

Telephone (617) 796-1120 Telefax (617) 796-1142 TDD/TTY (617) 796-1089

City of Newton, Massachusetts

www.newtonma.gov

Department of Planning and Development

Barney S. Heath

Ruthanne Fuller Mayor 1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Director

Date: April 25, 2024

Place/Time: Zoom, at 7:00 PM

Attending:

| Doug Cornelius, Chair | John Rice, Vice Chair |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Harvey Schorr, Member | Anne Marie Stein, Member |
| Mark Armstrong, Member | Nancy Grissom, Member |
| David Lewis, Staff | |

The meeting was called to order via Zoom at 7:00 p.m. with Doug Cornelius serving as Chair. Voting permanent members were John Rice, Harvey Schorr, Anne Marie Stein, Mark Armstrong, and Nancy Grissom. David Lewis acted as Zoom host and the meeting was digitally recorded on the Zoom device.

1. 65 Osborne Path – Request for Demolition

Request for Total Demolition of the House

Staff Reported that this is a typical example of a Postwar Traditional style home in Oak Hill Park. Staff welcomes discussion of its historical significance.

Eileen Rosa was present to represent the application. Ms. Rosa described the property and existing home, before explaining the proposed project and reasoning for demolition.

Mr. Cornelius commented that this is another home in Oak Hill Park, with mixed historical context.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Armstrong made a motion to find the property preferably preserved. Mr. Rice seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 2-2-1:

RESOLVED to find the property preferably preserved.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| HS | JR | DC - Abstain |
| NG | MA | |

The motion did not pass, and the property was not found preferably preserved.

2. 790 Watertown Street - Request for Demolition

Request for Partial Demolition of the House

Staff Reported that this is a 1911 Dutch Colonial house designed by a noted architect. Staff recommends finding the property preferably preserved, and welcomes discussion of the proposed addition.

Mark Sangiolo was present to represent the application. Mr. Sangiolo explained the reasoning for not wanting to preserve the property.

Ms. Grissom commented that the Dutch Colonial stylings may have been added later. Mr. Armstrong commented that there was precedent for preferably preserving the property. Mr. Armstrong asked how the parcel was zoned, and Mr. Sangiolo clarified.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Armstrong made a motion to find the property preferable preserved. Ms. Grissom seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 5-0:

RESOLVED to find the property preferably preserved.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | | |
| MA | | |
| HS | | |
| NG | | |
| DC | | |

3. 33 Terrace Avenue – Request for Demolition

Request for Total Demolition of the House

Staff Reported that this is a ca. 1900 Colonial Revival house on a well-preserved street. Staff recommends finding the property preferably preserved.

Anya Kogan was present to represent the application. Staff showed pictures of the property using the share screen function. Ms. Kogan explained that the property was in poor condition and has been poorly maintained. Ms. Kogan noted that she did not feel as if the house had any historic value.

Mr. Cornelius opened the meeting for public comment. Stan, a neighbor, asked for clarification on the process.

Mr. Cornelius commented that he leaned toward finding the property preferably preserved.

Ms. Grissom made a motion to find the property preferably preserved. Mr. Rice seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 5-0:

RESOLVED to find the property preferably preserved.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | | |
| MA | | |
| HS | | |
| NG | | |
| DC | | |

Commission Member Anne Marie Stein joined the meeting after this item.

4. 10 Crescent Street – Request for Demolition

Request for Total Demolition of the House

Staff Reported that this is a ca. 1900 Queen Anne on a street with some similar existing houses. Staff recommends finding the property preferably preserved.

Alena Shulakova was present to represent the application. Ms. Shulakova described the houses nearby this home and explained that she did not feel that they matched the style of this house. She also commented that the front of this house had been modified, and that she did not feel as if it should be preferably preserved.

Mr. Cornelius commented that he did not think there was much context on this street. Ms. Stein commented that the house is in very rough shape but commented that the house did retain context in terms of scale. Ms. Grissom commented that there are other houses of a similar era on the street and suggested that this property could be restored.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Grissom made a motion to find the property preferably preserved. Ms. Stein seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 4-2:

RESOLVED to find the property preferably preserved.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | MA | |

| AMS | DC | |
|-----|----|--|
| HS | | |
| NG | | |

5. 8 Everett Street – Request for Demolition

Request for Partial Demolition of the House

Staff Reported that this is a ca. 1900 Dutch Colonial home in a well-preserved neighborhood. Staff recommends finding the property preferably preserved and welcomes discussion of the proposed addition.

