



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: March 24, 2022

PLACE/TIME: Via Zoom

ATTENDING: Peter Dimond, Chairman
Nancy Grissom, Member
Amanda Stauffer Park, Member
Harvey Schorr Alt.
Valerie Birmingham, Staff
Doug Cornelius, Member
Mark Armstrong, Member
John Rice, Member

ABSENT: Katie Kubie, Member

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

1. 236 Auburn Street (Ward 4)

Request for NHC to authorize the Chair to sign a Preservation Restriction Agreement

Staff reported that in 2017, CANDO affordable housing developers received CPA funding to relocate and restore the original 1860s Italianate style house and convert the site into an affordable housing development with one affordable unit in the historic home. In addition to the historic house, the project included two duplex units in a second structure and a five-unit group home in a third. The restoration and new construction were completed in 2020 and leased to eligible affordable households at that time. In 2021, the property was acquired by the Newton Housing Authority, which now oversees and maintains the affordable units.

In exchange for the CPA funding, CANDO (now the NHA) was required to give the City a preservation restriction over the historic ca. 1860s house and an affordable housing restriction over all of the new units. The preservation restriction extends over the exterior architectural details of the house and

includes one original interior element – a marble fireplace surround on the first floor. The restriction is in perpetuity and has been reviewed and approved by the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC). At this time, the draft has been finalized and signed by the Newton Housing Authority. The next step is for the NHC to authorize the chair to sign the restriction on behalf of the Commission, after which it must be signed by the Mayor and sent back to the MHC for their signatures before it can be recorded with the Registry of Deeds. Andrew Lee, Assistant City Solicitor, further explained the Commission’s task and the Preservation Restriction.

Mr. Cornelius asked about a written description. Mr. Lee commented that the description is written as well as can be in the Preservation Restriction, and that the Massachusetts Historical Commission was satisfied.

Mr. Cornelius made a motion to authorize the Chair to sign the reviewed Preservation Restriction. Mr. Rice seconded the motion.

No public comment was heard for this item.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 24, 2022, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 7-0:

RESOLVED to authorize the Chair to sign the reviewed Preservation Restriction at 236 Auburn Street.

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

Peter Dimond, Chair
Doug Cornelius, Member
Nancy Grissom, Member
Mark Armstrong, Member
Amanda Stauffer Park, Member
John Rice, Member
Harvey Schorr, Alt.

2. **345 Walnut Street, Newton Senior Center – Local Landmark Nomination (Ward 2)**
Request to nominate the property for designation as a local landmark

Mr. Dimond introduced the item and explained the local landmark process. Additionally, Mr. Dimond recognized the significant amount of public comment the Commission received for this item.

Councilor Turik Lucas, co nominator of the local landmark petition, presented the petition to the Commission. Councilor Lucas went over the history of the property including its construction and dedication; as well as the relationship between Donald Robb, architect and Charles Connick, stained glass artist, as well as Robert Frost, poet, and how the building was designed cohesively during the Great Depression. Councilor Lucas commented that if the Commission accepted the local landmark nomination, the Commission would have the opportunity to learn more about the building and site. Further, Councilor Lucas noted a 1992 Council Order for the site. Councilor Malakie, co-nominator of the local landmark petition, presented information on the park and landscape of the site, including a

2004 CPA public space pocket park project. Further, Councilor Malakie remarked it was the only public green space in Newtonville village center and a valued civic space.

Joshua Morse, Public Buildings Commissioner, provided a timeline of the project and its process, as well as its vision statement. Mr. Morse commented on the prior NHC meetings, as well as the pros and cons of considering a renovation and addition, and the community support for the project. Doug Kelleher and Tonya Loveday Merrem, Epsilon Associates, presented their findings on the architectural integrity and significance of the building and site in comparison to the Local Landmark Ordinance. Ms. Loveday Merrem presented the history of the site and commented that the construction had deviated from the original architectural plans; and remarked that it was a typical example of a Colonial Revival civic building and a typical work for the architectural firm. Mr. Kelleher concluded that the building did not merit Local Landmark designation as it did not meet the criteria listed in the Ordinance. Dan Chen, BH+A Architects went over the existing building and accessibility issues, and the modifications needed to renovate the building and meet the needs of the Senior Center program. Mr. Morse commented on the impact of the Commission's decision and that no facts support local landmark designation.

