



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: April 28, 2022

PLACE/TIME: Via Zoom

ATTENDING:	Peter Dimond, Chairman	Doug Cornelius, Member
	Nancy Grissom, Member	Mark Armstrong, Member
	Amanda Stauffer Park, Member	Katie Kubie, Member
	John Rice, Member	John Sisson, Alt.
	Anne Marie Stein, Alt.	Barbara Kurze, Staff

ABSENT: Harvey Schorr Alt.

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, Kubie and Rice. Barbara Kurze acted as Zoom host and the meeting was digitally recorded on the Zoom device.

- Angino Farm (303 Nahanton Street), CR – Proposed Alteration (Ward 8)**
Request to install solar panels on the barn

Mr. Dimond reported that the proposal includes the installation of thirty solar panels on the barn’s roof slope that faces Winchester Street. The solar panels would be arranged in three aligned rows of ten, and the array would total 17.13’ x 34.19’. Any associated mechanical equipment is proposed to be placed out of site on the opposite side of the building, close to other existing mechanical equipment.

The City of Newton’s Historic Preservation Design Guidelines say that the NHC encourages “Minimizing impacts on the historic fabric and appearance of a building when installing modern equipment such as solar panels.” Further, they state that the NHC discourages “Installing modern equipment in a manner that is not reversible or adversely affects the historic building.” The Commission should keep in mind that the asphalt roof is not original to the historic fabric and has been replaced as recently as 2013.

Alterations to the barn come under NHC review as the property is owned by the City, and according to Lara Kritzer, the city's CPA Program Manager, the building has received CPA historic resource funds in the past. Due to this combination, according to Sec. 22-76 of the City's Ordinances, the NHC shall review and approve proposed plans for an alteration or demolition.

Sue Bottino, Executive Director at the Newton Community Farm, went over the proposal with the Commission. Mr. Cornelius inquired if anyone had looked into the possibility of the array be freestanding as opposed to on the building. Ms. Bottino replied that the Conservation Restriction on the property did not allow for it and it was preferred in order to maintain gathering space. Mr. Rice commented that there is support within the community and he was supportive of the proposal.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to approve the proposal to install solar panels on the roof of the barn at 303 Nahanaton Street. Mr. Rice seconded the motion.

RESOLVED to allow the installation of 30 solar panels on the roof of the barn, to be flush with no tilt beyond the angle of the roof that will sit 3-4" on top of the roof; and associated equipment on the rear wall

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

Peter Dimond, Chair

Doug Cornelius, Member

Nancy Grissom, Member

Mark Armstrong, Member

Katie Kubie, Member

Amanda Stauffer Park, Member

John Rice, Member

2. **29 Greenwood Street, LL – Request to Remediate Violation (Ward 8)**

Request review of proposed plans to remediate violation

Mr. Dimond reported that Architect Donald Lang, working on behalf of the owner, will present revised proposed plans for the remediation of the violation of the Certificate of Appropriateness at this address.

At the October 28, 2021, hearing when a previous revised submittal was reviewed, staff reported that the Gershom Hyde House was constructed c.1744, making it one of the oldest residences in Newton. This property was individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1986 and designated a Newton Local Landmark in 2005. The Gershom Hyde House came before the Newton Historical Commission in 2017, 2019 and 2020 for approval and subsequent extensions to approved plans for restoration of the house and construction of a rear addition. The property changed hands in January of last year and worked LL commenced based on the previously approved plans. An ISD building inspector visited the site on April 27th last year and observed that the historic house had been replaced by new framing. A Stop Work order was issued by ISD for violations of the NHC approval of this

project, and work at the site ceased. The work observed at the site was not in keeping with the previously issued Certificate of Appropriateness and approved plans.

At the May 27, 2021, hearing, the NHC voted to find 7-0 that the work at 29 Greenwood Street was in violation of the Certificate of Appropriateness that was previously issued for this project and that the Stop Work Order imposed by Inspectional Services would remain in effect. Lastly, the NHC voted 7-0 to authorize fines on the owner, beginning on the day the Stop Work Order was imposed, April 30, 2021, in accordance with the Local Landmark ordinance as revised in July 2020.

