SOUTH END LANDMARKS DISTRICT COMMISSION APPLICATION

Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción - Villa Victoria Center for the Arts & Preschool
85 West Newton Street, Boston, MA

10.15.2019
PROJECT DESCRIPTION
**Description of Proposed Work**

### 85 West Newton Street – Summary of Recent History and Progress:

Villa Victoria Center for the Arts at 85 West Newton Street is comprised of a building that served as a Lutheran church and parish house. Constructed in 1899, the building sits on a 9,300 square foot (sf) lot. Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción (IBA) purchased the property in 1986 and has operated it since then as a cultural center and preschool.

IBA obtained approval from the South End Landmarks District Commission (SELDCC) in 2017 for an exterior rehabilitation of the existing structure and proceeded in the fall of 2017 with Shawmut Design and Construction (Shawmut) to execute the scope of work. As the work progressed in the spring of 2018, it became progressively apparent that the original scope could not be executed as designed and priced, as there were extensive failures of the structure at and surrounding the west corner of the main building, encompassing the corner tower and the adjacent portion of the northwest wall and roof.

After thorough investigation of the conditions, a comprehensive revised scope was prepared by Gale Associates, the engineer of record for the project, and a detailed conceptual estimate was prepared by Shawmut. The revised estimate to achieve the original exterior scope was an additional $12.4 million on top of the original price of $10.9 million for a total of $23.3 million. As this amount far exceeded the budget and available resources, the work was halted in July 2018 and the building was shored, the steeple and belfry removed to protect public safety, and building occupancy limited to the parish house and portions of the lower level which houses the preschool.

In the interim, IBA, hired the team of Kennedy & Volich Architecture (KVA) working with BuroHappold Engineering and Jensen Hughes to fully evaluate its options going forward. The team reviewed the information available from prior work to date and investigated the property. They identified six alternatives that would allow IBA to fulfill its mission of providing a vibrant cultural center and preschool for the community. Given its detailed knowledge of the building, Shawmut developed detailed conceptual cost estimates for each of the six alternatives which ranged from full rehabilitation to full demolition of the existing buildings.

Two alternatives considered leaving the building largely intact and completing the originally proposed rehabilitation, essentially with the same functions in the same locations. A third alternative accommodated an expansion of the usable building floor area by removal of the roof to allow the construction of additional levels. Three additional alternatives included demolition of some or all of the existing structure and accommodated floor area expansion.

In June 2019, the IBA team met with the SELDC to provide an update on the project and a summary of the six alternatives.

Since then, two things have occurred.

1. BuroHappold confirmed that both the tower and western end of the northwest wall are not stable and in danger of collapse. Please see their September 25, 2019 letter included in this application. That letter BuroHappold recommends also says that demolition of the tower and western end of the northwest wall of the wall are recommended in the near future to protect public safety. It also notes The letter says that the remaining adjacent masonry
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walls would then no longer be stable and may also need to be demolished for safety reasons
unless they can be stabilized.
The version of a project that incorporates the substantial added cost of the necessary
elaborate temporary bracing and weather protection, as well as the redundant earthquake-
safe foundations adjacent to the existing stone foundations and the multiple connections
between the new components of a structure and the salvaged façade elements, would be
prohibitively expensive. IBA does not have the economic resources to incorporate salvaged
portions of the building into a completed project.
2. The Boston Fire Department determined on September 20, 2019 that the cultural center
including the parish house and preschool are no longer safe for any occupancy and required
the property be vacated that day. The Inspectional Services Department (ISD) inspector that
IBA has been working to allow for temporary occupancy of the parish house and preschool
accepted this determination and revoked the ISD Temporary Certificate of Occupancy. The
preschool and office uses have been relocated and the building is now vacant.

Analysis and conclusion:
As presented at the June 3, 2019 SELDC meeting, the cost analysis made clear that the six
alternatives fall into two categories. The first three alternatives (rehabilitation or rehabilitation
with a raised roof) would result in the expenditure, beyond the sunk cost to date of $300/sf, of
more than $1,000/sf if the roof is kept and $628/sf if IBA and the property management office
space can be added to the program to mitigate the cost. All of these alternatives are cost
prohibitive.
The other three alternatives (demolition of part or all of the building and new construction) are
in the range of $500/sf – a reduction of $10 million when compared to the two rehabilitation
alternatives and a reduction of $3 to $4.5 million from the third alternative that keeps the
exterior walls but removes the roof.
The prospect of raising and spending another $10 to $11.5 million is a daunting one, but it is
one that IBA is willing to take on and it hopes to succeed at. Raising an additional $3 to $10
million beyond that is not feasible.
Two of the three options that retain the church street façade or the parish house are within
the range of possible economic feasibility, based on Shawmut’s estimates. However, they
carry very significant financial uncertainties due to the complex and unpredictable nature of
knitting together elements of historic masonry with modern construction. The very palpable
risk of additional multi-million dollar overruns are deemed by IBA to be irresponsible given
its primary mission and commitment to developing low-income housing and community
services.
If the preservation of the street-facing southwest façade were to be accomplished without
any additional cost overruns, it would perpetuate the daunting separation between the space
and the community, which is imposed by the flight of stone steps and the large double
doors. At a practical level, differently-abled individuals cannot access the space except via a
switchback ramp into the parish house. At a programmatic and civic level, this architectural
arrangement, conceived in the middle ages to limit access, inspire awe, and define the
separation of the profane and the sacred, is in direct conflict with IBAs goals of inclusivity,
transparency, and connection. IBA is anxious to create a cultural center that welcomes all
people and connects to the street and to the adjacent O’Day Park and playground.
In addition to the risks of more complex construction, if the parish house were preserved, it
would commit IBA to an isolated, inefficient floorplate within the building and dictate floor-
to-floor heights that would not work for the other uses in the building. The parish house, at
its southeast elevation that faces the park, has small windows and a single, ground floor
entrance that make it effectively inaccessible to that important public space. IBA feels that the
parish house without the church is not a historical asset worth preserving given the burden it
places on the effectiveness of the cultural center and the economic burden to rehabilitate the
building coupled with new construction.
IBA has concluded that the most economically feasible and the most realistic option, and the
one it has chosen to pursue, is the removal of the building and construction of a new cultural
center and preschool with offices for IBA and the property manager. IBA relocating its offices
to 85 West Newton would allow it to repurpose its current office building at 405 Shawmut for
other uses to help further serve its mission. Most importantly, it would create a cultural center
and preschool that would continue to serve the IBA and wider community in a much more
effective way than any of the other alternatives.
IBA requests that the SELDC grant permission to demolish the building and allow a
redevelopment of the lot that creates a facility that is respectful of its architectural context
– at the nexus of the modern Villa Victoria neighborhood IBA created in the 1980s and the
historic neighborhood it has worked hard to preserve since the 1980s, including the current
rehabilitation of the entire block of low-income housing on the opposite side West Newton
Street.
This application for permission to demolish includes a request for a Certificate of Exemption
Based on Hardship. An important part of IBAs decision to seek this permission is that it
cannot raise or spend the massive resources or assume the additional risks that a complete or
partial historic rehabilitation would require.

Proposed Work:
IBA requests SELDC to approve demolition of the building. Provided SELDC approves
demolition, IBA will commence a community participation process to develop a design in
consultation with community and civic stakeholders, including SELDC commissioners and
staff, of a replacement structure of approximately six stories and 30,000 sf. The building will
accommodate all of the previous uses of the cultural center (performances, celebrations,
special events, arts display, education) and preschool, while adding offices IBAs office
operations and property management. A subsequent application would be made to SELDC for
review of the new construction.
PHOTOGRAPHS
Historic Photos - Exterior

Church and parsonage from south across site of current day O'Day Playground (ca. 1970)

Church and parsonage from west from site of current day Villa Victoria residences (ca. 1970)
Historic Photos - Exterior

Parsonage and church (in snow) from West Newton St (date unknown)

Northwest corner of church from Tremont St before mural painted (ca. 1986)

Photos of mural painted (ca. 1989)
Historic Photos - Interior

Church interior from north balcony prior to renovations (date unknown)
Church altar from north balcony prior to renovations (date unknown)
Organ in back balcony (date unknown)
Current Conditions - Exterior

Tower base behind scaffolding from Tremont St. (Winter 2018/2019)

Former parsonage and church from SW down West Newton St. (Winter 2018/2019)

Former parsonage and church from SE across O'Day Playground (Winter 2018/2019)

Former church down sunken alley from Aquadilla St. (Winter 2018/2019)
Current Conditions - Exterior

Former parsonage from West Newton St. (Winter 2018/2019)

Former parsonage across O’Day Playground (Winter 2018/2019)

