



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS

CONDOMINIUM REVIEW BOARD

JACOB D. WILSON

MAYOR

Monday, June 29, 2026

6:00 pm

Staff Liaison & Housing Policy Coordinator

Lauren Chapman

Board Members

Zachary Zasloff, Chair

Kate Byrne, Vice-Chair

Alix Simeon

Jennifer Tsolas

Meeting Minutes

June 29, 2026 – 6:00 PM

Virtual Hearing

Board Members present: Zachary Zasloff, Kate Byrne, Alix Simeon, Jennifer Tsolas

Staff present: Lauren Chapman, Housing Policy Coordinator; Joseph Theall, Housing Counsel; Lisa Davidson, Director of Housing

Chair Zasloff convened the meeting at 6:06PM. He read the following information aloud: Pursuant to Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2025, this meeting of the Condominium Review Board will be conducted via remote participation. We will post an audio recording, audio-video recording, transcript, or other comprehensive record of these proceedings as soon as possible after the meeting on the City of Somerville website and local cable access government channels.

1. MEETING CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order with a call for attendance made by Chair Zasloff. Responses were as follows:

Chair Zasloff Present

Vice-Chair Byrne Present

Member Simeon Present

Member Tsolas Present

With four in attendance there was a quorum, and the meeting was called to order.

2. ADMININSTRATIVE

a. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENT

i. JULY MEETING CANCELLATION

Staff liaison Lauren Chapman announced that the July 27, 2026 Condominium Review Board meeting had been canceled due to scheduling conflicts that prevented the Board from achieving quorum. Ms. Chapman noted that the Board's next meeting would be held in August.

ii. APPLICATION FEE INCREASES BEGINNING JULY 1, 2026

Staff liaison announced that, following the City's annual review of program fees as part of the budget process, the Condominium Conversion application fee increased to \$800 per unit, effective July 1, 2026. Staff also noted that the Condominium Review Board materials and webpage would be updated to reflect the revised fee.

b. MEETING MINUTES

i. MAY 2026

Chair Zasloff opened the floor for comments or edits to the May 2026 meeting minutes; seeing none, the floor was closed.

On a motion duly made a roll call vote was called and it was voted 3-0:

Chair Zasloff – yes

Vice-Chair Byrne – yes

Member Simeon – yes

To approve the meeting minutes for May 2026.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a. APPLICATIONS FOR FINAL OR COURTESY PERMITS

WARD 3 PRECINCT 2

12 Pleasant Avenue

Application of SCLT Community Land LLC, Benjamin Baldwin, seeking a Final Conversion Permit for Unit #1, Unit #2, Unit #3, Unit #4, Unit #5 and Unit #6 at 12 Pleasant Avenue. Andrés Bueno attended as representative on behalf of the applicant and stated that all eligible households had received relocation benefits, tenants exercising their right of first refusal had been provided draft purchase and sale agreements, and all outstanding documentation had been submitted to the Board for consideration of final conversion permits.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to the Board; seeing no comment, the floor was closed.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to public comment; seeing none, the floor was closed.

On a motion duly made a roll call vote was called and it was voted 4–0:

Chair Zasloff – yes

Vice-Chair Byrne – yes

Member Simeon – yes

Member Tsolas – yes

To grant a Final Conversion Permit for Unit #1, Unit #2, Unit #3, Unit #4, Unit #5, and Unit #6 at 12 Pleasant Avenue.

WARD 1 PRECINCT 4

17 MacArthur Street

Application of 17 MacArthur Street CBC, LLC seeking a Final Conversion Permit for Unit A, Unit B and Unit C and a Courtesy Permit for Unit R at 17 MacArthur Street. Jonathan Landry attended as representative and stated that the property was formerly a single-family, owner-occupied home and had been converted into a three-family dwelling with a detached

accessory dwelling unit. He confirmed that all outstanding documentation had been submitted to the Board for consideration of a Final Conversion Permit for Units A, B, and C and a Courtesy Permit for Unit R.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to the Board; seeing no comment, the floor was closed.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to public comment; seeing none, the floor was closed.