At the October 2021 hearing, the NHC reviewed revised plans and had questions about the dimensions of the foundation and remarked that the previously approved addition should not be part of the submittal as it was no longer applicable once the violation occurred. Further comments included the need to see exact documentation of the entire house and not just the salvaged elements, and references were made to the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, specifically Reconstruction, with comments that a submittal should be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary of physical elements, rather than conjectural design or on the availability of features on other properties. A comment included that as this was a landmarked property, it was necessary to meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. While this is considered a proposed reconstruction, the property's landmark report does reference the standards, and states in the General Standards for Design Review "The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation should provide a baseline for review of changes to a landmark property." The Commission unanimously voted to find the submittal inadequate and rejected the proposal

Franklin Schwarzer, attorney for the applicant, commented that there had been fundamental misunderstandings at the previous hearing. Further, Mr. Schwarzer remarked that there was anger about what had occurred and that the current proposal eliminated the rear addition, restored the original footprint, and reincorporated preservation ideals and historic fabric that was not there prior; further, that it was an extraordinarily expensive process, and there was an elimination of any profit for his client.

Donald Lang, architect for the submittal, presented the revised submittal to the Commission. Mr. Lang commented on the two objectives which are a careful reconstruction of the structure and reconstruction of the rear ell using careful documentation and measurements. Mr. Lang commented that the windows on site will be restored and a full report on the process will be provided to the Commission, and that the asphalt roof will be replaced with a cedar roof. Mr. Lang further went over the submittal, including the fenestration, and remarked the proposal adds 100sf to the garage, the side entrance will be reconstructed, and a connection in the rear between ell would not be rebuilt as it was prior to its demolition. Mr. Lang commented that reconstructing the rear ell would help restore the original farmstead setting.

Mr. Dimond inquired about the target date for the submittal and commented on conjecture in the submittal. Mr. Lang responded it was primarily 2017 prior to its demolition, aside from the proposed changes to the rear. Mr. Lang commented on the Local Landmark report and the estimated dates of the ell. Ms. Stauffer Park remarked that it was an interesting, thoughtful, and creative solution,

however there were a number of aspects in the submittal that deviate from the landmarked building that do not rise to the Secretary of the Interior Standard for Reconstruction. Further, Ms. Stauffer Park commented on material concerns and a concern that it does not adhere to a single period of significance, it was a departure from the standard a landmark is held to and would create a problematic precedent for Newton's other landmarks. Ms. Grissom inquired about the foundation to which Mr. Lang responded on the original and proposed material of fieldstone veneer for the rear, as well as the existing new concrete foundation. Mr. Cornelius commented he was surprised a reconstruction plan was submitted and inquired about the time period for the plans. Mr. Lang responded that the main forms were intact and lack of change since the work in mid-19th century and commented on the work to the Nathaniel Allen House and its previous additions. Ms. Stauffer Park commented that one time period should be chosen in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and that she would be flexible about the target era, however it needs to be consistent to one selected period. Mr. Lang and the Commission discussed a time period selection. Mr. Cornelius inquired about the front porch and commented it would take a bit more research to determine the timing of it. Mr. Lang remarked that the front porch was part of the originally approved drawings, on the Greek Revival style of the side porch, and that he would not have a problem with no porches. Further, Mr. Cornelius commented on the large window on the east elevation and remarked the proposed treatment works better; additionally, he commented he had issues with the skylights. Mr. Dimond commented on the elements such as the garage, sliders, and skylights that he feels is inappropriate. Mr. Lang commented that prior to the house's demolition there was a garage. Ms. Kubie commented on the previously approved addition. The Commission discussed the rear additions and reconstruction. Mr. Cornelius commented that the materials could be looked at a future time.

