



Ruthanne Fuller  
Mayor

**City of Newton, Massachusetts**  
Department of Planning and Development  
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone  
(617) 796-1120  
Telefax  
(617) 796-1142  
TDD/TTY  
(617) 796-1089  
www.newtonma.gov

Barney S. Heath  
Director

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS  
NEWTON HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**DATE:** November 18, 2021

**PLACE/TIME:** Via Zoom

<b>ATTENDING:</b>	<b>Peter Dimond, Chairman</b>	<b>Doug Cornelius, Member</b>
	<b>Mark Armstrong, Member</b>	<b>Amanda Stauffer Park, Member</b>
	<b>Katie Kubie, Member</b>	<b>Jennifer Bentley-Houston Alt.</b>
	<b>Valerie Birmingham, Staff</b>	

**ABSENT:** Nancy Grissom, Member

The meeting was called to order via Zoom at 7:00 p.m. with Peter Dimond serving as Chair. Voting permanent members were Cornelius, Armstrong, Kubie and Stauffer Park. Bentley-Houston was designated to vote as an alternate. Valerie Birmingham acted as Zoom host and the meeting was digitally recorded on the Zoom device.

1. **206-208 Concord Street – Local Landmark Nomination (Ward 4)**  
Request to nominate this property for designation as a local landmark  
**This item was postponed to the December 23, 2021 hearing**
2. **145 Warren Street, LL—Request for Certificate of Appropriateness (Ward 6)**  
Request to construct additional residential units in the rear of the site, install hardscaping including terraces and driveway

Staff reported that this property was designated as a local landmark at the June 24, 2021, NHC hearing, and as such the Law Department has stated that according to the Landmarks Ordinance, no building, structure, exterior architectural feature, or landscape shall be altered or demolished unless the NHC has first issued a Certificate. Prior to its landmarking, this address previously came before the NHC in 2018 for a partial demolition application to construct a second living unit onto the rear. The scope also included a detached two unit building behind the historic building. The NHC unanimously approved an

amended design to waive the demolition delay. Those plans and decision are included in the packet documents. After the expiration of the delay in 2020, a building permit was issued for interior demolition and demolition of the rear wall. According to the Law Department, any work that was not completed prior to the landmarking of the site, even if a building permit was issued and it is already underway, would then need a certificate from the Commission if the scope of work triggered review per the Landmark Ordinance. Additionally, the owner, who has changed since 2018, is currently seeking to obtain a special permit from the City Council. Again, even though a delay was waived in 2018, now that the property is a local landmark it comes under a different ordinance, and the proposed work cannot be done without the NHC granting a Certificate of Appropriateness, which has not been provided and the applicant is asking for at this hearing.

While it appears, the scope is the same, the plans have changed since the NHC last reviewed a project at this address in 2018. The plans now show that the rear construction only connects to the basement of the historic house, instead of the entire rear elevation. In doing this change, the applicant is proposing patio space above the basement connection. Additionally, the design itself of the proposed additional units has changed including the design of the roofline, fenestration, materials, etc. The location and massing appear similar.

Terry Morris, attorney for the applicant, commented that the plans were an improvement compared to what the Commission last saw when it was a demolition review. Further Mr. Morris commented the plan was to enhance the original house and have it be independent from most stances; and for the addition to not overwhelm the historic house and be broken into pieces to create a more consistent look.

Mr. Dimond asked if there were any proposed work to the historic house. Andrew Consigli, applicant, remarked that the house has changed over the years, and they plan to return it to its original design based on photographs, as well as make changes to window openings.

Mr. Cornelius remarked he was concerned that this was not being reviewed in accordance with the local landmark's standard for review. The Commission and the applicants discussed the process for review now that it is a local landmark. Ms. Stauffer Park remarked no agreement prior included the Commission, and the Commission can protect local landmarks as they come under the highest protection.

Mr. Consigli went over the proposed plans further with the Commission. Mr. Cornelius asked about changes to the roof. Mr. Consigli commented that the plan was to replace cracked tiles and not to touch the siding. Mr. Morris commented that they were trying to work with the Commission.