Back wall of former parsonage from SE corner of site (Winter 2018/2019)

Preschool entrance addition in sunken SE corner courtyard. (Winter 2018/2019)
Current Conditions - Exterior

Scaffolded tower base (Spring 2019)
Delaminating face brick (Spring 2019)
Cracks, tests and old repairs (Spring 2019)
Buttress with old patches and repairs (Spring 2019)
Stone displacement in granite base (Spring 2019)
Protective scaffolding in alleyway (Spring 2019)
Boarded openings and mural (Spring 2019)
Current Conditions - Interior

Existing balcony (Spring 2019)
Stage from balcony (Spring 2019)
Probes and Shoring at roof framing (Spring 2019)
Interior tower shoring & reinforcement (Spring 2019)

Exterior wall probes and temp support (Spring 2019)
Interior finishes and millwork (Spring 2019)
Tower and roof support shoring from below (Spring 2019)
Current Conditions - Exterior

1. Lancet thresholds
2. Gray slate
3. Blonde Brick
4. Wood trim windows
5. Granite base

MATERIAL STUDY - Church

Peak of Steeple: 163'-2"
Peak of Turret: 83'-3"
Peak of Nave: 68'-2"
Peak of Parish Hall: 38'-4"
HISTORIC AND ARCHITECTURAL SIGNIFICANCE
Historic and Architectural Significance

Report on Historic and Architectural Significance
The Villa Victoria Center for the Arts/IBA Preschool is located at 85 West Newton Street in Boston's South End neighborhood. The former church and parish house is located within the South End National Register, Massachusetts State and local historic districts.

History
In 1857, the Church of the Unity, a Unitarian congregation, was organized to accommodate the German population in the South End of Boston. Two years later, The Church of the Unity building was constructed at present-day 85 West Newton Street. The building was designed by locally-renowned architect Rev. Thomas W. Silloway (Sammacco 2004; Marchione 2001). The Church of the Unity remained in use by the Unitarian congregation until 1898, when it was demolished.

The Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church and parish house (later the All Saints’ Lutheran Church, now Villa Victoria Center for the Arts/IBA Preschool), also designed by Silloway, were constructed on the site in 1898 (Bromley & Co. 1898, 1908; Marchione 2001). The church was constructed to accommodate the growing number of German Lutheran immigrants in the South End in the late nineteenth century. The Lutheran congregation worshipped in the church until 1959, when it moved to the newly-constructed First Lutheran Church located at the corner of Berkeley and Marlborough streets in the Back Bay. That same year, the property on West Newton Street was acquired by the newly formed All Saints’ Lutheran Church. The building remained in use as a church by the All Saints’ Lutheran Congregation into the 1980s (Sammacco 2004; Martinez 1988:7–10).

The Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción (IBA) was founded in 1968 and is one of the nation’s first community-based, non-profit organizations to maintain and expand low- and moderate-income housing and community spaces. IBA, led by Jorge Hernandez from 1979 to 1986, purchased the property in 1986. After acquiring the property, IBA renovated the building into a cultural center and performing arts venue for the city’s Hispanic community. In March 1986, a Hispanic Cultural Center was dedicated and officially opened in the building. That same year, the property on West Newton Street was acquired by the newly formed All Saints’ Lutheran Church. The building remained in use as a church by the All Saints’ Lutheran Congregation into the 1980s (Sammacco 2004; Martinez 1988:7–10).

The IBA purchased the property in 1986. After acquiring the property, IBA renovated the building into a cultural center and performing arts venue for the city’s Hispanic community. In March 1986, a Hispanic Cultural Center was dedicated and officially opened in the building. That same year, the property on West Newton Street was acquired by the newly formed All Saints’ Lutheran Church. The building remained in use as a church by the All Saints’ Lutheran Congregation into the 1980s (Sammacco 2004; Martinez 1988:7–10).

In 1898, the Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church and parish house (later the All Saints’ Lutheran Church, now Villa Victoria Center for the Arts/IBA Preschool), also designed by Silloway, were constructed on the site in 1898 (Bromley & Co. 1898, 1908; Marchione 2001). The church was constructed to accommodate the growing number of German Lutheran immigrants in the South End in the late nineteenth century. The Lutheran congregation worshipped in the church until 1959, when it moved to the newly-constructed First Lutheran Church located at the corner of Berkeley and Marlborough streets in the Back Bay. That same year, the property on West Newton Street was acquired by the newly formed All Saints’ Lutheran Church. The building remained in use as a church by the All Saints’ Lutheran Congregation into the 1980s (Sammacco 2004; Martinez 1988:7–10).

The Villa Victoria Center for the Arts/IBA Preschool is located at 85 West Newton Street in Boston's South End neighborhood. The property consists of a Gothic Revival-style church and parish house, which fill the majority of the property to its lot lines. A red brick city-owned sidewalk with granite curbing and evenly-spaced street trees separates the buildings from West Newton Street. O'Day Playground forms the site's southeast boundary with an areaway lined by a chain-link fence running along the building's southeast (side) elevation. A small sunken courtyard at the east corner provides access to the basement-level IBA Preschool. The back of the former church is built to the lot line with low-rise housing that is part of the Villa Victoria residential neighborhood. A sunken, gated alley accessed by stairs from West Newton Street and Aquadilla Street runs along the northwest edge of the site.

Architect
Thomas William Silloway (1828–1910) was born in Newburyport, MA. He moved to Boston in 1847, where he studied with local architect, Ammi B. Young, and began his own practice in 1851. He is credited with the designs of over 400 religious buildings in the eastern United States, in addition to notable government and educational buildings, such as the State Capitol in Montpelier, VT, Goddard Seminary in Barre, VT, and Butchel College in Akron, OH. In addition to a career as an architect, Silloway became a Universalist minister in 1862. He served congregations in Kingston, NH, Boston’s North End, and Brighton, MA. In 1867, he relinquished his post as minister in Brighton to focus on his architectural career (Marchione 2001).

Project Siting
Villa Victoria Center for the Arts/IBA Preschool is sited on the northeast side of West Newton Street in Boston’s South End neighborhood. The property consists of a Gothic Revival-style church and parish house, which fill the majority of the property to its lot lines. A red brick city-owned sidewalk with granite curbing and evenly-spaced street trees separates the buildings from West Newton Street. O'Day Playground forms the site's southeast boundary with an areaway lined by a chain-link fence running along the building's southeast (side) elevation. A small sunken courtyard at the east corner provides access to the basement-level IBA Preschool. The back of the former church is built to the lot line with low-rise housing that is part of the Villa Victoria residential neighborhood. A sunken, gated alley accessed by stairs from West Newton Street and Aquadilla Street runs along the northwest edge of the site.

Architectural Description
Church
The former church is a southwest-facing buff and red brick building that rises two-and-one-half-stories above a raised brick and granite block foundation with granite block and brownstone watertable to a steep front-gable roof surfaced in asphalt shingles that features copper coping at the edge. The building’s cornerstone is carved into a base of one of the tower’s buttresses and reads “A.D. 1898.” The front (southwest) gable features a soldier-course cornice edged with copper coping. The eaves on the side elevations have corbelled, denticulated buff-brick cornices edged by copper gutters. A narrow, brick chimney is set at the east end of the southeastern slope. The four-bay-wide southwest (façade) elevation is accentuated by a three-story octagonal stair tower and spire at its southern corner and four-story square bell tower at its northern corner. The octagonal stair tower is capped by a steeply-pitched asphalt-shingle-clad hipped roof with copper coping at the roof edge above a denticulated cornice. An angled brownstone cornice runs between the second and third stories. Window openings in the stair tower have brownstone sills and lintels that step up from the first story on each elevation. The third story has narrow pointed-arch windows with brownstone sills and pointed-arch drip mold on each wall. The bell tower is buttressed at each
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corner and capped by a pyramidal roof edged with copper coping and a denticulated cornice ornamented with inset decorative terra cotta tiles. The tower is pierced by double-height lancet windows with brownstone sills and pointed-arch drip mold. The spire and upper portion of the belfry have been removed to address safety concerns and the tower base is currently covered in staging.

The two center bays of the southwest (façade) elevation contain paired entrances defined by brownstone pointed-arch drip mold. The entrances consist of paired replacement double wood doors with painted vertical board and metal strap hinges. The doors are flanked by round wood pilasters with Doric capitals and a transom with wood molding. The transoms feature arched window openings with quatrefoil tracery and a circular center with wood mullions. Both entries are accessed by a wide granite stair that extends between the bell tower and stair tower. A buff brick-clad knee wall capped with a cast stone planter (added in 1986) is positioned at the center of the stair with a continuous pipe metal handrail mounted to each side. The original large, pointed-arch stained glass window above the main entrance doors has been removed and filled with a panel with a mural painted in 1989 by local artist, David Fichter. The opening is capped by brownstone pointed-arch drip mold. The original brownstone sill has been replaced by a metal sill that has caused rust and paint runoff to stain the buff brick below.