The item was opened to public comment. Jennifer Bentley commented that the presentation was disingenuous and that the Commission should pick a time period and not have modern materials. David Patterson, Newton Friends of Historic Preservation, 10 Newbury Terrace, commented that the Commission should deny the submittal as it cannot be remedied and that a replica is not a substitute for the original; he further commented on the owner's violation track record and that it would set a dangerous precedent for landmarked properties. Stephen Farrell commented that the owner would make a profit, that this would set a precedent and that this submittal review was not how the Commission should proceed. Anne Greer, 31 Greenwood Street, commented that the process would continue and remarked about ISD and wetland issues and compliance needs. Barry Bergman remarked about the Cambridge Historical Commission and insistent on older materials. Rena Getz commented on the Local Landmark Ordinance and violations, inquired how to bring a landmark that no longer exists into compliance, and remarked that the owner could have appealed the Commission's previous decision and requested the Commission deny the submittal. Alice Ingerson commented on the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties and CPA, specifically the act create. Jared Schwartz, 5 Cynthia Rd, commented on the Commission's charge and that this is an unremediated site and its approval would create an unfortunate precedent and circumvent the rules, and would like to see a plan that does not allow the developer to profit. Simon French inquired about the fines. Carolyn Kraft commented that she would like the land restored and instances of vandalism. Alan Meyer inquired about moving a threatened historic structure to the site. Councilor Malakie commented about the clapboards being made as how it would have been originally and that the previous denial should be reaffirmed. Councilor Wright commented on the standard of local landmarks and that the developer should not be able to profit.

Ms. Kubie inquired about the site's status as a local landmark and commented that she would like a plaque on the site with information on what was there prior. Further, Ms. Kubie inquired about the landscape plans. Mr. Lang commented on the relationship of the buildings to the site according to the Local Landmark report. Ms. Stauffer Park inquired about the Commission's options. Mr. Dimond remarked that the plan with some changes is identical to the work underway prior to ISD shutting it down, and the plan has little historic value. Further, Mr. Dimond commented on the lack of documentation and research in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and issues with the modern rear elements.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to reject the submittal as it does not adequately remediate the violation of the Landmarks Ordinance. Ms. Stauffer Park seconded the motion. Mr. Armstrong voted no and commented it was a good compromise. Mr. Cornelius voted no and commented that he had unanswered questions. Mr. Dimond withdrew his motion and asked the applicant to return to the Commission with answers raised by the Commission. Mr. Schwarzer commented that they would be willing to return with answers and asked for specifics. Ms. Stauffer Park withdrew her second to Mr. Dimond's motion. Ms. Stauffer Park remarked about the plaque program from Historic Newton and further documentation such as maps, architectural databases, newspapers, that should be done. Further, Ms. Stauffer Park commented that the Commission should see a checklist of the exhausted research to aid with the Commission finding a period of significance and minimizing conjecture. Lastly, Ms. Stauffer Park commented that landscape plans should be provided. Mr. Schwarzer agreed on behalf of his client to continue the discussion to a future meeting. Assistant City Solicitor Andrew Lee received this agreement in writing from Mr. Schwarzer on May 2, 2022.

3. **395 Winchester Street – Demolition Review (Ward 8)**
Request to demolish house and detached garage

Mr. Dimond reported that the ca. 1923 one and a half story Vernacular Craftsman style house has a simple rectangular form under a gable end roof with decorative, square brackets extending out from under the peak and ends of the projecting eaves on the front facade. The original building permit lists the house as being designed and built by Melvin H. Clarry for its first owner, Joseph Watt. There is no evidence in this original permit of the existing front entry porch, which appears to be a later addition based on the differences in the trim and detailing of its gable end roof in comparison to the main roof of the house. However, if it was a later addition, it is also an early one as the porch does appear in a 1925 plot plan for the construction of the first detached garage (now demolished). A one-story addition to the rear façade was added in 1939 by Joseph Watt, who was noted to be the builder as well as the owner at that time. The one-car garage located at the end of the driveway is a Brooks Skinner Company metal garage installed in 1947.

The property is included in the Charlemont Area Inventory Form and was part of the Charlemont development laid out in 1922. An ad in the Newton Graphic from that year advertised it as "a new development where a man of moderate means may build a home in a neighborhood reasonably restricted to create and maintain an agreeable residential community." Staff does not find it to be a good example of the Craftsman style and with its siting at the entry to the Charlemont area, struggles to see surrounding context. For these reasons staff recommended not preferably preserving the house and garage.

Victoria Drizin Sirotin, owner, commented that she did not think the house was historic, and it was not a good example of the Craftsman style. Mr. Cornelius agreed with staff's recommendation and did not think it was a property that should be preferably preserved.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the house and garage at 395 Winchester Street. Mr. Armstrong seconded the motion.