Ms. Kubie commented that from the drawings it appeared the local landmark would be restored and did not think the additions would inhibit the status of the landmark or be detrimental. Mr. Armstrong agreed and commented it was well massed and designed.

Ms. Bentley-Houston remarked she was concerned about the front elevation and changes to the house and wanted to see actual plans and material specifications. Further, Ms. Bentley-Houston commented

she was struggling with the proposed additions and its size but was willing to consider it. Mr. Armstrong commented that the additions were much more spread out.

Mr. Cornelius reiterated his concern about not addressing the local landmark's standard for review and asked for clarification and that the applicant return to the Commission once that is set.

The item was opened to public comment. Simon French remarked that the rear was completely out of context. Mary Lee Belleville remarked that the plans have changed, and it did not have the city council votes, and it was not clear what the final plan would look like, and there should be more focus on the front elevation. Aedin Culhane went over her research and commented that the applicant had no regard to the interior or exterior of the house. Annemarie Stein commented what made the building significant on the interior was lost.

David Oliveri, applicant, commented they would focus on the front elevation. Mr. Consigli commented the plan was to maintain what was there and that they wanted it to be a collaborative process with the city. Mr. Cornelius commented the applicants should return with an understanding of the local landmark's standards for review as they were not addressed properly. Ms. Bentley-Houston commented that the plans did not match up.

No vote was taken, and Mr. Morris agreed to continue the application to the December 23, 2021 NHC hearing.

3. **31 Greenwood Street, LL – Request for Certificate of Appropriateness (Ward 8)**

Request to remove transom and metal divider above front entry slider and install siding to match the house in its place

Staff reported that plans for the converted barn at this location came under NHC review because this site was preserved as an individual Local Landmark when it was subdivided from the larger property at 29 Greenwood Street. In 2017, an in-kind replication of the historic barn was approved by the Newton Historical Commission, and a Certificate of Occupancy was issued earlier this year for the completed project. The new owner wishes to remove the transom and metal divider above the front entry slider facing Greenwood Street and install siding to match the house in its place. The installed transom was a part of the approved design, which is included in the packet docs, and a smaller transom above the entry was evident on the barn prior to any alterations.

The application also included the removal of black paint on the back side of a side window. Staff had issued a Certificate of Non-Applicability for this as the applicant is planning to reinstall the window once the paint is removed, and no exterior features are being impacted.

Anne Greer, owner, went over the proposal with the Commission and commented that the element had become damaged and that it only had floor joists behind it. Mr. Dimond asked if this was what was approved. Ms. Greer replied it was, but it was not installed correctly. Ms. Cornelius commented that it would take away the black decorative element. Ms. Bentley-Houston suggested a wooden millwork panel designed to look like what is there now. Mr. Dimond suggested lowering the transom to be more like it was prior to the alterations.

There was no public comment.

No vote was taken, and Ms. Greer commented that she would consider the suggestions and return to the Commission with a revised plan at a future hearing.

4. **27 Cross Street– Demolition Review (Ward 3)**

Request to demolish house and detached garage

Staff reported that the wood frame house was constructed c. 1884 by the Estes family. Charles G. Estes, originally from Maine, owned the land as far back as 1874, and resided in a house next door. Estes appeared to hold a number of jobs throughout the mid to late 19<sup>th</sup> century including butcher, provisions dealer and carpenter. The house first appears in its current location on the 1886 atlas belonging to the Estes family. Charles died in 1893, and the property was transferred to his widow, Mary Estes. By 1907 the property was owned by Edmund T. Wiswall, a milk dealer turned real estate businessman, who also owned nearby #40 and 41-43 Cross Street, and 24-26 Wiswall St. Ownership continued to change fairly often as in 1917, H.W. Bennet is listed as the property owner, and in 1929 the atlas shows Robert S. Jigger.

Permitted by Jigger, the single car prefabricated garage was constructed in 1930 and manufactured by Brooks Skinner Co. Located in Quincy, the company was very popular in the area and in 1923, claimed to “produce a complete building every 55 minutes in the factory.” A survey provided for the 1930 garage permit, showed what appeared to be a full width front porch on the house, which extended partially down the right side. By 1983, the porch had been removed or vastly altered and replaced with a smaller porch which was removed some point in the last couple of years, if not more recently. While the area retains a collection of late 19<sup>th</sup> century houses, this house has lost many contributing features and staff recommended not preferably preserving the house and detached garage.