Most window openings of the former church consist of rectangular or pointed-arch openings with single-light, fixed, wood sash arranged either singularly or in pairs. The northwest and southeast (side) elevations of the former church are dominated by four double-height lancet windows defined by brownstone springers and keystones. Each opening originally contained paired wood, double-hung sash on the bottom and paired pointed-arch, wood-frame fixed sash above with a wood-frame, circular window in the pointed arch of each opening. The double-height windows retain original wood frames, but only two, at the eastern end of the side elevations, are intact with leaded stain-glass sash that show signs of failure. Storm windows are set on the exterior of the stained glass window openings. The remainder of the window openings have a combination of replacement glass and infill. The remainder of the window openings in the former church also have original wood frames. Some have replacement glass; the majority have been infilled with solid panels.

Additional entrances are located in the basement level on the northeast (rear) elevation. There are two, single-leaf, wood entrance doors with a full-height sidelight and single-light transom in the eastern- and western-most bays. Three sets of double doors with full-height windows and single-light transoms are located in the second, third, and fifth bays of the basement. A brightly painted, one-story, wood-frame addition, that was built as part of a 2000 preschool renovation, is attached to the east end of the northeast elevation. The northeast (rear) elevation is relatively undecorated with the exception of a single, segmental arch window opening in the gable. A two-story, gable-roof apse is attached to the center of the northeast (rear) elevation flanked by one-story, shed-roof wings. The northwest and southeast (side) elevations of the rear apse and the wings have corbelled, denticulated buff-brick cornices. Narrow pointed-arch window openings are set in the center of the side elevations of the apse.

The interior of the former church was renovated in the mid-1980s to accommodate a performing arts venue and cultural center. The space is dominated by the double-height main performance hall at the northeastern side of the first floor, which includes a stage and balcony. Other improvements include the addition of a warming kitchen, restrooms, and barrier free accessibility. The building is currently vacant.

Parish House
The two-and-one-half-story tall, roughly rectangular parish house is three bays wide by five bays deep and is capped by a hipped roof that is clad in asphalt shingles with copper coping and gutters, and a denticulated buff brick cornice. Gable-roof dormers punctuate the front (southwest) and side (northwest and southeast) slopes of the roof. Brick chimneys are located near the edge of the side slopes. The southern end bay of the southwest (façade) elevation projects one bay past the main wall and is capped with a steeply-pitched front-gable roof. The main entrance is centered on the façade in a slightly recessed, wood-panel opening with a brownstone surround. The entrance consists of replacement double wood-paneled single-glazed doors with wood paneled transoms. It is accessed by a concrete ramp with concrete kneewalls and metal pipe handrails. Secondary entrances with brownstone lintels are located off-center on the southeast (side) elevation and in the basement level on the northeast (rear) elevation. The side entrance is a wood-paneled single-glazed door with wood paneled transom, and the basement entrance is a contemporary metal door with centered single-light, fixed pane. The northeast (rear) elevation is two-stories with red brick walls and a red brick denticulated cornice. The basement level is accessed by a set of concrete steps running alongside the southeast (side) elevation and at the rear patio.

Window openings throughout the parish house have brownstone sills and lintels. Windows are two-over-two, double-hung, aluminum replacement sash windows arranged either singularly or in pairs. The fourth bay on the first story of the southeast (side) elevation has been infilled with buff brick. The windows at the basement level of the northeast (rear) elevation are one-over-one, double-hung, aluminum replacement sash. Some windows were replaced in the late 20th century to accommodate alterations necessitated by the preschool addition. Other window openings have been bricked-in.

The two-and-one-half-story, one-bay, gable-roof hyphen connecting the former church and parish house has yellow brick walls on its southwest (façade) elevation and red brick walls on the northeast (rear) elevation. A corbelled, denticulated buff brick cornice runs along the eaves on the façade and rear elevation. A yellow brick buttress extends two-stories at the west end of the hyphen, visually separating the parish house from the former church. A door opening is at the first story of the façade, consisting of a vertical-board door with metal strap hinges. The northeast (rear) elevation of the hyphen is recessed one bay from the rear elevation of
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the parish house and has window openings with brownstone sills and lintels on the first and second stories.
The interior of the parish house has been renovated to support contemporary spaces for art galleries, art and dance studios, and offices; no historic finishes or spaces remain. The building is currently vacant.

IBA Preschool and Addition

The IBA Preschool, located in the basement of the former church and parish house, is accessed by a one-story, roughly T-shaped wood-frame addition at the southern intersection of the former church and parish house and includes cement-board clad walls with flat wood corner boards set on a concrete foundation and capped by an asphalt shingle-clad, cross-gable roof. The gable on the southeast (front) elevation features a clapboard sunburst with wide rake boards and a deep gable returns. An entrance is set back in the western bay on the front elevation and consists of single metal door with two centered single-light fixed panes. A secondary entrance accessed by a concrete ramp is sited at the northeast elevation of the addition. Windows are one-over-one, double-hung, aluminum sash with flat wood trim. The interior of the IBA Preschool was remodeled in 2000; no historic finishes or spaces remain. The preschool is currently vacant.
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ENGINEERING REPORTS
Wednesday, September 25, 2019

Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción
405 Shawmut Ave.,
Boston, MA 02118

For the attention of Vanessa Calderon Rosado

RE: Villa Victoria Center for the Arts, 85 West Newton Street, Boston – Existing Structural Conditions

Dear Vanessa,

With reference to our letter dated April 29, 2019 and further to the recent closure of the building, following the reported Boston Fire Department inspection and the subsequent revocation of the temporary certificate of occupancy by the City’s Inspectional Services Department, we are writing to you to restate the structural remediation work that will need to be undertaken if the building is to be made safe and retained for future use.

As previously advised, although there are temporary measures in place to support the tower, roof and north wall, the ongoing structural adequacy of the building and risk of falling masonry needs to be permanently addressed. Our earlier letter recommended that the demolition and repairs to the church tower should commence before the end of the summer season. As we are now approaching the fall period, we feel it is necessary to reinforce our recommendation and reconfirm the extent of the work that will be required.

As you are aware, the existing conditions and structural defects were identified by the previous Engineer of Record (Gale Associates) for the façade repair works. Gale Associates advised in a letter dated August 2nd, 2018 the extent demolition and repairs/rebuilding that would be required to reinstate the structural integrity of the church building. In summary the key points are as follows:

- Extensive masonry deficiencies (i.e. failed lime mortar, delamination of the outer blond brick wythe, loose bricks) were observed in the whole of the church tower structure requiring it to be completely demolished and rebuilt, with or without a spire.
- Water ingress to the north wall has damaged a ten foot length of wall, including a brick pilaster supporting the tower. The portion of the wall would need to be fully demolished and rebuilt from the existing foundation level.
- Related to the water damage, dry rot has compromised the end of a timber roof truss, requiring the end of the truss including the bottom chord to need repairing.
- The rebuilding of the tower and north wall, would need to be designed to meet current code requirements.
- The new tower construction would require the existing (6.5’ deep) granite foundations to be removed and new shallow or pile supported reinforced concrete foundations.

In addition to the rebuilding works outlined by Gale Associates in their letter, you should also expect that due to the height of the existing building and the lateral support currently provided by the tower structure, during the demolition, new construction and repair work, the building will require extensive temporary shoring to the existing north and west masonry walls, new foundations, existing (west) basement excavation and roof truss to maintain the structural integrity of the building. A temporary weather enclosure would also be required to protect the building until the building becomes weather tight again.

During the period since our letter was issued, a surveying regime using tilt meters, crack monitors and vibration gauges has been undertaken to monitor the movement and behavior of the tower structure. Fortunately the monitoring has not identified any untoward movement of the tower, suggesting that with the added temporary shoring the tower remains stable (albeit during the summer months), however it did record movement of the outer bond brick which confirms that the delamination of this brickwork wythe is an ongoing issue and risk to pedestrians.

Inclement weather during the fall and winter season could further affect the structural integrity of the tower and blond brick façade. As such we advise that the demolition of the tower and north wall (plus the installation of the associated temporary shoring and weather protection outlined above) commences immediately so that the structural integrity of the building can be reinstated. Should these repair/reinstatement recommendations prove to be infeasible, the owner should arrange for the orderly and safe demolition of the building in a reasonable time frame for the protection of the public and of adjacent structures.