Mr. Cornelius remarked he did not like seeing the building demolished and it was clearly somewhat significant but noted America's disability law and that the Commission should not be usurping the high number of meetings held for this project. Mr. Cornelius further stated that under section 22-64© of the landmark ordinance, in determining to designate a property as a landmark, the Commission must also consider the property's context in relation to the city's policies and adopted plans, and it did not require the Commission to balance the historical nature of the property against the city's plans and policies; additionally, he strongly opposed the acceptance of the local landmark nomination. Mr. Rice noted that he was on the building committee for the project as one of the City Council representatives and noted the issues and limitations with retaining the existing building and its negative impact on accessibility. Further, Mr. Rice commented it was a great building but would not work in the future as the senior center and remarked that the Parks and Recreation Department did not view the green space as a park, and that he would not be voting in favor of accepting the nomination. Mr. Schorr supported the remarks of Mr. Cornelius and Mr. Rice and that the Epsilon Associates report provided to the Commission was extremely persuasive in the summary of Colonial Revival and other buildings, and that he was a bit skeptical of landmarking the building. Ms. Stauffer Park remarked that the process was being politicized in a way it is not supposed to be as it should not be about function and use, but whether the Commission should retain history and the Commission's task is assessing the building's historical value. Mr. Dimond questioned if there was a better location for a senior center and noted that the Commission should separate the use and preservation of the building. Further, Mr. Dimond commented that the Commission needed a more conclusive study and to not make a political decision; and commented that the park was a park. Mr. Cornelius remarked that the Commission was tasked with administering the Local Landmark Ordinance and should take into account the city's policies and plans. The Commission discussed the future use of the site. Mr. Armstrong commented that the building was a pedestrian example compared to others of its style.

No public comment was heard for this item. A significant amount of written public comment was submitted prior to the meeting and is on the city's website or available upon request.

Ms. Stauffer Park made a motion to accept the local landmark nomination for 345 Walnut Street and authorize staff to conduct further study of the property. Mr. Dimond seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 24, 2022, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 2-5:

RESOLVED to accept the local landmark nomination for 345 Walnut Street and authorize to staff to conduct further study of the property

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

Peter Dimond, Chair

Doug Cornelius, Member
Nancy Grissom, Member
Mark Armstrong, Member

Amanda Stauffer Park, Member

John Rice, Member
Harvey Schorr, Alt.

The motion failed to pass, and the local landmark nomination was not accepted.

3. **23 Nahanton Street – Partial Demolition (Ward 8)**

Request to alter entry ways and fenestration; and construct dormers

Staff reported that this surveyed Italianate building first appears on the 1874 atlas and according to the survey form on file with the state, the First Baptist Church used the building from at least 1871 as a chapel and Sunday school. Further information about this use is found in a 1985 NHC publication, Newton's 19th Century Architecture, which stated that "A Sunday school and chapel was built nearby on Nahanton Street and the First Baptist Church at Newton Centre maintained preaching at Oak Hill every Sabbath by students connected with the Newton Theological Institute." The 1886 atlas still refers to the property as a chapel, but by 1895 it was owned by Noah S King, a local farmer who owned additional properties nearby, and was a lifelong resident of Oak Hill (1816-1901).