There was no public comment.

Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the house at 27 Cross Street. There was no second to the motion, so the motion did not pass. The house is not preferably preserved.

Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the garage at 27 Cross Street. There was no second to the motion, so the motion did not pass. The garage is not preferably preserved.

5. **1-21 Lincoln Street, NR – Partial Demolition (Ward 6)**

Request to replace slate roof with composite slate roof

Staff reported that known historically as the Steven’s Building, the address is included in the Newton Highlands National Register Historic District as a contributing structure. The area form states that “It is one of Newton’s most intact village commercial centers and is thus a significant illustration of both the city’s rapid 20<sup>th</sup> century growth and the expanded services offered by the village centers.”

According to the building’s survey form on file with the state, the prominently situated building was first owned by Elizabeth Stevens and was built in 1888 on an older foundation. Mrs. Stevens

commissioned a local architect, Herbert Moseley, to design and supervise its construction. Moseley designed churches in Needham and Harvard Square, as well as several private residences in the area. Though it is seen alterations over the decades, the large Romanesque brick building retains elements such as its focal center gable with intricate detailing surrounding the words “Stevens Building” as well as its detailed eaves with stepped brick corbel and dentils, and brick pilasters. Staff recommended preferably preserving the building for architectural integrity and as a contributing structure to the Newton Highlands National Register Historic District.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the building at 1-21 Lincoln Street. Mr. Armstrong seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on November 18, 2021, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 6-0:

RESOLVED to preferably preserve the building at 1-21 Lincoln Street

Voting in the Affirmative:      Voting in the Negative:      Abstained:

Peter Dimond, Chair  
Doug Cornelius, Member  
Katie Kubie, Member  
Mark Armstrong, Member  
Amanda Stauffer Park, Member  
Jennifer Bentley-Houston, Alt.

Chris Talanian, owner, discussed the existing conditions of the roof and proposed faux slate replacement.

Mr. Cornelius commented that he did not want to require people to replace slate with slate for economic reasons. Ms. Bentley-Houston agreed but commented that the replacement selected should look as close to the existing as possible. Ms. Stauffer Park remarked that the Commission is not stringent about materials. Mr. Armstrong commented that the slate roof was not a dominant feature of the building and that faux slate is visually great nowadays, and that the Commission should approve the request.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to waive the demo delay and OK the replacement of the slate roof with faux slate at 1-21 Lincoln Street with final staff approval. Ms. Kubie seconded the motion

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on November 18, 2021, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 6-0:

RESOLVED to waive the demo delay on 1-21 Lincoln Street based on approved plans to replace the slate roof with DaVinci Composite Slate Tiles with final review of material by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit

Voting in the Affirmative:      Voting in the Negative:      Abstained:

Peter Dimond, Chair  
Doug Cornelius, Member  
Katie Kubie, Member  
Mark Armstrong, Member  
Amanda Stauffer Park, Member  
Jennifer Bentley-Houston, Alt.

6. **131 Danehill Road – Demolition Review (Ward 8)**

Request to demolish house

Staff reported that the house was permitted for construction in 1935 for \$8500. The owner, architect and builder are all listed as D & V Realty Trust, which was the Davis & Vaughan Realty Trust. The architect on the original plans themselves is E.C. Davis, presumably Earl Cummings Davis. In addition to this property, Davis & Vaughan Realty Trust appeared to have subdivided and developed parts of the surrounding area, known at the time as Newton Countryside, and had an office within the area at 237 Dedham Street. According to an early brochure for the new development, “No two homes shall be built alike, and all must accede to the high character of the development.” This brochure, provided by an abutter, is included in the packet documents.

20 Bound Brook Road, also part of the Davis & Vaughan Realty Trust development, was recently deemed preferably preserved by the NHC in May of this year. According to the staff memorandum for that item, completed by Katy Hax Holmes, “The eponymous firm was named for Earl C. Davis and Victor H. Vaughan, the latter of whom lived at 69 Commonwealth Park in Newton in a house designed by the two. Vaughan owned several lots in the Day Street area, which were also developed by them.” Davis, formerly of Nashua, New Hampshire, is listed as an architect living on Jane Road on the 1930 and 1940 census. Vaughan was Davis’ brother-in-law, and the two were apparently close as Vaughan was Davis’ bestman at his 1927 wedding. Davis designed many of the homes in the new subdivision and any outside plans needed approval from the pair.

