##### **Motion:**

Vice-Chair Kelly moves to find the property preferably preserved. Mr. Bauer seconds. Chair Parkes votes yes, all others no.

##### **Vote (roll call):**

4-1 (Chair Parkes yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – no; Mr. Falvey – no; Mr. Bauer – no; Mr. Bingham - no)

RESULT: Building found **NOT** Preferably Preserved

##### **Findings:**

Mr. Bingham: The massing and form have changed over the years, it lacks fenestration and significant details, and it is not associated with any persons of note.

Vice-Chair Kelly moves to find the building Preferably Preserved. Mr. Bauer seconds the motion.

4-1 (Mr. Bauer, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Falvey, and Vice-Chair Kelly for, Chair Parkes against).

**Vote (roll call):**

4-1 (Mr. Bauer – yes; Mr. Falvey – yes; Mr. Bingham – yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – yes; Chair Parkes – no)

**2. HPC.DMO 2022.14 – 44 White Street**

Applicant: SGL Development, Inc.

Owner: ETS Family Investments, LLC

*The Applicant seeks to demolish a principal structure constructed a minimum of 75 years ago*

**Comments from Applicant team**

Attorney for the Applicant, Adam Dash, 48 Grove Street, reviews the project proposal. He provides a presentation, showing a picture from 1870 and the changes that have been made, including a major addition and several other alterations, additions, and removals.

Chair Parkes asks how the applicant determined the building in the 1870 picture was the building at 44 White Street. Adam Siegel from SGL Development reviews how they found the picture with the church, and Charlie Sullivan found a note stating it was the same house. Chair Parkes notes the eave line doesn't line up in the same way, and wonders if this is a different building. Preservation Planning notes that the picture is a painting rather than a photograph, and from historic maps the pond is in a different location.

**Public Comment (name and address of commenters)**

Thomas Halls has his hand raised but was unable to unmute himself.

Ron Cavallo, 70 Victoria Street. Cavallo believes the building has no architectural value, and the property has important economic value to the city as a development site.

Mary Kay Severino, states she is one of the owners of 46 White Street, but also one of the owners of this property. 105 Montville Ave, Woburn, MA. States she grew up in the building and she and her brother grew up in Somerville. She states that it has been a multi-generational family goal to develop 44 White Street, and that she is speaking on behalf of her brother and her mother, who still lives at 46 White Street. She states her parents completely redid the interior and exterior of the home in the 1970s. The siding is red cedar vertical siding. The interior was completely gutted in the early 1980s. She continues that although it is a bittersweet move, they believe it is the right move for Porter Square, where a single-family house is out of place.

**Commission Discussion:**

Vice-Chair Kelly states that aside from the steep gables, she doesn't believe there is much in terms of architectural significance. She does not see it as preferably preserved. Mr. Bauer agrees.

Mr. Bingham sees the property as an anomaly and is unlike anything else in Somerville. Mr. Bingham notes that, due to the radical changes, it has lost qualities that would have allowed it to be determined preferably preserved.

Mr. Falvey concurs with Mr. Bingham.

Chair Parkes states that the houses on that side of the street add character and shouldn't be removed just because they are different from what is proposed from the other side of the street. However, in this case, he agrees the building doesn't rise to the level of preferably preserved.

Mr. Falvey appreciates the history that Ms. Severino provided on the property. Mr. Bauer agrees that the building should not be considered preferably preserved and expresses his appreciation for the historic photos of the area.

**Motion:**

Vice-Chair Kelly moves to determine the property to be preferably preserved, Mr. Bingham seconds.

**Vote (roll call):**

0-5 unanimously against. (Mr. Falvey – no; Vice-Chair Kelly – no; Mr. Bingham – no; Mr. Bauer – no; Chair Parkes – no)

**RESULT:** Property determined **NOT** Preferably Preserved

**Findings:**

The property lacks sufficient integrity, is not associated with any significant person, historic, or cultural activity. Vice-Chair Kelly motions, Mr. Bingham seconds. 5-0 unanimously passes.

**Vote (roll call):**

5-0 unanimous adoption (Mr. Falvey-yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – yes; Mr. Bingham – yes; Mr. Bauer – yes, Chair Parkes – yes)

**V. Other Business**

- Minutes 01/18, 02/15, 3/15, 3/28

Mr. Bauer suggests continuing the minutes due to the late hour. Preservation Staff states that, due to open meeting law, the Commission should take up the January and February minutes.

**01/18 minutes:**

Mr. Bauer moves to approve the minutes for 01/18. Vice-Chair Kelly seconds.

**Vote (roll call):**

5-0 unanimously approved (Mr. Falvey – yes; Mr. Bingham – yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – yes; Mr. Bauer – yes; Chair Parkes – yes)

**02/15 minutes:**

Vice-Chair Kelly notes one typo, the second spelling of Ron Cavallo's name. Vice-Chair Kelly asks for clarification on whether a comment should be added to the minutes if a member of the public stated something that is incorrect. Preservation Staff states that is not the purpose of the minutes, regardless of whether it is correct or not. Chair Parkes concurs, that the minutes are just a reflection of what was said.

Mr. Falvey moves to approve the minutes for 02/15. Mr. Bauer seconds. 5-0 unanimously approved.

**3/15 minutes:**

Chair Parkes notes a correction to his name. Mr. Bauer notes one additional typo related to Chair Parkes' name. Mr. Bauer states that there are certain places where the roll-call vote was stated but it doesn't review the details of the vote. White asks if the Commission

Vice-Chair Kelly moves to approve the March 15 minutes as amended. Mr. Bauer seconds.

**Vote (roll call):**

4-0-1 (Mr. Falvey – abstain; Chair Parkes – yes; Vice-Chair Kelly – yes; Mr. Bingham – yes; Mr. Bauer – yes)

- **CPC update**

Mr. Bingham states he was not present for the last CPC meeting, so he has nothing to report but expects a substantial report after the next CPC meeting.

## **VI. Adjournment**

- Motion to adjourn at 10:47 PM and roll call vote. Mr. Falvey motions, Mr. Bauer seconds. 5-0 unanimously approved.

*NOTICE: These minutes constitute a summary of the votes and key discussions at this meeting. To review a full recording, log into the remote meeting session. The meeting link can be found by clicking on the appropriate meeting date on the City calendar <https://www.somervillema.gov/events> or through the meeting agenda link found at the start of these minutes.*