King never resided at the dwelling, as he resided his entire life nearby at the family dwelling at 328 Brookline Street, which still stands today. King must have had a connection to its previous owner as a 1901 newspaper article about his funeral mentions that the officiating clergyman was the former President of the Newton Theological Institute and prayers, scripture readings and eulogies were done by members of the Newton Centre Baptist Church. At some point the King family converted the building into a residence and sold it to Rocco and Christina Carchia in 1925. Rocca Carchia permitted alterations to the converted residence including the construction of a new stone foundation and cellar in 1925, and the exterior shingling and changes to the size of (10) windows in 1936. The Carchia family retained ownership of the property for nearly a century and sold it last year to its current owner. Staff recommended the NHC preferably preserve the Italianate style building as an intact example of a converted 19th century Oak Hill chapel and Sunday School that has retained its overall massing, form and siting.

John Downie, architect for the project, remarked that the site had been a residence for nearly a century and there were no original materials left, but only the basic massing.

Mr. Cornelius commented that the building had some history but that a fair amount of materials had been lost.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the building at 23 Nahanton Street as an intact example of a converted 19th century Oak Hill chapel and Sunday School that has retained its overall massing, form and siting. Mr. Cornelius seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 24, 2022, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 7-0:

RESOLVED to preferably preserve the house at 23 Nahanton Street

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

Peter Dimond, Chair
Doug Cornelius, Member
Mark Armstrong, Member
Nancy Grissom, Member
Amanda Stauffer Park, Member
John Rice, Member
Harvey Schorr, Alt.

Mr. Downie went over the proposed plans with the Commission and noted that the plan was to maintain the building's integrity and basic shape. Mr. Dimond asked about the windows and Mr. Armstrong asked about the exact changes to the exterior. Mr. Downie further explained the proposal and noted it would be used as a residence.

There was no public comment.

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

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 24, 2022, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 7-0:

RESOLVED to waive the demo delay on 23 Nahanton Street based on the submitted plans

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

Peter Dimond, Chair
Doug Cornelius, Member
Mark Armstrong, Member

Nancy Grissom, Member
Amanda Stauffer Park, Member
John Rice, Member
Harvey Schorr, Alt.

4. **152 Crafts Street – Demolition Review (Ward 2)**
Request to demolish house

Staff reported that The Dutch Colonial Revival style house at 152 Crafts Street was permitted for construction in November 1919 for \$10,000 and built as infill construction for the area even though the lot itself had been created as early as 1874. The owner, architect and builder are listed as Vincent E. Squiers, who lived nearby on Washington Street. Squiers was born in Guilford Vermont, and grew up in the Brockton area, and built a number of houses in Newton during the 1920s and 30s, as well as homes in Brookline, Belmont and Quincy. For 152 Crafts Street, Squiers likely used an architect-designed plan, as would have been common. The first known owner was Alois W. Krause, a salesman, though his residence was short as by 1925, Archie Osgood, a proprietor in the laundry business, and his family are residing at the property. The longest owner of the property thus far was Gerald Swartz, who purchased the property in 1936 and owned it until his death in 1996. Swartz owned a hardware store not far from his house, which is still in existence on Watertown Street in Newton. The hardware company was started by Swartz's parents in 1890. The house has endured some alterations over the decades including the enclosure of a right side one story open porch in 1951 and the installation of solar panels in 2014. The original building permit plans show a covered entry portico, which was enclosed at an unknown date though the gable entry roof and footprint was retained. While it is a nice, typical example of a Dutch Colonial Revival style dwelling, the house does not stand out alone architecturally and is not aided by any surrounding context. For these reasons staff recommended not preferably preserving the house.

Vlad Vilkomir, owner, remarked that the house did not really fit into the neighborhood, and believed other alterations had occurred without the benefit of building permits.

Mr. Armstrong commented that it was sensitive location. Mr. Dimond agreed with staff's recommendation.

Councilor Norton, an abutter, remarked that it was sad to demolish the house and asked if the owner could reach out to her to discuss the mature vegetation.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the house at 152 Crafts Street. Mr. Armstrong seconded the motion.

