



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
JOSEPH A. CURTATONE
MAYOR

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

October 19, 2011

Joanne Turco
420 Medford Street
Somerville, MA 02144

Re: HPC 11.104 – 420 Medford Street Garage, Somerville, MA

Dear Ms. Turco,

On Tuesday, October 18, 2011, the Somerville Historic Preservation Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to make the initial determination that the brick garage at 420 Medford Street is not “significant” under section 2.17, Criteria B as set forth in the Demolition Review Ordinance #2003-05, section 4.2. under section B. ▼

If you have any questions about this letter, please feel free to contact us at (617) 625-6600 x 2500.

Sincerely,

Kristi Chase
Preservation Planner

Cc: Paul Nonni, Sr. Building Inspector, Inspectional Services Division.
John Long, City Clerk
Dick Bauer, Chairman, Somerville Historic Preservation Commission

Deleted: June 16, 2010

Deleted: Stephen & Ron Trombley

Deleted: 152 Central Street

Formatted: English (U.S.)

Deleted: 5

Deleted: 10.50 – 8 Partridge Avenue

Formatted: English (U.S.)

Deleted: r. Trombley

Deleted: June 15, 2010

Deleted: 5

Deleted: single family residence

Deleted: 8 Partridge Avenue

Deleted: This was because the building was (Section 2.17) “at least 50 years old, and is or has been determined by the Commission to be a significant building or structure after a finding that the building or structure is either: ¶

i. . . “Importantly associated with one or more historic persons or events, or with the broad architectural, cultural, political, economic or social history of the City or the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or ¶

ii. . . “Historically or architecturally significant (in terms of period, style, method of building construction, or association with a reputed architect or builder) either by itself or in the context of a group of buildings or structures, and therefore it is in the public interest to be preserved or rehabilitated rather than to be demolished.” ¶

Specifically, the significance of the building is: associated with a group of 5-6 similar buildings apparently developed with the rest of the street by Horace Partridge before 1884. It shares a common roofline and massing with several other buildings on the street ... [1]

Deleted: George Proakis, Director of Planning



CITY HALL • 93 HIGHLAND AVENUE • SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS 02143
(617) 625-6600 EXT. 2500 • TTY: (617) 666-0001 • FAX: (617) 625-0722

www.somervillema.gov



This was because the building was (Section 2.17) “at least 50 years old, and is or has been determined by the Commission to be a significant building or structure after a finding that the building or structure is either:

- i. *“Importantly associated with one or more historic persons or events, or with the broad architectural, cultural, political, economic or social history of the City or the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or*
- ii. *“Historically or architecturally significant (in terms of period, style, method of building construction, or association with a reputed architect or builder) either by itself or in the context of a group of buildings or structures, and therefore it is in the public interest to be preserved or rehabilitated rather than to be demolished.”*

Specifically, the significance of the building is: associated with a group of 5-6 similar buildings apparently developed with the rest of the street by Horace Partridge before 1884. It shares a common roofline and massing with several other buildings on the street. According to the maps, Partridge owned this house and neighboring ones through 1900, suggesting that these were designed as rental properties. The size and massing are similar to other groups of workers’ housing found throughout the City. Partridge was a dealer in "fancy goods" with a shop on Hanover Street, Boston. One can still find trade cards for his business. Online someone posted: "Horace Partridge, jeweler, printer, and land developer according to the 1874 city directory.”

Your building retains the massing and form characteristic of the neighborhood. The iteration and repetition of the roof lines and the eave returns form the rhythm of the streetscape. The Commission was particularly interested that those aspects of the building be retained.

The Commission will be holding a public hearing on Tuesday, July 20, 2010 to review the SHPC’s initial determination of “significance” and whether the building should be “preferably preserved” as per section 4.3 “that it is in the public interest to be preserved or rehabilitated rather than to be demolished.” As part of the hearing, the Commission would particularly like to hear about your plans for retention of the roof line and eave returns characteristic of the neighborhood as part of any reconstruction and enlargement of the building.

While the ordinance requires the Applicant to submit photos and building descriptions, these materials have been prepared by the HPC Staff to aid in the initial determination of ‘significance.’ Should you have additional information that you believe could effect the determination, the Commission requests their submission for Staff review within one week of the public hearing which would be by Tuesday, July 13th. Public testimony will be taken at the hearing, followed by discussion and a vote by the Commission.

It should also be noted as per sec 4.7 that “anyone who voluntarily demolishes a significant building or structure without complying fully with the provisions of this ordinance shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$300” per violation levied daily, and that “no building permit shall be issued for a new building or structure on any premises

where a significant building or structure is voluntarily demolished in violation of this ordinance for a period of two (2) years after the date of demolition.”

According to the Demolition Review Ordinance, demolition (sec. 2.9) means “the act of pulling down, destroying, removing, or razing a building or structure or commencing the work of total or substantial destruction with the intent of completing the same. For the purposes of this ordinance, the term “demolition” shall not include routine maintenance, interior renovations, or other types of renovations for which Commission approval is generally not required.” And that voluntarily (sec. 2.19) means “any act(s) done by design or intention, which is proposed, intended, or not accidental. An Act of God is not considered voluntary, but rather is regarded as an act done without the will or choice of the applicant (or owner, if different from applicant). For the purposes of this chapter, the destruction of a significant building or structure for failure to properly secure it shall be considered voluntary.”