We trust the above is clear, but should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

on behalf of Buro Happold Consulting Engineers P.C.

Craig Schwitter
Principal
Email: craig.schwitter@burohappold.com

cc Paul Richardson – BuroHappold Engineering
Monday, April 29, 2019

Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción
405 Shawmut Ave.,
Boston, MA 02118

For the attention of Peter Munkenbeck

RE: Villa Victoria Center for the Arts, 85 West Newton Street, Boston – Existing Structural Conditions

Dear Peter,

As part of the new feasibility study being carried out by Kennedy & Violich Architecture (KVA) for the Villa Victoria Center for the Arts, BuroHappold has been engaged to provide Engineering input for the future design options and studies being considered.

As part of these future studies, BuroHappold have walked the site and observed the existing conditions and associated structural defects identified by the Engineer of Record (Gale Associates) for the façade repair works. The first visit was made on December 14th 2018, with a follow up visit carried out on January 29th, 2019.

It was observed that the dangerous structural defects - identified by Gale Associates during the partial demolition of the church tower - have been temporarily shored, with external scaffolding provided to protect pedestrians from the danger of falling masonry and internal areas closed off. We understand that this temporary shoring and external scaffolding was installed by the former Contractor’s (Shawmut Construction) Sub-Contractor (Marr Scaffolding). Following Shawmut Construction leaving the site, we understand that Marr Scaffolding have been retained by the Owner, and continue to monitor the shoring and scaffolding.

We recommend that;
- If not already in their possession, the Owner should obtain copies of the shoring and scaffolding design. The designs should be signed and stamped by a Professional Engineer licensed in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- On-going inspections of the shoring and external scaffolding should continue to be performed by a qualified Contractor until such a time as the shoring can be safely removed.
- As areas of the blond brick façade are in danger of falling away, the extent of the existing scaffolding and scrim protection should be reviewed to insure that it is providing adequate protection to the sidewalk, should any brickwork fall away.
- A monitoring/survey regime is instigated to demonstrate that the tower remains structurally stable or that identifies any movement caused by an instability in the building structure. We understand that the monitoring regime of the remaining church tower structure will commence shortly and that the survey company will employ a Professional Engineer licensed in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to stamp the survey scope and monitoring reports.
- Should the building be retained for future use;
  - The demolition and repairs/rebuilding advised by Gale Associates in their letter dated August 2nd, 2018 should commence by the end of the summer season, to prevent any further weather damage to the tower structures.
  - Further intrusive investigations (in addition to those already carried out by Gale Associates) are carried out in other areas of the structure.

In summary, as BuroHappold we remain focused on providing engineering advice to the new building scheme design work being undertaken by KVA architects. However, we note that the condition of the existing building remains poor and that demolition and restoration work undertaken by other must be reviewed and approved by Professional Engineers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. BuroHappold take no responsibility for the existing structure condition and means and methods currently undertaken on site. Our observation reports should not be misconstrued as instruction to direct such demolition and/or restoration work.

We trust the above is clear, but should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

on behalf of Buro Happold Consulting Engineers P.C.

Paul Richardson
Associate Principal
email paul.richardson@burohappold.com
Recap of Evaluation & Discoveries
Villa Victoria Center for the Arts

Corey G. Matthews, P.E.
November 20, 2018
Exterior Evaluation

March 2017

- Limited exterior evaluation
  - W. Newton St. elevation using 120’ boom lift...other elevations were inaccessible
- Pilaster cracks and separation
  - Previous repair using grout pins
  - Partial rebuild outer brick only
- Loose bricks removed by hand
- Spire roof deteriorated
  - Missing shingles
  - Gaps along corners
  - Moisture damage to wood and steel members
Hazardous Conditions
April 2017

- **Temporary Stabilization Plan**
  - Debris netting and structural banding

- **Life safety concerns – masonry fall hazards**
  - Overhead protection W. Newton St. sidewalk and alley
  - Temporary closure of hall, lobby, restrooms

- **Team elected to begin design of permanent repairs**
Additional Interior & Exterior Tower Eval.
July 2017

- Test Cuts – interior of tower (no access to exterior – unsafe scaffold)
- Deteriorated masonry within belfry
- Rotted ends of pocketed floor joists
- Pocketed steel lintels corroded
- Team made decision to proceed with Phase 1A design (replace spire and upper tower walls) rather than wait for additional exterior test cuts when scaffolding was deemed safe to access.
Demolition of Spire & Belfry Begins
November 2017

- Spire removed in pieces
  - Staging erected full height of spire
  - Cut into small segments and removed with crane
- Tower walls removed
  - Contractors used handheld demolition hammers to loosen masonry
  - Brick rubble was lowered to the ground with crane
- Demolition suspended in December (winter shutdown)
  - Hazardous brick conditions were removed and hall was opened for several events
Construction Resumes
March 2018

- Granite stair foundations replaced
- Tower demolition resumes
North Wall Damage Discovered
April 2018

- Scaffolding installed along north elevation
  - Discovered debris clogged primary roof drain had caused extensive damage to wall below
  - Gale initiated GPR scanning followed by additional test cuts which identified separation between the inner and outer courses
    - Mortar washout and deteriorated conditions full height of wall below clogged drain
    - Rotted timber and steel lintel with deteriorated masonry above preschool egress door to alley
    - Severely corroded steel beam supporting floor joists
    - Shoring required
    - Adjacent classroom closed
Tower Demolition Approaches Design Elev.
May 2018

- Poor masonry conditions still exist
  - Demolition hammers loosen large areas of wall
  - Bricks removed easily by hand
  - Large sections of blonde brick “peeled” away with pry-bar...snapped headers
  - Severely deteriorated joint mortar

- SGH to provide 2nd opinion on wall integrity and validate Gale’s findings:
  - SGH agreed with Gale’s assessment that masonry deterioration too extensive to support weight of new belfry and spire
Owner Considers Complete Rebuild of Tower and Spire
August 2018

- Team was asked to provide a narrative of design and construction requirements for contractor pricing
  - Design must meet current code requirements – Wind & Seismic
  - Must replicate the original appearance using similar materials
  - New reinforced masonry walls and deep foundations will be required
  - Major impacts to adjacent property/sidewalk likely
  - Building will remain closed for extended design and construction period
  - Requires significant support of adjacent structural components and temporary enclosure to protect building
Gale has been asked to prepare a written scope to structurally repair the damaged building components we have uncovered to date. Since the building has historical significance and is within a landmark district within Boston’s South End Neighborhood, the proposed reconstruction will attempt to replicate the original construction methods while adhering to the current building code requirements. The following outline will describe the building components requiring reconstruction that are outside the current contracted scope of work:

Tower (below the belfry level)

- Two courses of fully grouted, medium weight CMU block (22” nominal structural wall thickness), moderately reinforced, designed as intermediate reinforced masonry shear walls to resist current seismic loading. Continuous reinforced bond beam courses will be provided at intervals not to exceed eight feet vertically throughout the tower.
- The southeast corner of the tower will be supported by a new structural steel column to approximately the attic level, where the south and east CMU tower walls will emerge. Structural steel lintels will span from the southeast corner column to the exterior CMU walls at the north and west sides of the tower.
- At this time the results of the geotechnical exploratory work have not been provided. We anticipate that the existing granite block foundations will not be sufficient to support the weight of the new tower and the lateral loads associated with the code-required wind and seismic loading. The existing granite blocks must be removed to allow new pile supported reinforced concrete foundation walls to be installed below the new tower walls.
- A single course of blonde brick veneer with seismic anchors, thermal insulation and rainscreen will be provided to replicate the original elevation.
- A continuous steel shelf angle will be required at approximately twelve-foot intervals above the bottom thirty feet of stacked brick veneer. Additionally, arched loose steel lintels will be provided at all window openings. Due to the size of the lintels at the large tower windows, additional tie-backs to the CMU walls are anticipated.
- New insulated floors, comprised of cold formed steel joists, plywood sheathing, and plaster ceilings will be provided at the main floor, balcony, and attic levels.