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on March 24, 2022, the Newton Historical Commission, by a vote of 2-5:

RESOLVED to preferably preserve the house at 152 Crafts Street

Voting in the Affirmative:

Voting in the Negative:

Abstained:

Nancy Grissom, Member
Mark Armstrong, Member

Peter Dimond, Chair
Doug Cornelius, Member

Amanda Stauffer Park, Member
John Rice, Member
Harvey Schorr, Alt.

The motion failed to pass. The house is not preferably preserved.

5. **145 Warren Street, LL – Request for Certificate of Appropriateness (Ward 6)**

Request for final review and approval of all listed proposed alterations/materials to the historic house, inventory of existing windows and gutters, details of the roof and front porch, existing conditions drawings and design of brick pier

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. The Commission last reviewed this project at its January 27, 2022, meeting and voted to approve the project, however, prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant needed to return to the Commission for final review and approval of seven items. The listed items included:

1. inventory of existing windows and gutters
2. drawn details of the roof
3. drawn details of the front porch and railings
4. design of the replacement free standing front column (brick pier)
5. complete set of architectural drawings depicting existing conditions
6. itemized list and explanation of alterations to the historic house to be depicted with original, existing, and proposed elevations side by side
7. list and approval of all proposed materials on the historic house

All other elements, such as the rear addition, of that submission were approved. Any changes to that previous submission or additional work to the historic house would need an amendment to or a new local landmark application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, Non-Applicability or Hardship, and review process. At this hearing, the applicant is returning to the Commission to request final review of the listed items and approval in order to move forward with the project. The new submission for these items is included in the packet docs. The Local Landmark report for this address, is included in the packet docs and it lists Standards for Design Review, beginning on page 11 of the report. These should be taken in consideration as the Commission reviews the submittal.

Mr. Dimond asked about the removal of landscaping at the site. David Oliveri commented that it had been an oversight on their part and that they take the local landmark requirements seriously.

The Commission reviewed the item in different parts.

Gutters:

Mr. Cornelius asked if there were any original gutters. Mr. Oliveri answered no, and that gutters added over time were aluminum.

Windows:

Mr. Dimond asked for further clarification on the proposed windows. Andrew Consigli, owner, commented they were proposing white Pella aluminum clad windows with the profiles to match the original design, and that they would be the same size where noted as possible on the submittal. Mr. Consigli further clarified and discussed the proposed windows with the Commission. Mr. Consigli commented that a majority of the existing windows were replacement windows, and that the size of the original windows was not known at that time. Mr. Dimond remarked that the Commission wanted to know how each window would be treated. Mr. Consigli went over the provided window spreadsheet and commented that they were proposing double pane windows and that they wanted to achieve Passive House, or at least be leed certified. Mr. Dimond commented that he would like single pane as that was what would have been used originally. Mr. Oliveri reiterated that the existing windows were replacements, and Mr. Consigli remarked that the plan was to match the original design as closely as they can. Ms. Stauffer Park commented on a need to choose a time period for the design and asked about bench. Mr. Consigli commented it was the original bench. Mr. Cornelius remarked the plan should be consistent with a time period. Mr. Armstrong remarked that it should go back to the original design, and that the plan was doing a good job in recreating it.

Brick Pier:

Mr. Dimond asked about the light fixture. Mr. Consigli replied they intended to have a custom one made.

Roof:

Mr. Consigli went over the proposal with the Commission, which included a fiber cement synthetic trim. Mr. Dimond inquired about the use of wood for the trim and that he would like to see original materials. Mr. Armstrong asked about the use of composite materials and any advantages. The applicants and the Commission discussed the use of composite and original materials, specifically in regard to the trim, soffits and gutters. Mr. Armstrong commented that an alternative downspout solution was needed and asked about the brackets. Mr. Consigli remarked that they were proposing keep the original but refinish them. Mr. Cornelius asked for specifications on the trim. Mr. Armstrong commented that fragments of the original building were being retained, and that he would support some compromise. The Commission commented they were OK with the roof details.