On a motion duly made a roll call vote was called and it was voted 4–0:

Chair Zasloff – yes

Vice-Chair Byrne – yes

Member Simeon – yes

Member Tsolas – yes

To grant a Final Conversion Permit for Unit A, Unit B, and Unit C and a Courtesy Permit for Unit R at 17 MacArthur Street.

WARD 7 PRECINCT 1

37 Kingston Street

Application of 37 Kingston St Somerville LLC, Jason Santana, seeking a Final Conversion Permit for Unit A and a Courtesy Permit for Unit B and Unit R at 37 Kingston Street. Jason Santana attended as representative and stated that the property had previously received preliminary conversion permits and that all outstanding documentation had been submitted to the Board for consideration of a Final Conversion Permit for Unit A and Courtesy Permits for Units B and R.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to the Board; seeing no comment, the floor was closed.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to public comment; seeing none, the floor was closed.

On a motion duly made a roll call vote was called and it was voted 4–0:

Chair Zasloff – yes

Vice-Chair Byrne – yes

Member Simeon – yes

Member Tsolas – yes

To grant a Final Conversion Permit for Unit A and a Courtesy Permit for Unit B and Unit R at 37 Kingston Street.

WARD 6 PRECINCT 4

2 Cottage Circle

Application of Yung Chang Chen seeking a Final Conversion Permit for Unit #1 and Unit #2 at 2 Cottage Circle. Catherine Chen attended as representative on behalf of the applicant and stated that the property had previously received preliminary conversion permits and that all outstanding documentation had been submitted to the Board for consideration of final conversion permits.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to the Board; seeing no comment, the floor was closed.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to public comment; seeing none, the floor was closed.

On a motion duly made a roll call vote was called and it was voted 4–0:

Chair Zasloff – yes

Vice-Chair Byrne – yes

Member Simeon – yes

Member Tsolas – yes

To grant a Final Conversion Permit for Unit #1 and Unit #2 at 2 Cottage Circle.

b. PRELIMINARY CONDOMINIUM CONVERSION PERMITS

WARD 1 PRECINCT 4A

85-87 Gilman Street

Application of Xiaomin Song & Xinsheng Chang seeking a Preliminary Non-Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #85 and a Preliminary Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #87 at 85-87 Gilman Street. Xiaomin Song attended on behalf of the applicants and stated that Unit #85 is owner-occupied, Unit #87 is tenant-occupied, and that the applicants had submitted the required application materials to the Board for consideration.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to the Board; seeing no comment, the floor was closed.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to public comment; seeing none, the floor was closed.

On a motion duly made a roll call vote was called and it was voted 4–0:

Chair Zasloff – yes

Vice-Chair Byrne – yes

Member Simeon – yes

Member Tsolas – yes

To grant a Preliminary Non-Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #85 and a Preliminary Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #87 at 85-87 Gilman Street.

Vice Chair Byrne recused herself from deliberation and voting on the application for 15–17 Oak Street. Chair Zasloff noted the recusal for the record and introduced the application.

WARD 2 PRECINCT 1

15-17 Oak Street

Application of Hope and Prospect Development LLC, Brian Cheng, seeking a Preliminary Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #1 & Unit #2 at 15 Oak Street and Unit #1 & Unit #2 at 17 Oak Street. Applicant to seek a Courtesy Permit for additional units at a later date. Attorney Mark Sheehan attended as representative on behalf of the applicant and confirmed that the property had been vacant since September 2025. He stated that all required application materials had been submitted and noted that the applicant intended to seek Courtesy Permits for additional units following future construction.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to Board discussion. Board Member Tsolas questioned whether the applicant's intent to convert may have formed while the property remained occupied, citing Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) proceedings in September 2025 citing potential demolition plans for the property while tenants still resided at the property. She expressed concern that, if intent had formed while the property was occupied, former tenants may have been entitled to additional protections under the Ordinance.

Housing Counsel explained that the application was before the Board as a vacant-property application and that applications are generally considered as submitted. He noted, however, that the Board has previously examined evidence regarding when intent to convert was formed and could consider such evidence if supported by the record.