North Wall of the Sanctuary

- Approximately ten feet of the north wall adjacent to the tower will be completely removed and reconstructed above the existing granite block foundation wall. The wall will be comprised of a single course of 12”, fully grouted, medium weight CMU block, moderately reinforced, designed as an intermediate reinforced masonry shear wall.
- Single course of blonde brick veneer with seismic anchors, thermal insulation and rainscreen will be provided to replicate the original elevation.
- Arched loose steel lintels will be provided at all window openings.
- A reinforced CMU lintel will be provided to support the main floor framing over the double doors at the basement.
- An integral reinforced CMU pier will be created to support the roof truss nearest the tower.
Primary Timber Roof Truss

- Structural steel reinforcing plates will be required to strengthen the rotted timber truss bottom chord. We anticipate the reinforcing plates will be fabricated to follow the precise geometry of the top to bottom chord intersection and will be provided on both sides of the truss. The plates will be through fastened and will extend approximately ten feet along the top and bottom chord with sufficient fasteners to develop the capacity of the plates. The reinforcing plates and fasteners will be hot dipped galvanized for additional protection against corrosion.
- A structural steel bearing plate assembly will be provided at the top of the CMU pier to support the repaired roof truss.
May 21, 2018

Mr. Fernando Domenech, Jr.
DHK Architects, Inc.
54 Canal Street, Suite 200
Boston, MA 02114

Re: Summary of Findings and Options Moving Forward
Villa Victoria Center for the Arts (VCCA)
Boston, MA

Gale IN 832681

Dear Mr. Domenech:

The purpose of this letter is to summarize the information gathered to date regarding the condition of the building’s tower masonry walls, and how these discoveries have led to the temporary evacuation of the main hall and daycare at the VCCA. Under a separate memorandum, we will briefly describe several options for stabilization or reconstruction of the existing tower, including pros and cons for each option.

Gale Associates, Inc.’s (Gale’s) evaluation report dated May 15, 2017 (excerpted pages 21 and 22 attached) indicated severely deteriorated conditions. However, the extent of required removals was not known at that early stage of the project. As part of Design Development, Gale was on site on July 29 - 30, 2017, to observe test cuts performed on the upper walls of the tower. The goal of the test cuts and associated evaluations was to gain an understanding as to the condition of the tower masonry walls. The condition of the masonry walls was needed in support of structural analyses of the existing walls to determine their load carrying capacity.

Gale observed nine (9) test cuts performed on the interior of the tower at various levels, from the belfry level down approximately eighteen feet (18’) below the level of belfry. The exterior of the tower was not made available to Gale for planned test cuts, as scaffold pens were pulled out of the brick presenting an unsafe condition. Gale staff were ordered to remain off the scaffolding until it was made safe. Our letter, dated August 11, 2017 (attached), describes the test cuts and unsafe conditions of the scaffolding.

Gale reported our preliminary findings regarding the condition of the masonry to the OPM/Architect/Construction Management team by email (attached) on July 30, 2017. These findings were the focus of the follow-up project meeting held on July 31, 2017. To complete Gale’s evaluation efforts, further test cuts were requested. With the scaffold unsafe to utilize and the resultant delay in design development while awaiting the installation of replacement scaffolding anchors, all parties (including the Owner) concurred that such a delay would have ramifications on the initiation of construction. Based on this situation and during the July 31st meeting, the OPM and Owner verbally directed the design team to continue with development of Construction Documents without delay, to include removal of the spire, belfry walls and portions of the masonry tower, utilizing the field data collected to date.

The level to which the masonry walls of the tower would be removed was also determined during the July 31st meeting. Based on limited test cut observations by Gale, indicating the interior brick appeared less deteriorated at areas below the belfry, the Owner, OPM, DHK and Gale agreed that the limit of masonry tower wall removal, for the purposes of continuing immediately with developing Construction Documents, would be approximately nine and a half feet (9.5’) below the belfry floor level. Gale documented this in our August 11, 2017 follow-up letter (attached). Shawmut’s minutes of July 31, 2017 also refer to this situation.

Upon the erection of staging and initiation of construction, Gale visited the site on April 24, 2018 to review the condition of the tower masonry walls as demolition approached the contract removal limit. Our observations of the mortar at the masonry walls, including the inner red brick wythes, was observed to be in poorer condition than anticipated and subsequently led to overall tower stability concerns on the part of Gale.

Gale recommended that the tower masonry wall demolition operations be ceased until additional evaluation and analysis could be performed. Gale also recommended select interior spaces adjacent to the tower be evacuated, including a portion of the basement/classroom kitchen be closed, along with portions of the first floor and balcony levels. These recommendations were described in Gale’s letter dated April 27, 2018 (attached). This letter also included a plan to perform additional masonry test cuts at exterior tower wall locations on Monday and Tuesday of the following week.

On April 30, 2018 and May 1, 2018, Gale observed ten (10) additional masonry test cuts along the north and west faces of the tower, at various elevations. High variability in the mortar conditions at inner red brick wythes was found to exist throughout and prompted Gale to seek a third-party review from Simpson Gumpertz and Heger (SGH) to confirm Gale’s assumptions related to masonry conditions and options for repair.
Based on test cut observations and discussions with SGH, Gale recommended solicitive tower masonry wall demolition continue, using hand tool techniques only, in an effort to evaluate the undisturbed condition of the inner red brick wythes. We were hoping that the masonry wall would incur reduced damage, which could have been associated with bulk demolition that would have utilized impact hammers. Furthermore, Gale and SGH discussed laboratory testing as a means of acquiring empirical data related to mortar bond strength, but ultimately determined that testing results would be highly subjective based on the inherent challenges of obtaining viable test specimens and the lack of appropriate standardized testing procedures. These findings and recommendations were outlined in a letter dated May 4, 2018 (attached).

On May 8, 2018, Gale again visited the site to observe Shawmut’s method of demolition using hand tool techniques and to review the underlying condition of the undisturbed inner red brick wythes. Following the removal of approximately seven feet (7’) of blonde brick veneer along the north tower wall using this technique, it was revealed that more than half of the blonde brick headers were snapped or unbonded.

Ultimately, Gale’s opinion was developed that the demolition method was not positively correlated to the poor bond strength discovered to exist throughout the wall. It was Gale’s conclusion that the condition of the tower masonry walls, at the current level of demolition, would be incapable of supporting the weight of a new belfry and spire and recommended stabilization methods for the remaining tower structure could be extensive and, as such, possibly not cost effective.

On May 9, 2018, Gale observed the truss bearing condition adjacent to the tower, at the main building roof purlin, which was previously inaccessible, and discovered multiple structural deficiencies. The end of the timber roof truss appeared to be severely deteriorated, with significant section loss where the top and bottom chords meet at the truss bearing point.

Additionally, adjacent to the truss, a portion of the structural steel lintel supporting the entire weight of the remaining east tower masonry wall was observed to be severely deteriorated. The visible portion of the flanges and web of the lintel was observed to have significant section loss, including a hole through the web at its end.
The observed deteriorated condition of integral structural components compounded Gale’s previous concerns regarding the stability of the masonry wall with these newly revealed truss and lintel issues. This led Gale’s most recent recommendation for the evacuation of the function hall and daycare until a feasible shoring solution could be developed. Our expanded findings and recommendations, based upon these recent site visits starting on May 8, 2018, were addressed and detailed in Gale’s e-mail dated May 10, 2018 (attached).

On May 15, 2018, Gale observed eleven (11) additional masonry test cuts along the north wall of the main building, at various elevations. Poor conditions of inner red brick wythes were found to exist in areas surrounding the first arched window from the west and adjacent to the tower’s northeast plaster. The majority of test cuts performed further east of the window were found to exhibit improved conditions, including firmer, drier, well-bonded mortar, with less voids between bricks. These findings were outlined in a field report issued May 18, 2018 (attached), with repair recommendations forthcoming.

At the on-site construction meeting on May 15, 2018, Gale provided verbal updates to the team, with likely scenarios for stabilizing tower walls and for demolition/rebuild. Gale’s explanation of the likeliest scenario for stabilization included the following:

- Removal of blonde brick veneer from the tower to expose the back-up masonry for observation and analysis in an attempt to determine the extent of stabilization efforts;
- Although unknown at this time, potential back-up stabilization methods might include epoxy injection of large portions of the walls or as much as the entire tower, installation of helical ties, or the installation of a permanent interior shoring system such as reinforced shotcrete or structural steel;
- The deteriorated steel 4-beam lintel assembly holding up the east tower wall requires replacement. The location and amount of brick supported by this assembly will require removal and rebuilding of the brick above the lintel;
- It is Gale’s opinion the stabilized walls would still not be able to support construction of additional upper walls or a spine.

Because of the variable conditions observed to date, this scenario could result in an unknown amount of stops and starts in construction as new conditions and issues are uncovered, thus extending the project schedule, resulting in unknown increased costs and further efforts from all parties. At points during stabilization efforts, it may be determined the walls are not repairable and may still need to be removed.

Based on the scenario above, and the high level of effort likely required for stabilization, the Owner reported to the team, during the meeting on May 15, 2018, they would be recommending bulk demolition of the tower to IBM’s Board of Directors.