RESOLVED to preferably preserve the house and garage at 395 Winchester Street

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

Peter Dimond, Chair

Doug Cornelius, Member
Katie Kubie, Member
Mark Armstrong, Member
Nancy Grissom, Member
Amanda Stauffer Park, Member
John Rice, Member

The motion failed to pass. The house and garage were not preferably preserved.

4. **20 Janet Road – Demolition Review (Ward 2)**

Request to demolish house

Mr. Dimond reported that the ca. 1950 Ranch style house is located in a neighborhood of similar post WWII Cape Cod and Colonial style single family homes and appears to be in largely original condition. The cross-gable style, single story house has retained its original entrance and single car garage, which was expanded in 1966 with the addition of a second, larger garage bay designed by architect Milton Stiles. Although the configuration and design of the house is intact, the design and sizing of the windows and front door have been altered.

Although an earlier house was planned for this site in the 1942, nothing was constructed on this site until the current house was built in 1950 by builder Morris Green. The house was designed by Joseph Selwyn, a civil engineer and architect from Belmont who designed homes and subdivision plans throughout Newton after WWII. Selwyn is listed in the Mass. Historical Commission's database as having designed at least 44 houses in Newton during this period as well as in Brookline, Boston and New Bedford. The house is not a standout example of any architectural style, and staff struggles to see a significant role for the house in the context of the neighborhood. For these reasons staff recommended not preferably preserving the house.

No one attended to present the application. Mr. Cornelius agreed with staff's recommendation and did not think it was a property that should be preferably preserved.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the house at 20 Janet Road. Mr. Armstrong seconded the motion.

RESOLVED to preferably preserve the house at 20 Janet Road

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

Peter Dimond, Chair

Doug Cornelius, Member

Katie Kubie, Member

Mark Armstrong, Member

Nancy Grissom, Member

Amanda Stauffer Park, Member

John Rice, Member

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

5. **19 Carlton Road – Demolition Review (Ward 5)**

Request to demolish detached garage

Mr. Dimond reported that the building permit for this ca. 1924 wood framed two car detached garage lists the architect and builder as Howard Brothers and was permitted for \$1000 while the house was either under construction or newly built. The owner is listed as Robert Snow, a grocery proprietor. No formal architect was listed on the building permit, though the design seemed to intentionally mimic elements from the house, which was designed by local architect Howard B.S. Prescott. Character features include the fan light window in the gable, also seen close by on the house, as well as the cornice returns and slate roof.

Its siting was typical for the time, and while certainly not all existing detached garages have significance, the Brookline Preservation Commission's book *Carriage House to Auto House* by former longtime Preservation Planners, Roger Reed and Greer Hardwicke, notes that in general "They can tell us much about the transportation history of New England...especially the impact of the automobile on our cultural, technological and physical landscape. They are vitally important parts of how we adapted to a new mode of transportation and how we incorporated the automobile into our lives."

Staff recommended preferably preserving the garage at 19 Carlton Road for architectural integrity as an intact example of a 1920s Revival style garage designed to complement the house, that has retained original features noted above.

Mr. Dimond commented that it was an interesting garage that was built to match the house.

Yael Gill, owner, remarked that they did not want to demolish the garage but that the City would not allow them to construct an attachment to the house due to setback zoning issues. Further, Ms. Gill commented that they had done a lot of work to bring back the house and rebuild the garage to match

the house's details. Alan Mayer, architect for the project, commented that he did not think the garage was architecturally significant.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the detached garage at 19 Carlton Road. Mr. Armstrong seconded the motion.

RESOLVED to preferably preserve the garage at 19 Carlton Road

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

Peter Dimond, Chair

Doug Cornelius, Member
Katie Kubie, Member
Mark Armstrong, Member
Nancy Grissom, Member
Amanda Stauffer Park, Member
John Rice, Member

The motion failed to pass. The garage was not preferably preserved.