No building permits besides its initial construction were located in the ISD file, and today the house still reflects many elements of its original Tudor Revival design, including its steeply pitched cross gabled slate roof, half timbering detailing, and combination of siding materials. Additionally, the round arched brick entry way and mix of double hung and diamond-shaped windows have been retained. Staff recommended preferably preserving the building for architectural integrity and as part of an intact cohesive area developed by the same company.

Trina Murphy, representative for the owner, discussed that the house has structural and water management issues, and that the basement was not repairable.

Mr. Cornelius commented that it was a nice Tudor, but not exemplary and there was no context.

The item was opened to public comment. Mitch Fischman, abutter, remarked that it was a very charming house and a textbook Tudor, and that the Commission should look at the broader context of

the development and history of the neighborhood; further, Mr. Fischman remarked that structural issues are part of the nature of living in an old house.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the house at 131 Danehill Road. Ms. Bentley-Houston seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on November 18, 2021, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 4-1-1:

RESOLVED to preferably preserve the house at 131 Danehill Road

Voting in the Affirmative:    Voting in the Negative:    Abstained:

Peter Dimond, Chair

Doug Cornelius, Member

Katie Kubie, Member

Mark Armstrong, Member

Amanda Stauffer Park, Member

Jennifer Bentley-Houston, Alt.

7. **249 Upland Road – Demolition Review (Ward 2)**

Request to demolish detached garage

Staff reported that the fieldstone garage was constructed between 1895 and 1907 with the matching carriage house (22 Oakwood Road) and house (47 Kirkstall Road), on an estate belonging to James L. Richards. Both the carriage house and house are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Richards made his fortune in the tobacco business, but was known in the Boston business community, at one time serving on the boards of thirty-three separate companies at the same time. According to the forms on file with the state, Samuel J. Brown is the presumed architect of the buildings. The reason for this assumption is that Richards, who was president of the Norumbega Park Company, commissioned Brown to design the buildings at the Auburndale park, and is thought to have likely later engaged Brown to design his own estate.

In 1955 the property was subdivided. The carriage house was converted to a residence and the garage became part of the land associated with the newly constructed house at 249 Upland Road. While the application also included the 1955 house, staff and the chair deemed the house not historically significant, and the Commission is only determining whether the garage should be preferably preserved. The garage has retained its notable material, including its matching side chimney, as well as parts of its diamond pane windows, also evident on the nearby carriage house. Staff recommended preferably preserving the garage for architectural integrity and direct association with two buildings listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Alex Bushoy, owner, remarked that it was not part of the National Register designation, and that the garage is completely hidden; further, Mr. Bushoy commented that the plan was to construct a new house with an attached garage.

Mr. Dimond and Ms. Bentley-Houston commented that the garage was visible from the street. Mr. Cornelius asked if the garage was included on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Birmingham commented that it was not.

The item was opened for public comment. Melinda Roman, abutter, commented that the garage was beautiful and was part of a large estate, but it was hard to say it couldn't come down. Costas Pavlides, abutter, commented that he would leave it to the Commission, that the photographs shown by the applicant were strategically taken, and that it was beautiful building, appreciated when seen in its context, that would be a shame to lose but understood the owner's intentions.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the garage at 249 Upland Road. Ms. Bentley-Houston seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on November 18, 2021, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 5-0-1:

RESOLVED to preferably preserve the garage at 249 Upland Road

Voting in the Affirmative:    Voting in the Negative:    Abstained:

Peter Dimond, Chair

Doug Cornelius, Member

Katie Kubie, Member

Mark Armstrong, Member

Amanda Stauffer Park, Member

Jennifer Bentley-Houston, Alt.