Adrienne Weir was present to represent the application. Mr. Cornelius explained the partial demolition process. The applicant allowed for a preferably preserved vote to take place.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 6-0:

RESOLVED to find the property preferably preserved.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | | |
| AMS | | |
| MA | | |
| HS | | |
| NG | | |
| DC | | |

The homeowners, Sam and Randie Goldberger introduced themselves, explained their reasoning for wanting to expand the existing property, and described the proposed project. Ms. Weir then displayed the proposed plans using the share screen function.

Mr. Cornelius commented that he thought the proposed design was great. Mr. Schorr commented that the existing character of the building may have been better preserved on the elevation that the garage is attached to. Ms. Weir commented that they did not have the space to build portions of the addition elsewhere. Mr. Schorr asked if the garage could be moved at all.

Mr. Cornelius opened the meeting for public comment. MaryLee Belleville commented that she was glad that the owners are preserving the house, and that she liked the design.

Ms. Stein made a motion to approve the plans as proposed. Mr. Armstrong seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 6-0:

RESOLVED to approve the plans as proposed.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | | |

| AMS | |
|-----|--|
| MA | |
| HS | |
| NG | |
| DC | |

6. 3 Valley Spring Road – Request for Demolition

Request for Partial Demolition of the House

Staff Reported that this 1954 raised ranch is well-preserved and designed by a noted architect. Staff recommends finding the property preferably preserved and welcomes discussion of the proposed addition.

Dan Rubin and Bond Worthington were present to represent the application. Mr. Cornelius explained the partial demolition process. Mr. Rubin gave a presentation using the share screen function, explaining the neighborhood context, before describing the existing house.

Mr. Cornelius explained that he liked the street but agreed that there is mixed context. Mr. Cornelius commented that he believed that the property should be preferably preserved. Ms. Stein commented that the property should be preferably preserved. Mr. Schorr commented that the architect, Hugh Stubbins, was significant, and as such he believed the property should be preferably preserved.

Mr. Schorr made a motion to find the property preferably preserved. Ms. Grissom seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 6-0:

RESOLVED to find the property preferably preserved.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | | |
| AMS | | |
| MA | | |
| HS | | |
| NG | | |
| DC | | |

Mr. Rubin continued by showing photos of the existing house, before showing the plans and renderings for the proposed addition and explaining the design. Mr. Rubin explained that they hoped to keep some elements of the Midcentury Modern design.

Mr. Armstrong commented that he liked the design and that he would approve the design. Mr. Schorr commented that he was less enthusiastic about the design, and that he did not feel as if it fit well into the neighborhood. Mr. Cornelius commented that he agreed with Mr. Armstrong. Ms. Stein commented that she liked certain elements of the design but was not sure if she felt like it was truly

midcentury modern. Ms. Grissom commented that she felt that the windows on the addition were too vertical for the midcentury design.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Armstrong made a motion to approve the plans as proposed. Mr. Rice seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 3-2-1:

RESOLVED to approve the plans as proposed.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | HS | AMS - Abstain |
| MA | NG | |
| DC | | |

7. 300 Cabot Street – Request for Demolition

Request for Partial Demolition of the House

Staff Reported that this is a ca. 1890 Victorian eclectic house in a well-preserved neighborhood. Staff recommends finding the property preferably preserved and welcomes discussion of the proposed addition.

Mariana Dagatti was present to represent the application. Mr. Cornelius explained the partial demolition process. The applicant allowed for a preferably preserved vote to take place.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 6-0:

RESOLVED to find the property preferably preserved.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | | |
| AMS | | |
| MA | | |
| HS | | |
| NG | | |
| DC | | |

Ms. Dagatti gave a presentation using the share screen function. She began by describing the project, before showing photos of the existing structure and an existing site plan. Ms. Dagatti also explained that the project required a special permit. She continued by showing the plans and renderings of the proposed addition.

Mr. Schorr asked for clarification between the elevation drawings and the renderings. Ms. Dagatti clarified the differences, explaining that the were in part due to the perspective of the rendering. Mr.

Schorr commented that overall, the design was good. Mr. Cornelius commented that he also liked the design.

Mr. Cornelius opened the meeting for public comment. MaryLee Belleville commented that she did not think the proposed design was representative of the original house. Lem Lanier and Maggie Thompson, residents of 294 Cabot, asked if there was a plan to put a fence up on the property, and where it would be if so. Ms. Dagatti confirmed that there would be a fence on the back and sides of the property.

Ms. Stein commented that the house looks like it fits in with the city well.