Attorney Sheehan responded that the Historic Preservation Commission proceedings reflected routine development due diligence rather than a decision to create condominiums. He explained that developers frequently pursue historic review before determining a project's ultimate use and argued that, had the applicant intended to convert the property in 2025, it would have been advantageous to apply before the October 2025 amendments to the Ordinance took effect, rather than subjecting the project to the more restrictive two-year waiting period and increased relocation requirements.

Staff informed the Board that proper notice of the application had been provided to the former tenants and that City staff had conducted outreach by email and telephone but received no response.

Board Member Tsolas remained concerned that documents submitted to the Historic Preservation Commission demonstrated an earlier intent to redevelop the property and stated that she was not persuaded the applicant's intent to convert had arisen only after the property became vacant.

Chair Zasloff acknowledged that Board members could reasonably differ regarding when intent may have formed but stated that, absent testimony or additional evidence establishing an earlier intent to convert, the Board was obligated to consider the application within the framework of the Ordinance. Housing Counsel further advised that the Board could approve the application as presented, deny the application if it determined the applicant had not satisfied the Ordinance, or seek additional fact-finding regarding the issue of intent.

Chair Zasloff then reviewed the application materials, noting that notice had been provided, the applicable waiting period was two years, all units were vacant, and the Certificate of Good Standing, final paid water bill, and required application fee had been received. He further noted that the Master Deed and Engineer's Report remained outstanding and proposed approval of the application conditioned upon submission of those materials.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to public comment; seeing no speakers, the floor was closed.

On a motion duly made, a roll call vote was called and it was voted 2–1:

Chair Zasloff – yes

Member Simeon – yes

Member Tsolas – no

To grant a Preliminary Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #1 and Unit #2 at 15 Oak Street and Unit #1 and Unit #2 at 17 Oak Street.

WARD 5 PRECINCT 4

57A Cherry Street

Application of 57 Cherry Street Real Estate Trust, James P. Douglas Manager, seeking a Preliminary Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #1, Unit #2, and Unit #3 at 57A Cherry Street. Attorney Matthew Spang attended as representative on behalf of the applicant and stated that the application had previously been before the Board in March 2026 and had been tabled due to questions regarding whether relocation payments were subject to the previous or amended Ordinance requirements. Attorney Spang stated that, following discussions with City staff, Housing Counsel, and the Housing Director, the applicant had reached an agreement with the tenants and provided relocation payments. He stated that the applicant had submitted documentation of the relocation payments, tenant acknowledgements, certified mail receipts confirming receipt of payments, an updated final water bill, and an updated Certificate of Good Standing.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to the Board. Housing Counsel noted that the application included a mutual release agreement between the applicant and former tenants acknowledging receipt of relocation payments and requested that, if the Board approved the application, the Board authorize Staff Liaison Lauren Chapman to execute the agreement on behalf of the Board.

Chair Zasloff acknowledged the tenant agreement and thanked Attorney Spang for working with the former tenants to address the relocation payment requirements under the Ordinance. Chair Zasloff reviewed the application materials and noted that the Board had received the tenant acknowledgements, documentation of relocation payments, Certificate of Good Standing, paid final water bill, quitclaim deed, and application fee. Chair Zasloff noted that the Master Deed and Engineer's Report remained outstanding and proposed approval of the application conditioned upon submission of those materials at a future date.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to public comment; seeing no speakers, the floor was closed.

On a motion duly made, a roll call vote was called and it was voted 4-0:

Chair Zasloff – yes

Vice-Chair Byrne – yes

Member Simeon – yes

Member Tsolas – yes

To grant a Preliminary Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #1, Unit #2, and Unit #3 at 57A Cherry Street.