8. **68 Hartford Street, NR – Waiver Request (Ward 6)**

Request to waive demo delay

Staff reported that a representative for this property will return to the Commission with revised plans for two story additions on either side to the preferably preserved house. The property was preferably preserved on September 2, 2021. At the hearing, Commission members reviewed the plans and asked about the location and number of garages and stated that the drawings did not reflect them correctly. Further, Commission members commented that the presented plans did not provide a good idea of the proposal and that the site plan does not show the proposal and included elements of the existing structure that are to be demolished. The applicant was asked to provide 3-D renderings of the proposal and elevations that could accurately explain the proposal. Concerns were raised that the plans just added a box on the back of an ornate structure, and that the house disappeared into the proposal.

Jeet Shahani, representative for the owner, went over the revised plans with the Commission.

Mr. Dimond asked if the plan was to convert the building to a two family and about the garages. Mr. Shahani answered yes and explained the location of the garages. Ms. Bentley-Houston asked about the location of the stairways to the porch and why there were two and suggested it be merged into one. Mr. Dimond commented he did not like the side addition and asked if it could be in the rear. Mr. Shahani



remarked they were also planning to construct an addition in the rear. Mr. Armstrong remarked that it was a good plan and explained why he thought the plans were adequate. Mr. Cornelius remarked that he appreciated the thought that has gone into the design and that it retained the building. The Commission and Mr. Shahani further discussed the proposed plans and changes incorporated since the last hearing.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to waive the demolition delay based on the submitted plans. Mr. Armstrong seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on November 18, 2021, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 5-0-1:

RESOLVED to waive the demo delay on 68 Hartford Street based on approved plans as presented at this hearing

Voting in the Affirmative:    Voting in the Negative:    Abstained:

Peter Dimond, Chair

Doug Cornelius, Member

Katie Kubie, Member

Mark Armstrong, Member

Amanda Stauffer Park, Member

Jennifer Bentley-Houston, Alt.

9. **34 Esty Farm Road – Waiver Request (Ward 8)**

Request to waive demo delay

Staff reported that the owner of this property will present plans for a replacement structure at this location. This property was preferably preserved on July 22, 2021, and the minimum four-month waiting period has elapsed.

Omar Youssef, representative for the application, commented that the new owners were an extended family, and the best fit was a custom house. Eelam Adil, owner, remarked that they had worked for a year to find a multi-generational house, and decided to go with the construction of a custom house.

Mr. Dimond commented that it was hard to appreciate the context. Mr. Armstrong asked about the style of the house and remarked that the plans did a good job with transition. Mr. Youssef commented that the neighborhood was in transition.

Ms. Kubie commented that it did not reflect the existing house's mid-century sentiment and commented on the materials and remarked that stucco with black framed windows was not in keeping with the neighborhood. Ms. Bentley-Houston commented that the design did not fit with the neighborhood and that the design did not do a good enough job to represent how it mitigates the loss of the preferably preserved house. Ms. Stauffer Park agreed. Mr. Cornelius commented that he had an issue with the stucco and that the Commission had only seen a few attempts at mid century modern.

Ms. Kubie remarked that another property on the street was able to find a way to add on to a mid-century house.

The item was opened to public comment. Ben Ginsburg remarked that the design was not an homage to the mid-century design and that the entire street was cohesive. Anne Marie Stein stated that the neighborhood was super cohesive and had a special character. Aedin Culhane remarked that she agreed with the comments and that the proposed house did not fit within the context of the neighborhood.

Mr. Armstrong commented the roof line should be simplified. Ms. Kubie remarked she was concerned about the materials. Ms. Bentley-Houston commented that the design should be more horizontal to reflect the mid-century modern design.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to waive the delay at 34 Esty Farm Rd based on submitted plans. Mr. Cornelius seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on November 18, 2021, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 2-4:

RESOLVED to waive the demo delay on 34 Esty Farm Road based on submitted plans.

<u>Voting in the Affirmative:</u>	<u>Voting in the Negative:</u>	<u>Recused:</u>
Doug Cornelius, Member	Peter Dimond, Chair	
Mark Armstrong, Member	Katie Kubie, Member	
	Amanda Stauffer Park, Member	
	Jennifer Bentley-Houston, Alt.	