The weeks that followed the tower masonry wall demolition operations in late April of this year revealed numerous unforeseen conditions at VVCA. As each of these conditions were revealed, Gale provided prompt and appropriate assistance to the project. Deterioration and life safety concerns associated with several of these conditions led to Gale’s difficult recommendation for an immediate evacuation of the main hall and daycare, and consideration of alternative design options moving forward. The following list summarizes the most critical unforeseen conditions encountered at VVCA:

1. Condition of the daycare egress door lintel at the north wall of the main building.
2. Condition of the main building north wall masonry above the daycare egress door lintel.
3. Condition of the main building timber roof truss adjacent to the tower.
4. Condition of the embedded steel lintel beams at the tower masonry walls.
5. Condition of the blonde brick headers at the tower masonry walls.
6. Condition of the inner red brick wythes at the upper tower masonry walls.

Under a separate letter, Gale will outline a variety of options for team consideration related to tower reconstruction and shoring options.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns you may have regarding this letter.

Best regards,

Corey G. Matthews, P.E.
Sr. Structural Engineer
Building Enclosure Design & Consulting Group
GCA/Arch
Mr. Fernando Domenecch, Jr.
DHK Architects, Inc.
54 Canal Street, Suite 200
Boston, MA 02114

Re: Tower Options
Villa Victoria Center for the Arts (VCCA)
Boston, MA
Gale JN 832681

Dear Mr. Domenecch:

Per Gale Associates, Inc.’s ([Gale’s]) previous correspondence related to the above referenced project, below please find a narrative for reconstruction options related to the tower structure.

Option 1: Structural Stabilization of Existing Tower Walls for Capping

This option requires extensive repairs of the existing masonry walls, beyond what was previously anticipated. Exterior blonde brick must be removed, and the back-up, multi-wythe masonry wall shall be strengthened with a combination of removal/replacement of deteriorated sections, possible grout injection and/or the installation of helical ties. Due to variance in the condition of the wall, the extent of masonry reconstruction work will not be known until the exterior blonde brick and interior finishes are removed and the interior wythes evaluated. After the back-up walls are stabilized, a new blonde brick veneer would be installed on all surfaces. Even if Option 1 stabilization is performed, Gale cannot recommend installation of a belfry or spire. A new roof assembly would be required to cap of the tower at the belfry level.

Pros:
- Structural stabilization may reduce project costs associated with full demolition and rebuild of the tower structure.
- This option may allow portions of the basement and hall spaces to remain operational during on-going construction.

Cons:
- Structurally stabilized existing masonry walls will not be able to support additional construction of the belfry and spire onto the walls directly.
- The conditions of the masonry wall and associated constructions are unknown and determining the extent of repairs prior to proceeding with restoration/stabilization is impossible. Even after removal of unsound masonry and repair attempts, the walls may still be deemed unsalvageable.

Option 2: Demolition of Existing Tower to Basement and Modern Reconstruction to Belfry Level

This option requires temporary protection of interior spaces to enclose the northwest corner of the main building, prior to the complete removal of the tower masonry walls. A geotechnical evaluation will be required to determine if existing foundations are adequate to support the new construction. If new or augmented foundations are required, access to the basement with equipment will be challenging and may impact sidewalks and street access. Engineered design documents and additional permitting for demolition of the tower and the rebuild will be required. This option requires that reconstructed tower walls will meet current energy and building code for new construction.

Pros:
- Reprogramming of interior spaces within the tower could result in additional usable square footage and better space utilization.
- Bulk demolition of the tower may be faster than selective demolition/on-going evaluation and repair of walls and pilasters as described in Option 1.
- Unlike stabilization, new construction is predictable, reducing the exposure to unforeseen conditions and associated costs.
- Rebuilding provides the Owner flexibility to add the belfry and spire at a later date.
- Improved energy efficiency utilizing modern insulated wall construction.
- If the Owner chooses to proceed with installing the belfry and spire, the presently engineered spire structure may be implemented. However, additional engineering may be required to satisfy Building Code requirements.
Cons:

- The building spaces (daycare, kitchen and hall) will remain closed for the duration of the demolition and reconstruction of the tower and roof structure.
- Option 2 will extend the project schedule for design, permitting, and a larger construction scope.
- Additional demolition below the current contract limit will result in increased construction costs.
- Pending geotechnical evaluation, new or augmented foundations may be required to support the proposed construction.
- Additional code-driven building improvements may be triggered by the increased project scope.

The rebuilt tower structure can be designed to accommodate a future belfry and spire to maintain the aesthetic of the original construction. Structural system options for reconstruction include:

- Reinforced concrete masonry unit walls with an insulated cavity and blonde veneer.
- Cast-in-place or pre-cast concrete walls with an insulated cavity and blonde veneer.
- Structural steel frame with cold-formed steel framing back-up walls, an insulated cavity and blonde veneer.

Option 3: Structural Stabilization of Existing Tower Walls for Addition of Belfry and Spire

This option requires stabilization, repairs to walls, and the installation of blonde veneer brick to be executed as described in Option 2.

Option 3 is based on Gale’s opinion that the “stabilization” of the original tower walls will not be structurally capable of supporting the addition of the belfry and spire construction. To accommodate these structures, a structural steel frame would have to be installed on the interior of the tower to support new belfry and spire construction, independent of the stabilized and repaired walls. Footings will be required for steel columns to be installed down to the basement level.

Pros:

- The existing back-up walls could remain in place and may allow the daycare to be occupied during wall repairs.
- The steel structural frame system could possibly be utilized to augment and brace the existing masonry walls.

Cons:

- Installing the steel structure and footings will be disruptive.
- The steel structure is redundant and therefore adds cost to the assembly of the tower.

Option 4: Demolition of Existing Tower to Basement and Historic Reconstruction

This option has been requested by the client and its exploration based on the tower being removed and rebuilt in kind, with the same or similar unreinforced brick masonry construction as the existing tower. This option is deemed to be infeasible due to present day seismic requirements required for code compliance. Additionally, it would be less costly to reconstruct the tower, as noted in Option 2, with present day construction materials.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned with any questions you may have regarding the contents of this document.

Best regards,

COREY G. MATTHEWS, P.E.
Sr. Structural Engineer
Building Enclosure Design & Consulting Group

GAME ASSOCIATES, INC.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Images and logos are present on the page, but the text is not transcribed.]
ALTERNATES STUDY AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF REHABILITATION vs DEMOLITION
Inquilinos Boricuas en Accion (IBA) has asked Kennedy & Violich Architecture (KVA) to work with them to develop and review alternate scenarios for rehabilitation, selective demolition and new construction of the former church and attached parish house at 85 West Newton Street. The building currently houses the Villa Victoria Center for the Arts and IBA Preschool.

Discovery of significant structural problems during the previously approved building envelope restoration project required IBA to stop work and reevaluate options. Currently, the steeple and belfry have been removed, program uses have been moved out of at-risk areas and temporary shoring and scaffolding are in place to address public safety concerns. While IBA has made significant attempts to stabilize and renovate the buildings, they do not have the resources to complete all of the required structural repairs. This realization has forced them to consider alternate solutions which could be achieved within their means, address existing building problems, and better serve the space and operational needs of the Villa Victoria Center for the Arts and IBA Preschool.

Before proceeding with alternative design studies for the project site, approval for some level of selective demolition of the structurally compromised building is required. The scope and scale of approved demolition and rehabilitation work will establish the basis for subsequent design efforts.

This Alternates Study, that KVA has prepared with our consultant team at Buro Happold and Jensen Hughes, provided the information necessary to do a high level cost review of six proposed options which range from full renovation to full demolition of the existing buildings. This comparative cost review, produced by Shawmut Construction under direct contract with IBA, is being used as the basis for review of what can realistically be achieved within IBA’s budget.