Ms. Stein made a motion to approve the plans as proposed. Mr. Rice seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 6-0:

RESOLVED to approve the plans as proposed.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | | |
| AMS | | |
| MA | | |
| HS | | |
| NG | | |
| DC | | |

8. 50 Hartford Street - Request for Demolition

Request for Total Demolition of Carriage House

Staff Reported that this is a ca. 1900 Colonial Revival house on a well-preserved street. Staff recommends finding the property preferably preserved.

Nick DiDuca was present to represent the application. Mr. DiDuca explained that the home at 50 Hartford Street was well-maintained, and that the carriage house was used primarily as a garage and for storage. He also commented that he is not sure how structurally sound the carriage house is. Mr. Cornelius shared a picture of the carriage house using the share screen function.

Mr. Cornelius commented that he would not be inclined to preferably preserve the carriage house, but that he wanted the commission to discuss it. Ms. Stein commented that she felt that the carriage house matched the house well, and did not think it would be a big expense to preserve the carriage house.

Mr. Cornelius opened the meeting for public comment. MaryLee Belleville asked if the carriage house could be converted into an ADU and commented that it appeared to be in good shape.

Ms. Grissom made a motion to find the property preferably preserved. Ms. Stein seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 4-2:

RESOLVED to find the property preferably preserved.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| AMS | JR | |
| MA | DC | |
| HS | | |
| NG | | |

9. 39 Marla Circle - Request for Demolition

Request for Partial Demolition of the House

Staff Reported that this is a 1966 split-level home. Staff recommends finding the property preferably preserved and welcomes discussion of the proposed addition.

Carmine Petruzziello was present to represent the application. Mr. Cornelius explained the partial demolition process. The applicant allowed for a preferably preserved vote to take place.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 6-0:

RESOLVED to find the property preferably preserved.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | | |
| AMS | | |
| MA | | |
| HS | | |
| NG | | |
| DC | | |

Staff used the share screen function to show photos of the existing house and the proposed plans. Mr. Petruzziello explained the proposed project.

Mr. Schorr said that the design was a good start but that there were a few changes he would like to see.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Stein said that the design was good, as it kept the vernacular style alive and that the original home was still visible.

Ms. Stein made a motion to approve the plans as proposed. Ms. Grissom seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 6-0:

RESOLVED to approve the plans as proposed.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | | |
| AMS | | |
| MA | | |
| HS | | |
| NG | | |
| DC | | |

10. 853 Dedham Street - Request for Demolition

Request to demolish house.

Applicant has requested this item be postponed to the May 23, 2024 meeting.

11. 32 Hickory Cliff - Request for Demolition

Request to partially demolish house.

Staff Reported that this is a 1938 Cape in a well-preserved neighborhood. Staff welcomes discussion of the proposed addition.

Janet Qin was present to represent the application. Staff displayed the proposed rendering using the share screen function. Mr. Qin commented that she addressed the commissioners' previous comments by proposing the same siding throughout the building.

Mr. Schorr commented that the design has improved, but asked why the new design intends to align the front elevation on one plane, while on the existing house, the right side of the front elevation is set back slightly. Ms. Qin responded that the house is very narrow, and aligning the front elevation will allow for more room. Ms. Qin displayed other renderings prepared by her architect, that were not part of the submission. Mr. Cornelius clarified that the commission could not vote on plans that were not submitted as part of the application. Mr. Schorr commented that he preferred the rendering with three dormers and a front porch. Mr. Cornelius suggested that Ms. Qin revise the design with her architects and return to a later meeting.

12. 19-21 Maple Park – Request for Demolition Waiver

Request for waiver of demolition delay.

Staff Reported that this is a ca. 1870 Carpenter Gothic home.

Hanwen Wu was present to represent the application. Mr. Wu gave a presentation using the share screen function, beginning by showing photos of the existing house before moving on to plans of the proposed new construction.

Mr. Cornelius commented that he did not think the proposed design fit into the context of the neighborhood or mitigated the loss of the existing home. Mr. Schorr agreed that the form of the design did not fit in to the existing neighborhood. Ms. Stein agreed with Mr. Cornelius and Mr. Schorr and added that she did not think the proposed design felt like a home.

Mr. Cornelius opened the meeting for public comment. Johanna, a resident of 16 Maple Park, commented that she agreed with the commissioners that the design did not fit in with the neighborhood. Councilor Wright commented that the proposed design did not have any context with the neighborhood. Susan Chused, a resident of 14 Maple Park, agreed with the commissioners and other residents. Mr. Wu commented that he was sad to hear these comments. Councilor Malakie commented that the proposed renderings did not seem to accurately depict the existing plot. Councilor Wright commented that the existing house is nearly identical to the one next door.