6. **85 Parker Street – Demolition Review (Ward 6)**

Request to demolish house and detached garage

Mr. Dimond reported that the house and detached garage at 85 Parker Street were permitted for construction in 1916. The owner is listed as Alfred Knudsen, and the architect for both structures is noted as Edward Stratton. Stratton, (72 Columbus) a prominent and prolific architect whose work can be found throughout eastern Massachusetts, was born in Chelsea, MA in 1870. He studied architecture at M.I.T and in Paris and practiced in Boston for over 50 years beginning in 1900. Stratton is known to have designed 46 other surveyed structures in Massachusetts, thirteen of which are located in Newton, and of these, three are listed on the State Register. A fourth, a home Stratton designed for him and his family, is located at 25 Kenmore Street and is individually listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Stratton was also the architect for 72 Columbus Street, which the NHC designed at local landmark in 2021.

Alfred Knudsen and his family did not reside in the house long and sold the property in 1922 to Alice and Olin Dickerman. Dickerman, was a Vice President for the coffee manufacturing company, Dwinell Wright Co, and died in 1933. His widow continued to reside at the property, and remained there after she married Henry S Adams, a treasurer superintendent at Forest Hills Cemetery. Adams died in 1958, but Alice continued to own the property until 1972, fifty years after her and her first husband first purchased the house. Staff recommended the Commission preferably preserve the house and garage as a handsome example of the Colonial Revival style that have retained character defining features and architectural integrity.

Michael Yankovski, representative for the application, commented that the area was diverse with architectural styles. Mr. Cornelius commented that it is a beautiful house and should be preferably preserved. Ms. Grissom agreed.

The item was opened to public comment. Todd Rakoff, 94 Parker Street, commented that it is a nice house, consistent with the setback and fits in to the surrounding and would like to see the setback preserved if a new house is constructed. Michael Wang, 91 Parker Street, commented that it was a nice example of the architect's work and fit in contextually with the area.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the house and garage at 85 Parker Street. Ms. Grissom seconded the motion.

RESOLVED to preferably preserve the house and detached garage at 85 Parker Street

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

Peter Dimond, Chair

Doug Cornelius, Member

Nancy Grissom, Member

Mark Armstrong, Member

Katie Kubie, Member

Amanda Stauffer Park, Member

John Rice, Member

7. **37 Truman Road – Demolition Review (Ward 8)**

Request to demolish house

Mr. Dimond reported that permitted for construction in 1949, the cape house with attached single car garage at 37 Truman Road was owned and built by K.V. Wolsey Co. Inc. No architect is listed, though an area survey attributes the design to local architect Ralph I. Williams. The name for the builder stands for Karl Valdemar Wolsey, a Malden developer who bought a 10-acre parcel in 1948. The Wolsey Co. filed a subdivision plan comprising of 17 lots along Truman Road. The area was surveyed in 2003, and the survey form notes that these were the lots on which the area's capes were constructed in 1949 and 1950, and the Wolsey Company was listed as builder on all the building permits sampled for this area. Additionally, the survey form states "Houses are uniformly set back from the street and are frequently fronted by deciduous trees at curbside. This, with the generally level lots and grouping of same-form houses together, contributes to a uniform street line despite a variety of decorative finishes and landscaping elements." Further, the area form comments that "the Truman Road capes are distinctive, a departure from the traditional three or five bay façade with a center entry... As a group, the capes in this area retain a high degree of integrity. No better preserved collection of capes from the 1940-1969 survey period was observed in Newton during the survey."

The individual house at 37 Truman Road as well other capes on the street have endured alterations including material changes, and the construction of additions and dormers. Specifically at 37 Truman Road a rear addition and dormer have since been constructed. According to the 1949 survey with the original building permit, the single-story portion to the right of the main body of the house, first

appeared to have been unenclosed. Still, the one and a half story cape, and plentiful others on the street, maintain many qualities of its original appearance, and cohesiveness with the surrounding development. For these reasons staff recommended the Commission preferably preserve the house.

David Koren and Rafael Baranets, owners, commented that they did not the property was in a flood zone when they bought the property, originally hoped to renovate the house, and that there were other houses in the area that had been changed and were not consistent with the surrounding. Mr. Cornelius commented that the house had had enough obtrusions occur that it was removed from the context. Ms. Stein commented that Truman was an area that context did matter and that the question with new construction was how it changed the character of the neighborhood. David Boronkay, architect for the project, commented on the issue with the property's flood zone and construction of additions.