KVA and our engineering team will continue to work with IBA and the cost estimators at Shawmut Construction to provide any additional information required to support this ongoing effort.
# Alternates Review Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Renovation</th>
<th>Full Demo/New Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuild tower and complete previously approved church and parish house building envelope renovation and addition upgrades. Existing building systems remain.</td>
<td>Full demolition of existing church and parish house. New construction of purpose-built 2 story, 30,000sqft performing arts center and preschool with income generating space for offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Intrusive investigations to determine condition of structure to be retained.</td>
<td>All elements/walls of the Church to be retained and tied back to new tower structure. Parish House assumed to be structurally sound.</td>
<td>No walls or structures from existing building will remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitoring of existing structure required to confirm current condition and integrity (see monitoring report). During demolition and construction period to protect retained façade and address potential public safety concerns and risks to neighbouring properties.</td>
<td>Monitoring required during demolition of church and parish house to address potential public safety concerns and risks to neighbouring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demolition</td>
<td>Tower structure (with foundations) and 10ft length of north (alley) wall to be reconstructed.</td>
<td>Full site demolition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Temp. shoring of basement walls</td>
<td>Local to demolished tower structure and at junctions with existing walls that will be retained or rebuilt. Where existing rubble retaining wall and foundation will be replaced on W Newton St elevation.</td>
<td>East (back), south (Day Park) and west (W Newton St) basement retaining walls will need to be temporarily shored until the new structural frame is installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Temp. shoring of façade</td>
<td>Required to support retained façade junctions while the tower is rebuilt. Roof shoring also required while alley elevation is rebuilt.</td>
<td>No walls or structures from existing building will remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Life Safety Upgrades</td>
<td>Assuming no change of use from previously approved program and no substantial space alterations, project will be considered a “repair” with no life safety upgrade requirements. Existing sprinklers and fire alarm are regularly inspected.</td>
<td>New construction will be built to meet current life safety codes with cost to be incorporated into benchmark pricing of new construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accessibility Upgrades</td>
<td>Cost of renovation work and tower reconstruction significantly exceeds 30% of fair value of existing building. Facial accessibility upgrades to church and parish house include new elevators, balcony modifications, and ramp and door widening.</td>
<td>New construction will be built to meet current accessibility requirements with cost to be incorporated into benchmark pricing of new construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Underpinning</td>
<td>Required locally, adjacent to tower structure depending upon depth of existing wall foundations where new foundations are being installed. Deep-filled foundations would mitigate this, however some underpinning may be required close to pile caps etc. and the foundation design would need to account for differential movement between differing foundation solutions.</td>
<td>No existing building walls remain. New construction sets basement level above adjacent retaining walls to eliminate need for underpinning of existing foundations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Alternates Review Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Renovation</th>
<th>Full Demo/New Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Construction within confines of existing building structure.</td>
<td>Construction site constrained by existing church which occupies full site. Localized reconstruction of exterior tower and alley wall and access from W Newton St. and alley simplify logistics.</td>
<td>No existing building walls remain. Urban site and adjacency to residential buildings and active playground will continue to raise logistical issues which should be accounted for in benchmark pricing of new construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lateral system upgrades triggered.</td>
<td>The new tower frame needs to be designed to meet current lateral system code requirements, and support retained street and alley façade elevations.</td>
<td>New structure replaces the church and parish house building. Cost of lateral system covered in benchmark pricing of new construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. New build elements</td>
<td>New tower structure and foundations and completion of building envelope repairs (refer to Option 2 scope outlined in Gale letters dated 8/2/18). New bathrooms in church. Existing bathrooms are half demo’d as part of discontinued building renovation work. New elevator shaft to provide access to all floors including balcony with elevator with mini-clearance of 48. Reconstructed steel tower within tower to provide access to balcony. Reconstruct significant sections of balcony to address structural problems and accessibility requirements. Significant repair of interior finishes to close in destructive testing sites and address water damage.</td>
<td>New 6 story steel framed structure (approx 15-18 psf) with 6.25&quot; concrete slab on deck floor slabs thick (3&quot; deck/3.25&quot; concrete with 8000 psi footprint) on site of demo’d church and parish house. New steelwork will require fire protection. New foundations required to support new steel frame. Deep or shallow foundations could be used. Grade beams required to tie pile caps and support new façade on 3 elevations. New basement retaining walls required to west (W Newton St) south (O’Day Playground), and east (residential neighbors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mechanical</td>
<td>All existing mechanical systems can be maintained and it is assumed that no alterations are proposed. Means of access and service space for mechanical equipment within the above ceiling space in the church sanctuary shall be altered to meet requirements of IMC 2015 par. 306.4, subject to determination of the provisions of the Massachusetts Building Code in effect at the time of the equipment installation as stated in IMC 2015 par. 102.3. New systems serving reconstructed tower or corner infill will be required.</td>
<td>Provide new heating, cooling, ventilation, and exhaust systems for a new building based on the proposed architectural scheme, program, functionality and energy performance goals. New system cost should be incorporated into benchmark pricing for new construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Electrical</td>
<td>Remove electrical systems within tower back to last active device or source panel outside of demolition area. Provide new electrical systems to serve reconstructed tower.</td>
<td>Remove all electrical installation. Provide new electrical systems (inc. lighting, AV/IT etc) based on the proposed architectural scheme, program and functionality. Coordinate with utility provider to mark safe service entrance. New system cost should be incorporated into benchmark pricing for new construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Plumbing/Fire Protection</td>
<td>Bring 4&quot; main to top of accessible part of reconstructed tower and include 2-1/2&quot; fire department valve. Relocate sprinkler piping, and plumbing layout based on updated architectural scheme.</td>
<td>Provide new sprinkler and piping layout based on the proposed architectural scheme, program and functionality. New system cost should be incorporated into benchmark pricing for new construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full Renovation

- Tower reconstructed on new foundations
- Complete previously approved church and parish house building envelope renovation and bathroom upgrades
- New elevator and accessibility updates required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Full Renovation</th>
<th>Full Demo/New Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net square feet</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Cost</td>
<td>$21,900,000</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per sf</td>
<td>$1,095</td>
<td>$533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net sf of office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage for offices</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard cost net of mortgage</td>
<td>$21,900,000</td>
<td>$11,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITE/BLOCK PLAN
Site Block/Plan

- Address: 85 W Newton St, 02118
- Parcel ID: 0900337001
- Land Use: C
- Owner: Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción
NEW CONSTRUCTION MASSING
Full Demo/New Construction Massing

- Tower not reconstructed
- Full demolition of church and parish house
- New construction of purpose-built 5 story, 30,000 sf performing arts center and preschool with income generating office space
CERTIFICATE OF EXEMPTION BASED ON HARDSHIP DOCUMENTATION
Certificate of Exemption based on Hardship

Section 7.4  CERTIFICATE OF EXEMPTION BASED ON HARDSHIP

Section 7 of the enabling statute establishes certain conditions under which the Commission may issue a Certificate of Exemption based on economic hardship to the applicant. No administrative review may occur on an application for a Certificate of Exemption based on hardship. An applicant seeking a Certificate of Exemption based on financial hardship shall be required to produce evidence of substantial financial hardship, the applicant shall supply the Commission with the following information:

1. The amount paid for the property, the date of purchase and the party from whom purchased (including a description of the relationship, if any, between the owner and the person from whom the property was purchased);

2. The assessed value of the land and improvements thereon according to the most recent tax assessments.

3. Real estate taxes for the previous two years.

4. Annual debt service, if any, for the previous two years.

5. All appraisals obtained within the previous two years by the owner or applicant in connection with purchase, financing, or ownership of the property.

6. Any listing of the property for sale or rent, price asked and offers received, if any.

7. Any consideration by the owner as to profitable adaptive uses for the property.

If the property is income-producing, the owner must also provide:

1. Annual gross income from the property for the previous two years.

2. Itemized operating and maintenance expenses for the previous two years.

3. Cash flow, if any during the same period.

Response

See Exhibit A, attached

Land & Improvements: $961,700

+ Building: 31,094,500

FY2018: $12,217.21

FY2019: $12,587.38

None

None

Not Applicable

Not applicable, given physical conditions of the property.

See Exhibit B, attached

See Exhibit B, attached

See Exhibit C, attached
Certificate of Exemption based on Hardship

EXHIBIT A

1. Amount paid for the property - $40,000
2. Date of purchase - June 18, 1980
3. Party from whom the property was purchased - Board of American Missions of the Lutheran Church in America
4. Description of the relationship, if any, between the owner and the person from whom the property was purchased: None

EXHIBIT B

Inquiries Reflected on Axos, Inc.

Statements of Activity - 85 West Newton Street
For the Years Ended December 31, 2018 and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Income from Property</td>
<td>67,776</td>
<td>75,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental for Events</td>
<td>42,648</td>
<td>64,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (Takings) (Excl)</td>
<td>24,399</td>
<td>14,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Income from Property</td>
<td>67,776</td>
<td>75,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating &amp; Maintenance Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Expense</td>
<td>109,167</td>
<td>119,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes &amp; Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>27,873</td>
<td>15,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>29,954</td>
<td>21,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant &amp; Contract Service</td>
<td>24,251</td>
<td>12,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Taxes</td>
<td>24,569</td>
<td>12,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>10,005</td>
<td>4,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Repair</td>
<td>9,410</td>
<td>5,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing &amp; Filing Fees</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>4,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>9,030</td>
<td>4,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Supplies</td>
<td>5,735</td>
<td>2,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiosk Removal</td>
<td>6,285</td>
<td>3,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Support</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>2,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing &amp; Service Charges</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage &amp; Shipping</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Copying</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Activity</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating &amp; Maintenance Expenses, Before Non-Operating Expenses</td>
<td>248,579</td>
<td>250,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income (Loss) from Operating, Before Non-Operating Expenses</td>
<td>(181,800)</td>
<td>(157,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impairment of Fixed Property</td>
<td>2,676,958</td>
<td>281,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>110,078</td>
<td>110,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Operating Expenses</td>
<td>2,786,036</td>
<td>391,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income (Loss) from Property</td>
<td>(2,794,831)</td>
<td>(142,065)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Certificate of Exemption based on Hardship

EXHIBIT C

Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción, Inc.