WARD 3 PRECINCT 1
43 Boston Street

Application of 43 Boston LLC, James P. Douglas, Caitlin M. Merullo, and Lucas Mendes Garcia, seeking a Preliminary Non-Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #1 at 43 Boston Street. Applicant to seek a Courtesy Permit for additional units at a later date. Attorney Matthew Spang attended as representative on behalf of the applicant and stated that the property had previously been an owner-occupied single-family home prior to the applicant purchasing the property. Attorney Spang stated that the applicant had submitted the completed application materials, including the application fee, quitclaim deed, affidavit from the prior owner confirming owner occupancy, twelve months of gas and utility bills in the prior owner's name, paid final water bill, and Certificate of Good Standing.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to the Board. Vice-Chair Byrne requested clarification regarding the Board's interpretation of Courtesy Permits, specifically whether Courtesy Permits could apply to additional units created through construction attached to an existing structure.

Housing Counsel explained that the Ordinance references Courtesy Permits but does not provide a specific definition. Housing Counsel stated that the Board has previously established precedent allowing Courtesy Permits for additional units created through alterations or additions to existing housing accommodations, including basement or attic conversions, where the additional space was treated

as new construction. Housing Counsel further explained that the Board's prior practice distinguishes between converting existing portions of a structure, which require conversion permits, and newly constructed additions, which may qualify for Courtesy Permits.

Housing Counsel provided an analogy comparing existing structures and new additions to building blocks, explaining that a newly constructed addition separate from the existing converted space may qualify for a Courtesy Permit.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to public comment; seeing no speakers, the floor was closed.

On a motion duly made, a roll call vote was called and it was voted 4–0:

Chair Zasloff – yes

Vice-Chair Byrne – yes

Member Simeon – yes

Member Tsolas – yes

To grant a Preliminary Non-Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #1 at 43 Boston Street.

WARD 2 PRECINCT 2

62 Line Street

Application of 60-62 Line Street LLC, William Pino & John Hadley, seeking a Preliminary Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #1, Unit #2, and Unit #3 at 62 Line Street. Applicant to seek a Courtesy Permit for additional unit at a later date. Attorney Anne Vigorito attended as representative on behalf of the applicant and stated that the applicant had submitted a completed application, paid final water bill with receipt, Certificate of Good Standing, quitclaim deed dated May 7, 2025, corporate summary for 60-62 Line Street LLC, and application fee totaling \$1,800. She stated that the property was purchased vacant on May 7, 2025 and had remained vacant since that time. Additionally, the detached cottage had not yet been constructed and that the applicant intended for it to become part of the 62 Line Street Condominium.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to the Board. Chair Zasloff asked whether the applicant intended to seek the Courtesy Permit for 62R Line Street as part of the current application or at a later date. Attorney Vigorito stated that the applicant was seeking the Courtesy Permit as part of the current application but acknowledged that the detached cottage would not be eligible for review until the necessary building permit had been approved.

Staff Liaison Lauren Chapman informed the Board that, based on the submitted application materials, there was no approved building permit for the backyard cottage included with the application and, therefore, the additional unit was not eligible for a Courtesy Permit at this time.

Attorney Vigorito stated that the applicant would return to the Board to seek a Courtesy Permit once the building permit had been approved.

Vice-Chair Byrne asked whether the property's proximity to the Cambridge boundary raised any additional considerations. Attorney Vigorito stated that, to her knowledge, the property was located entirely within Somerville and did not overlap into Cambridge. Housing Counsel further explained that Cambridge does not have a local condominium conversion ordinance and noted that the Board has previously reviewed situations where a property crossed

municipal boundaries. Chair Zasloff noted that, if the property were located in both municipalities, separate permitting requirements would generally apply.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to public comment; seeing no speakers, the floor was closed.

On a motion duly made, a roll call vote was called and it was voted 4–0:

Chair Zasloff – yes

Vice-Chair Byrne – yes

Member Simeon – yes

Member Tsolas – yes

To grant a Preliminary Rental Conversion Permit for Unit #1, Unit #2, and Unit #3 at 62 Line Street

WARD 2 PRECINCT 1

33 Preston Road

Application of Tufted Titmouse Revocable Trust, Kirin Kachroo-Levine, seeking a Preliminary Rental Conversion Permit for Unit A, Unit B and Unit C and a Courtesy Permit for Unit R at 33 Preston Road. Attorney Mark Sheehan, representing the applicant, presented the application for a Preliminary Rental Conversion Permit for Units A, B, and C and a Courtesy Permit for the newly constructed backyard cottage, Unit R. The applicant submitted the required application materials, including the deed, paid final water bill, certificate of good standing, and \$1,800 application fee.