Ms. Stein commented that the house was not inviting to create community. Mr. Cornelius clarified the criteria for waiving demolition delay. Mr. Wu commented that he was disappointed.

13. 154 Langley Road - Request for Demolition Waiver

Request for waiver of demolition delay.

Staff Reported that this 1845, 2.5-story home was constructed with elements of both the Greek Revival and Italianate Styles.

Jason Graca was present to represent the application. Mr. Graca used the share screen function to give a presentation, beginning by showing photos of the existing house and neighborhood, before showing the plans for new construction.

Mr. Cornelius commented that he did not think this design mitigated the loss of the historic structure. Ms. Stein commented that the new construction house across the street does more to fit in with the context of the neighborhood.

Mr. Cornelius opened the meeting for public comment. MaryLee Belleville commented that she did not think the house mitigate the loss of the existing home. Councilor Wright commented that she agreed that she did not think the proposed design mitigated the loss, and that demolition of the existing house would be a big loss. Councilor Malakie commented that she agreed with the others who had commented.

The commission did not take action on this application.

14. 23 Sylvester Road – Request for Demolition Waiver

Request for waiver of demolition delay.

Staff Reported that this is a small, Cape style home in a brick construction that is characteristic of the other immediate neighbors on the street.

Michael Quinn was present to represent the application. He described the existing house and the proposed plan. Mr. Cornelius used the share screen function to display the proposed plans.

Mr. Cornelius commented that this design was closer than the previous designs the commission had reviewed. Mr. Schorr commented that he was surprised by the lack of and small size of the windows on the side and rear elevations. Mr. Cornelius agreed with Mr. Schorr. Ms. Stein commented that she believed the design was moving in the right direction and that it would fit in with the neighborhood, however she lamented allowing for demolition in the in-tact neighborhood. She also commented that she agreed with Mr. Schorr.

Mr. Cornelius opened the meeting for public comment. Ann Donovan commented that she was sad to see houses in the neighborhood torn down, as the street is currently very in-tact. She also commented that the design felt too big for the street. Councilor Wright commented that she was sad to see some of the capes in this neighborhood torn down, but that she did appreciate that the footprint would not be expanded too greatly in the proposed design. Councilor Malakie asked how much higher the foundation line would be, as the existing homes are built closer to the ground. She also commented that the two-car garage would not be keeping with the existing houses on the street.

Mr. Armstrong commented that improved graphics, including a three-dimensional image, would be appreciated.

The commission did not take action on this application.

15. 93 Sevland Road – Request for Demolition Waiver

Request for waiver of demolition delay.

Staff Reported that this 1961 home was constructed in a midcentury, split level style, as are many of the properties on this street.

Alex Fox was present to represent the application. He explained that they took the commission comment from the previous month into account and made changes to the proposed design. Kevin Remillard, the project architect, was also present, and gave a presentation using the share screen function. He began by showing pictures of the neighborhood and existing house, before showing the previous design presented to the commission and then the new proposed design. Mr. Remillard explained how the comments from the commission last month were incorporated into the updated design.

Mr. Cornelius commented that the proposed design was definitely an improvement. Mr. Schorr commented that the design was a huge improvement over the original version, but suggested that the stone facing and paneling around the window on the right side be removed, and the gable on the right side be aligned on the same plane. Ms. Stein commented that she agreed with Mr. Schorr.

Councilor Farrell commented that the design was a vast improvement over the original design and that it is in keeping with the neighborhood.

Mr. Cornelius asked if the architect would be willing to alter the design according to Mr. Schorr's comments.

Ms. Stein made a motion to waive the demolition delay and approve the plans as proposed, subject to the removal of the stone facing and simplification of the window on the right side, and delegate approval to staff. Mr. Schorr seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 5-0:

RESOLVED to waive the demolition delay and approve the plans as proposed. Conditional staff approval.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | | |
| AMS | | |
| MA | | |
| HS | | |
| DC | | |

16. 9 Applegarth Street - Request for Demolition Waiver

Request for waiver of demolition delay.

Applicant has requested this item be postponed to the May 23, 2024, meeting.

17. 36 Bonnybrook Road – Request for Demolition Waiver

Request for waiver of demolition delay.

Staff Reported that this is a well-preserved 1936 Garrison Colonial style home.

Mike McKay was present to represent the application. Mr. McKay gave a presentation using the share screen function, beginning by showing a map and photos of the neighborhood, before showing a site plan of the proposed design. Mr. McKay then presented the rendering and proposed plans for the new building.