**The motion did not pass, and the demolition delay was not waived.**

10. **197 Nehoiden Road – Waiver Request (Ward 5)**

Request to waive demo delay

Staff reported that the owner of this property will present plans for a replacement structure at this location. This property was preferably preserved on April 22, 2021, and the minimum four-month waiting period has elapsed.

Justin Berlucchi, architect for the project, went over the plans with the Commission and commented that the existing house has soil issues and that the plan incorporated more modern materials.

Mr. Cornelius commented that he liked the mimicking of the gable and the incorporation of the stone, and that he thought the proposal was OK and it mitigated the loss of the preferably preserved house. Mr. Armstrong agreed.

The item was opened to public comment. Rena Getz of Waban remarked that the existing house had a lot of charm and it not being replicated, and she was not sure the proposed plan merits the waiver.

Mr. Dimond asked about the roof material and using slate or a synthetic slate. Mr. Berlucchi went over the roof material with the Commission and mentioned that slate was a high cost, but he would discuss the material with his client. Further he commented that they been mindful of the garage placement and that there was not a lot of slate on the existing house. Mr. Cornelius commented that the Commission should not require the use of slate as they had never done that in the past. Ms. Kubie agreed that she would not ask to use a synthetic slate.

Ms. Kubie remarked that the proposal does not reflect the loss of the preferably preserved house and commented on the proposed massing and that it was too much. Mr. Dimond commented that the proposal was out of scale. Ms. Bentley-Houston commented that the front was too big for the space and needs to be more appropriate.

Mr. Cornelius moved to waive the demolition delay based on the submitted plans. **There was no second to the motion, so the motion did not pass. The delay was not waived.**

11. **36 Chandler Place – Waiver Request (Ward 5)**

Request to waive demo delay

Staff reported that the owner of this property will present plans for a replacement structure at this location. This property was preferably preserved on June 24, 2021, and the minimum four-month waiting period has elapsed.

Omar Youssef, representative for the application, went over the plans with the Commission.

Mr. Dimond asked about the location of the garages and material. Mr. Youssef commented on the location of the garages and that the material would be clapboard on the bottom and board and batten on the top. Ms. Bentley-Houston commented that compared to the street, the house appeared fat. Mr. Youssef remarked that the issue is the shape of the lot and that the rear grade drops significantly. Ms. Bentley-Houston inquired about pushing one of the units back. Mr. Youssef and the Commission discussed the suggestion and the existing conditions of the lot. Mr. Youssef remarked that if a unit was pushed back there would no longer be a single peak, to which Ms. Bentley-Houston commented that she would rather the plan show two narrow peaks.

Mr. Cornelius asked about the width and peak heights of the existing and proposed house and commented that the other houses on the street are fairly plain and that it fit in with the nature and massing of the street. Ms. Bentley-Houston asked about the windows and suggested separated them as they appeared too large.

The item was opened to public comment. Rena Getz of Waban suggested the applicant look at 72-76 Fuller Street for guidance.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to waive the delay based on the submitted plans. Mr. Cornelius seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on November 18, 2021, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 0-6:

RESOLVED to waive the demo delay on 36 Chandler Place based on submitted plans.

Voting in the Affirmative:      Voting in the Negative:      Recused:

Peter Dimond, Chair  
Doug Cornelius, Member  
Katie Kubie, Member  
Mark Armstrong, Member  
Amanda Stauffer Park, Member  
Jennifer Bentley-Houston, Alt.

**The motion did not pass, and the demolition delay was not waived.**

**Administrative Discussion:**

**a) Minutes from October 28, 2021 hearing.**

Minutes from the October 28, 2021 hearing were unanimously approved by those in attendance at the hearing.

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous vote.

**Administratively approved Full Demos for the month of November:**

<b>250 Hartman Rd</b>	<b>10/15/2021</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>47 Windsor Rd (garage)</b>	<b>10/18/2021</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>36 Nardell Rd</b>	<b>10/21/2021</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>229 Bellevue St (garage)</b>	<b>10/27/2021</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>249 Upland Rd</b>	<b>10/28/2021</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>60 Manchester St (garage)</b>	<b>11/1/2021</b>	<b>D</b>
<b>15 Emerald St</b>	<b>11/3/2021</b>	<b>D</b>

Respectfully,

 , NHC