Statements of Cash Flow: 85 West Newton Street
For the Years Ended December 31, 2018 and 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Income (Loss) from Property</td>
<td>$2,976,636</td>
<td>$549,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impairment of Real Property</td>
<td>2,676,958</td>
<td>281,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>115,078</td>
<td>110,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cash Deficit of the Property</td>
<td>($180,600)</td>
<td>($157,300)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 7.4 CERTIFICATE OF EXEMPTION BASED ON HARDSHIP. Section 7 of the enabling statute establishes certain conditions under which the Commission may issue a Certificate of Exemption based on economic hardship to the applicant. No administrative review may occur on an application for a Certificate of Exemption based on hardship. An applicant seeking a Certificate of Exemption based on financial hardship shall be required to produce evidence of substantial financial hardship. At the time of filing for a Certificate of Exemption based on hardship, the applicant shall supply the Commission with the following information:

1. The amount paid for the property, the date of purchase and the party from whom purchased (including a description of the relationship, if any, between the owner and the person from whom the property was purchased).
2. The assessed value of the land and improvements thereon according to the most recent tax assessments.
3. Real estate taxes for the previous two years.
4. Annual debt service, if any, for the previous two years.
5. All appraisals obtained within the previous two years by the owner or applicant in connection with purchase, financing, or ownership of the property.
6. Any listing of the property for sale or rent, price asked and offers received, if any.
7. Any consideration by the owner as to profitable adaptive uses for the property.

If the property is income-producing, an owner must also provide:

1. Annual gross income from the property for the previous two years.
2. Estimated operating and maintenance expenses for the previous two years.
3. Cash flow, if any during the same period.

Section 7.5 APPEAL OF DECISIONS. Any person aggrieved by a decision of the commission must, in accordance with Section 9 of the enabling statute, file for appeal to the superior court for Suffolk County.

Section 7.6 APPEAL OF SATISFACTION OF CONDITIONS. If both the person designated under Section 7.1(b) to certify approval with prejudice and the applicant cannot agree as to whether the conditions have been met, the applicant may appeal to the full commission by filing for an appeal with the secretary. The appeal must be filed in writing by the deadlines for application for Certificates of Design approval, and must include all necessary drawings and documents. The appeal will be heard at the first eligible regular meeting of the commission. The commission may uphold an appeal by simple majority vote.
Certificate of Exemption based on Hardship
Certificate of Exemption based on Hardship

Assessing On-Line

Property #: 23-10
Appraiser#: B200410-006
Parcel #: 001-001-00
Address: 40 SHEFFIELD ST BOSTON MA 02118

Certificate of Exemption based on Hardship

Owner: INQUILING BORAD

The owner is exempt from the payment of real estate taxes to the extent authorized by law.

Assessors:

Date: January 1, 2018

Value History

- **Exempt:** $0
- **Non-Exempt:** $0

Certificate of Exemption based on Hardship

Owner: INQUILING BORAD

The owner is exempt from the payment of real estate taxes to the extent authorized by law.

Assessors:

Date: January 1, 2018
Certificate of Exemption based on Hardship

Question # 3
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This form approved by Commissioner of Revenue

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR-RECEIVER
101 CITY HALL SQ, BOSTON, MA 02201

COLLECTOR OF TAXES
FRANK T. HADDY

INQUIROS BORICUES
C/O INQUIROS BORICUES EN ACII
405 Shainebert Av
BOSTON MA 02118

FV 2018

CITY OF BOSTON
REAL ESTATE TAX
Office of the Collector 617-326-4101
Office Hours: Monday - Friday 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM

PAYMENTS CAN BE MADE ONLINE AT: www.mass.gov/property
creditcard payments are subject to fees
For more information, please contact Collector's office at 617-326-4101

TAXPAYER'S COPY
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This form approved by Commissioner of Revenue

COMMOMWALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR-RECEIVER
101 CITY HALL SQ, BOSTON, MA 02201

COLLECTOR OF TAXES
FRANK T. HADDY

INQUIROS BORICUES
C/O INQUIROS BORICUES EN ACII
405 Shainebert Av
BOSTON MA 02118

FV 2019

CITY OF BOSTON
REAL ESTATE TAX
Office of the Collector 617-326-4101
Office Hours: Monday - Friday 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM

PAYMENTS CAN BE MADE ONLINE AT:
www.mass.gov/property
creditcard payments are subject to fees
For more information, please call Collector's office at 617-326-4101

Please check the perforated area below with payment.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR-RECEIVER
101 CITY HALL SQ, BOSTON, MA 02201

COLLECTOR OF TAXES
FRANK T. HADDY

INQUIROS BORICUES
C/O INQUIROS BORICUES EN ACII
405 Shainebert Av
BOSTON MA 02118

TOTAL FULL VALUATION
491,085.00

TOTAL TAXABLE VALUATION
491,085.00

COMMUNITY PREVENTION SET
90.00

TOTAL TAX & SPEC AMT DUE
13,274.54

PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS
5,937.10

MORTGAGE INTEREST & TAX DUE
3,223.67

TOTAL DUE
3,223.67

TAX DUE
3,223.67

INTEREST
0.00

RECEIVED
3,223.67

TAX DUE
3,223.67

IMPORTANT: NO REVERSE USE FOR UNAPPROVED INFORMATION.

Please check the perforated area below with payment.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR-RECEIVER
101 CITY HALL SQ, BOSTON, MA 02201

COLLECTOR OF TAXES
FRANK T. HADDY

INQUIROS BORICUES
C/O INQUIROS BORICUES EN ACII
405 Shainebert Av
BOSTON MA 02118

TOTAL FULL VALUATION
490,585.00

TOTAL TAXABLE VALUATION
490,585.00

COMMUNITY PREVENTION SET
90.00

TOTAL TAX & SPEC AMT DUE
13,274.44

PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS
5,936.60

MORTGAGE INTEREST & TAX DUE
3,223.64

TOTAL DUE
3,223.64

TAX DUE
3,223.64

INTEREST
0.00

RECEIVED
3,223.64

TAX DUE
3,223.64

IMPORTANT: NO REVERSE USE FOR UNAPPROVED INFORMATION.

Please check the perforated area below with payment.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR-RECEIVER
101 CITY HALL SQ, BOSTON, MA 02201

COLLECTOR OF TAXES
FRANK T. HADDY

INQUIROS BORICUES
C/O INQUIROS BORICUES EN ACII
405 Shainebert Av
BOSTON MA 02118

TOTAL FULL VALUATION
491,085.00

TOTAL TAXABLE VALUATION
491,085.00

COMMUNITY PREVENTION SET
90.00

TOTAL TAX & SPEC AMT DUE
13,274.54

PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS
5,937.10

MORTGAGE INTEREST & TAX DUE
3,223.67

TOTAL DUE
3,223.67

TAX DUE
3,223.67

INTEREST
0.00

RECEIVED
3,223.67

TAX DUE
3,223.67

IMPORTANT: NO REVERSE USE FOR UNAPPROVED INFORMATION.

Please check the perforated area below with payment.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR-RECEIVER
101 CITY HALL SQ, BOSTON, MA 02201

COLLECTOR OF TAXES
FRANK T. HADDY

INQUIROS BORICUES
C/O INQUIROS BORICUES EN ACII
405 Shainebert Av
BOSTON MA 02118

TOTAL FULL VALUATION
490,585.00

TOTAL TAXABLE VALUATION
490,585.00

COMMUNITY PREVENTION SET
90.00

TOTAL TAX & SPEC AMT DUE
13,274.44

PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS
5,936.60

MORTGAGE INTEREST & TAX DUE
3,223.64

TOTAL DUE
3,223.64

TAX DUE
3,223.64

INTEREST
0.00

RECEIVED
3,223.64

TAX DUE
3,223.64

IMPORTANT: NO REVERSE USE FOR UNAPPROVED INFORMATION.

Please check the perforated area below with payment.