Ms. Stauffer Park remarked that the Commission did not have a full schedule and that it was difficult to envision all of the proposed changes. Mr. Dimond remarked that some parts of the submittal included as close of possible. To this point, Mr. Cornelius questioned the wording if the applicants had the exact information. Mr. Armstrong commented that the Commission needed to know the materials. Mr. Consigli remarked that they were looking for some flexibility from the Commission. Mr. Dimond asked about the size of the proposed windows. Mr. Consigli further explained the proposal and provided spreadsheet and reiterated that exact information was not known until the applicants opened the wall

on some of the façade. Terry Morris, attorney for the applicant, commented on the historical integrity of the building.

Front porch and railings:

Mr. Cornelius asked about the material. Mr. Consigli remarked that it would be wood, and the plan included the heart shapes. The Commission did not have any concerns with the porch when asked by Mr. Dimond.

Mr. Cornelius inquired about the existing conditions plans. Ms. Birmingham remarked they appeared to not provide enough information.

The item was opened to public comment. Mary Lee Belleville, 136 Warren Street, commented on the windows to be replaced, the special permit and Council Order, notion of Passive House and energy efficiency. Further, Ms. Belleville commented on the shingle siding's replacement and staining. Mr. Consigli responded and further went over the shingle proposal. Simon French, 47 Glen Avenue, remarked about changes to the front and the proposed materials on the roof and solar panels.

Mr. Consigli and the Commission discussed the shingle siding and possible scope of work, including the proposed staining and replacement. Mr. Schorr remarked that the submittal was all over the place and commented on the Passive House/Leed certified desires by the applicant; and stated he did not see a problem with replacing the shingle siding. The Commission and the applicants again discussed the proposed windows, specifically using aluminum clad versus wood. Ms. Stauffer Park remarked that when all of the original materials are lost, the house no longer has architectural integrity, and no longer rises to the status of a landmark. Mr. Schorr inquired about the profiles of the windows and a desire to fully understand the existing and proposed, and that it was difficult for the Commission if any part of the proposal was still unknown by the applicants. Further, Mr. Schorr remarked that noting the windows would be as close as possible would not be enough. Mr. Consigli remarked that they would return to the Commission once more is known. Mr. Dimond remarked the Commission should not allow composite materials, the windows should be required to be wood, and the original shingles should be retained by stripping and being stained. Ms. Grissom inquired if the shingles were original. Ms. Stauffer Park commented the shingles appeared to match those in the photographs and appeared historic. Mr. Consigli asked to return to the Commission with more information on the items Mr. Dimond referenced. Mr. Dimond further commented that the Commission would seek detailed drawings and measurements of all aspects of the house, as well as more information on the windows, shingles and materials, specifically the use of composite.

The Commission did not make any motions on this item.

Administrative Discussion:

a) Approval of minutes. Mr. Cornelius made a motion to approve the draft 1/27/22 minutes. Mr. Dimond seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

b) Vote to select a Commissioner to serve on the Farm Commission. No Commissioner volunteered for this role, and the Chair decided to put it on a future agenda.

c) Discussion of edits to the Commission's Rules and Regulations. The Chair decided to not hear this item, and it was proposed to go on a future agenda.

Administratively approved applications for the March hearing cycle

70 Wiswall Rd	2/7/2022	D	
44 Brandeis Rd	2/8/2022	PD	Left side addition
130 Ridge Ave	2/8/2022	D	
336 Cabot St	2/8/2022	PD	Left side addition
15 Buff Cir	2/8/2022	D	
244 Arnold Rd	2/15/2022	D	
47 Myerson Ln	2/17/2022	D	
24 Ruane Rd	2/22/2022	PD	Right side and rear addition
56 Roosevelt Rd	3/1/2022	PD	Left side addition
20 Greenlawn Ave	3/2/2022	PD	right side addition
15 Keefe Ave	3/1/2022	PD	Second story Addition

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous vote.

Respectfully,

 , NHC