Mr. Cornelius commented that he had questions about certain design elements, like the window panels and stepped cornices. Mr. Schorr commented that the pitch of the two gables on the front façade are different, and inquired why. Mr. McKay commented that the pitch could be updated. Mr. Cornelius asked for clarification on the siding materials. Mr. McKay commented that the siding was stucco. Mr. Armstrong asked if the window spandrels were made by the window manufacturer or by a contractor. Mr. McKay commented that they were made by the manufacturer. Mr. Armstrong commented that he had a problem with how the garage projected out in front of the house. Ms. Stein commented that the spandrels reminded her of air conditioner panels. She also commented that she did not like that the windows on the right side of the front façade were recessed.

Mr. Cornelius opened the meeting for public comment. Gerry Mahony, resident of 31 Bonnybrook, asked what the square footage of the house was. Mr. McKay clarified it was 5500 square feet. Mr. Mahony also asked for clarification as to how the house would be positioned in relation to the street. Mr. McKay showed the proposed site plan, and explained where the house would be positioned. Mr. Mahony commented that the windows were very large. Mr. Mahony commented that he did not like the design of the previous new construction houses, and that it is disappointing how much the neighborhood is changing, and how that impacts the scale of the other houses. Benjamin Kornitzer commented that the street is small, and that he appreciated that the design was in keeping with the scale and spatial relationship of the neighborhood.

Mr. Armstrong commented that he liked the design, but would prefer if the garage was pushed back. Mr. McKay commented that the garage could be moved. Mr. Cornelius summarized that the commission hoped to see the pitch of the gables, the panels on the windows, and the location of the garage changed.

Ms. Stein made a motion to waive the demolition delay and approve the plans, with changes to the pitch of the gables, removal of the window panels and recess, and location of the garage. Mr. Schorr seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 4-1:

RESOLVED to waive the demolition delay and approve the plans as proposed.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | MA | |
| AMS | | |
| HS | | |
| DC | | |

18. 31 Greenwood Street – Local Landmark Nomination

Nomination to Delist Property as a Local Landmark

Mr. Cornelius described the process of this application and the history of the property, and also explained that this was the first time the commission had received a petition to remove a landmark status.

Anne Greer was present to represent the application. Ms. Greer explained the history of the house, before explaining her reasoning for why she believes the landmark status should be removed from the house at 31 Greenwood Street.

Mr. Cornelius commented that he agrees that the property is new, is not historic, and would not meet the standards of a local landmark.

Mr. Cornelius opened the meeting for public comment. MaryLee Belleville asked if any property had been de-landmarked previously. Mr. Cornelius clarified none have been. Ms. Belleville commented that if the property was landmarked, she was unsure if it mattered if the barn was a replica or not. Councilor Farrell commented that he wondered when the parcel was first sold by the family that originally owned the property, and if it was sold off as a whole or separately. Councilor Farrel also asked why the petitioner wanted to de-landmark the property. Councilor Farrell explained that his understanding was that the whole original property was landmarked as a farm, and that he believed that significance should be retained. Councilor Farrell also inquired what the benefits of delandmarking would be. Ms. Greer commented that she knew the house was considered to be a landmark when she purchased with the property and has cooperated with the requirements of the landmark ordinance since owning the home. Ms. Greer commented that she did not believe that the entire property was included in the landmark designation. Ms. Greer said that the benefit of delandmarking the house would be to allow for her to make alterations and repairs to her house without approval of the Newton Historical Commission each time. Councilor Wright commented that the commission approved the demolition of the original barn and construction of a new building and commented that she thinks that the new building does retain design elements of the original barn. Councilor Malakie inquired how many members of the commission were on the commission when

the subdivision happened. Ms. Greer urged the commission to take action on the first of the two steps of the landmark process.

Mr. Cornelius clarified the process of de-landmarking and what the motion of a vote would be.

Mr. Cornelius made a motion to accept the petition and conduct further study. Mr. Schorr seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 25, 2024, the Newton Historical Commission, by vote of 5-0:

RESOLVED to accept the nomination and conduct further study.

| Voting in the Affirmative | Voting in the Negative | Recusal/Abstain |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| JR | | |
| AMS | | |
| MA | | |
| HS | | |
| DC | | |

Administrative Discussion:

Dr. 6. 2, NHC

a) Approval of minutes from the March 28, 2024, meeting

Minutes from the March 28, 2024, hearing were unanimously approved by those in attendance at the hearing.

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous vote.

Respectfully,