The item was opened to public comment. Zvi Eizenberg, 11 Mildred Road, commented that he did not see the advantage of the cape style house, and would like to see new architecture.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the house at 37 Truman Road. Mr. Armstrong seconded the motion.

RESOLVED to preferably preserve the house at 37 Truman Road

Voting in the Affirmative:

Peter Dimond, Chair

Katie Kubie, Member

Voting in the Negative:

Doug Cornelius, Member

Mark Armstrong, Member

Nancy Grissom, Member

Amanda Stauffer Park, Member

John Rice, Member

Abstained:

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

8. **60 Esty Farm Road – Demolition Review (Ward 8)**

Request to demolish house

Mr. Dimond reported that the ca. 1958 Contemporary style split level house was inventoried in 2003 as part of the Esty Farm-June Lane Area, a late 1950s subdivision built adjacent to the then recently completed Oak Hill Park. The house is a nearly unaltered example of the “flying wing” style which is characterized by an asymmetrical front gable roof with exposed beams, the peak of which is centered over the entry/garage/bedroom stack with the long slope of the roof sweeping down over the living room/basement stack.

60 Esty Farm Road is one of several houses built in the subdivision between 1958-1959 by Sunny Lane Homes Inc. and Creative Builders, both Newton construction and development firms. The house was designed by Ralph I. Williams of Wollaston and is noted on the area form to be one of at least a dozen

of this style constructed in the neighborhood during this period. Williams also designed houses for at least four other Newton subdivisions between 1940 and 1960 and his work can also be found in Brookline and Quincy. Staff recommended the Commission preferably preserve the house as a good example of an intact Contemporary split-level house as well as its surrounding architectural context in the area.

Namrata Godbole and Himanshu Bhat, owners, commented that the family was seeking more space as their children were getting older and their parents were visiting for long periods of time, and wanted to rebuild. Further, they commented that they loved the neighborhood, and that Oak Hill Park was a diverse neighborhood in terms of architectural styles, and that it had changed recently. Mr. Dimond inquired about an addition on the house. Mr. Cornelius commented that the area was very intact. Ms. Stein remarked that the neighborhood was very intact and a rare example. Ms. Kubie commented that the Commission should be consistent and that they preferably preserved a house down the street in the exact same style. Mr. Armstrong remarked that the quality of construction for that time was terrible.

The item was opened to public comment. Ben Ginsburg, commented that he would like to see the neighborhood preserved.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to preferably preserve the house at 60 Esty Farm Road. Mr. Armstrong seconded the motion.

RESOLVED to preferably preserve the house at 60 Esty Farm Road

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

Peter Dimond, Chair

Doug Cornelius, Member

Katie Kubie, Member

Mark Armstrong, Member

Nancy Grissom, Member

Amanda Stauffer Park, Member

John Rice, Member

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

Administrative Discussion:

Vote to select a Commissioner to serve on the Farm Commission.

Mr. Sisson volunteered to serve.

Mr. Dimond made a motion to elect Mr. Sisson to serve on the Farm Commission as the Commission's representative. Ms. Stauffer Park seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

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 April hearing cycle

294 Highland Ave	PD	Historically significant and administrative approval
472-474 Watertown St	D	Not historically significant
72 Concolor	PD	Historically significant and administrative approval
1766 Comm Ave	PD	Not historically significant
2-4 Auburndale Ave	PD	Historically significant and administrative approval
20 Old Farm Rd	PD	Historically significant and administrative approval
18 Tudor Ter	PD	Historically significant and administrative approval
135 Berkeley St	PD	Historically significant and administrative approval
54 Goddard St (garage)	D	Not historically significant
95 Dedham St (garage)	D	Not historically significant
159 Carlton Rd	PD	Not historically significant
68-71 Washington St	D	Not historically significant
38 Maplewood Ave	PD	Historically significant and administrative approval
20 Barbara Rd	PD	Historically significant and administrative approval
56 Upland Rd	D	Not historically significant
66 Cumberland Ave	D	Not historically significant

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous vote.

Respectfully,

 , NHC