Attorney Sheehan stated that Units A, B, and C are currently occupied by tenants and provided an overview of the tenant documentation submitted with the application. He explained that all tenants received tenant information packets and signed affidavits waiving their rights under the Condominium Conversion Ordinance. He stated that the tenants reviewed the materials, signed the documents voluntarily through a mobile notary, and were provided with information regarding tenant rights and available resources, including contact information for Condo Review Board staff and the Office of Housing Stability (OHS).

Attorney Sheehan provided additional updates regarding each tenant:

The Unit A tenant entered into an agreement to purchase the unit from the applicant and will remain in the property.

The Unit B tenants notified the applicant prior to discussions regarding condo conversion that they intended to vacate the property at the expiration of their lease due to other opportunities.

The Unit C tenant entered into a lease extension through August 2027 at the same rental rate after being referred to OHS.

During board discussion, members raised concerns regarding the Unit B tenant's understanding of the waiver. Board members discussed whether the tenant's waiver was made knowingly and voluntarily after the tenant later expressed concerns about the process. Board Member Tsolas emphasized the importance of ensuring that tenants fully understand their rights under the Condominium Conversion Ordinance.

Staff provided an update on outreach efforts regarding the Unit B tenant. Staff reported that, following an initial conversation with the tenant, the tenant and other residents were referred to OHS on June 5, 2026. Staff coordinated with OHS regarding follow-up outreach and contacted the tenant again on June 25, 2026, requesting confirmation of whether concerns had been resolved; no response was received. Staff also notified the applicant's attorney of the tenant's concerns prior to the hearing.

Attorney Sheehan clarified that the Unit B tenants informed the applicant they intended to vacate prior to any discussion of condo conversion, and therefore the decision to leave the property was unrelated to the conversion process. He reiterated that the tenants had received the required disclosures, had time to review the documents, and signed the affidavits through a notarized process.

Attorney Theall advised the Board that under the Board's rules, a tenant waiver must be knowing and voluntary. He noted that the submitted affidavits, tenant information packets, and notarization provided documentation supporting that the waivers were executed knowingly and voluntarily. He further advised that a determination that a waiver was not valid would require evidence beyond a tenant's subsequent change of mind or uncertainty.

Following discussion regarding the tenant waiver concerns and staff outreach efforts, Chair Zasloff stated that, in his view, the Board had conducted appropriate due diligence and expressed concern that delaying the application could result in an unnecessary delay. Board Member Tsolas questioned whether the Board had fully addressed the Unit B tenant's concerns and sought additional confirmation that the tenant had been afforded an opportunity to understand and exercise any applicable rights.

During this discussion, Board Member Tsolas expressed disagreement with the characterization of the discussion and stated her resignation from the Condo Review Board. Board Member Tsolas then left the meeting.

Attorney Sheehan provided additional clarification regarding the tenant waivers, including that the affidavits were notarized, tenants were provided tenant information packets outlining their rights, and the tenants had opportunities to review the materials prior to signing. Attorney Theall advised the Board that, under the Board's rules, a waiver must be knowing and voluntary and stated that the documentation in the record supported that the waivers were executed knowingly and voluntarily. He further noted that a later change in perspective or uncertainty would not, by itself, establish that a waiver was invalid.

Following the discussion, the Board proceeded with consideration of the application.

Chair Zasloff opened the floor to public comment; seeing no speakers, the floor was closed.

On a motion duly made, a roll call vote was called and it was voted 2–1:

Chair Zasloff – yes

Vice-Chair Byrne – no

Member Simeon – yes

To grant a Preliminary Rental Conversion Permit for Unit A, Unit B and Unit C and a Courtesy Permit for Unit R at 33 Preston Road.

4. ADJOURN

Chair Zasloff motioned to adjourn at 7:44pm which Vice-Chair Byrne seconded. The meeting was adjourned.