



CITY OF WATERTOWN  
**Historical Commission**  
Parker School  
124 Watertown Street  
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Elise Loukas, Chair  
Joseph Panto, Member  
Matthew Walter, Member  
Richard Glenn, Member  
Jamie Gordon, Member  
Andrew Thompson, Member

**Minutes:** Thursday, May 14, 2026, Hybrid Meeting 7:00 p.m.- Location, Third Floor Conference Room and Zoom

**Historical Commission Members Present:** Elise Loukas, Mathew Walter, Richard Glenn, Jamie Gordon

**Member(s) Absent:** Joseph Panto, Andrew Thompson

**Public Present:** Peter Zagorianakos, Keith Glavash, Marylene Altieri, David Schwarzmman, Andy Mann, Nathan Turner, Vera Jewell

**Staff Present:** Erika Oliver Jerram, Director of Community Design, Susan C. Jenness, Administrative Specialist, Conservation/Preservation, Larry Field, Planner

---

Loukas Chaired opened the meeting.

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Minutes**

- A. Review and acceptance of the Minutes of the April 9, 2026, Historical Commission meeting.

Motion- Walter made a motion that the minutes from April 9, 2026, Historical Commission meeting be accepted as written. Gordon seconded the motion.

Poll - All members present agreed with the motion made by Walter.

- B. To consider an amendment to the minutes of January 8, 2026, to state that the motion regarding 22 Stoneleigh Circle was to find the house "historically significant and preferably preserved but not the garage.

Motion- Gordon made a motion to accept the amendment to the minutes from January 9, 2026, minutes. Walter seconded the motion.

Poll- All members present agreed with the motion to make the one amendment to the minutes from the January 9, 2026, meeting.

4. Commission Business

- A. To review plans and a potential vote on Demolition Delay imposed on **18-22 Washburn St.** on October 9, 2025.

Loukas, Gordon and Walter met on-site to look under the siding of the house with Oliver Jerram. Walter reported that what was found under the siding was cedar shingles in very good condition, too new to be part of the original structure. At recent meetings between the Chair, developers and city staff, they have discussed using historic photos and adjacent homes as a model for renovation. Gordon mentioned they walked the neighborhood to view other similar structures to use as inspiration for the house.

Public Comments

Marielynn Altierri and Keith- 40 Otis St.- the resident submitted an email in advance of the meeting to express her opposition to the proposal.

Susan Musinsky- A 40-year resident who lived on Philips St. and now on Otis St. wrote to say she is in support of the many comments made in opposition to the proposal made by other neighbors, speaking of the density of the proposal and what it would do to the character of the neighborhood.

Joseph and Lonnie Gerson- from 4 Washburn St. asked for the continued delay due to what this project would do to the fabric of the neighborhood.

Laura Pabo- 23 Otis St.- The scale of the project has gone for 14 units to 18 units of luxury townhouses that will overtake the houses in the neighborhood.

Andrew Izsak and Jo Saunders of 17 Otis St. spoke up to echo the other comments by concerned residents who are concerned about the project.

Kate Moreau- 49 Chester St. on the corner of Washburn St. spoke to echo the other comments made by residents who are concerned about the proposal.

### Commission Discussion

Gordon expressed that she thought it was a good idea to move the house and restore it as a solution for preserving the house. Walter pointed out if they lift the delay they can add conditions that would bind the developer. Loukas mentioned Field had written versions of sample motions that could be applied in this case. Walter wanted to convey to the neighbors they were trying to get them the best outcome in this case. Glenn said he felt the developer was doing a great job of preserving and reestablishing the structure. He also mentioned it was important to note that issues like congestion and traffic were not issues for the Historical Commission, and that he did not want the HC to be used as an all-purpose barrier to new construction.

Gordon asked if there was a way to keep other boards from changing any of the conditions in the agreement made to lift the delay on this house, to keep the proposal from bouncing back to the Historical Commission again. Oliver Jerram said she or Field could write a letter to accompany the determination to the other boards that review the project after this discussion. Loukas pointed out the contractor has agreed to continue working with the HC to find the best colors for the restoration of this house.

**Motion-** Walter made a motion to lift the 2-year delay on 18-20 Washburn St. with the following conditions. Gordon seconded the motion.

- Applicants project will comply with site plan elevations, views, floor plans contained in the Historical Commission meeting packet for May 14, 2026, meeting packet, indicating specifically the area of the relocation of this structure into the new development which is to have the look of the Otis Houses in the neighborhood.
- The applicant will work with the commission and staff regarding historic house colors.
- The applicant will not move forward with the relocation of the structure until all permits have been issued to develop the proposed development.

**Poll-** Walter, Glenn, Gordon and Loukas all agreed with the motion made by Walter.

- B. To review plans and a potential vote on Demolition Delay imposed on **45 Mt. Auburn St.** on November 13, 2025.

David Schwarzmann of Triad Group introduced members of the team and explained their long history of real estate projects and construction development with an understanding of the passion for historic preservation. He explained that the team has worked diligently to meet the requirements of the MBTA zoning requirements and has also indicated there is a lot of support for the project. Working with the Chair and City Staff, they have explored numerous ways to reconfigure the existing home into the proposal, including turning the building around, and reorienting the entrance but found no way to do so that would allow them to maintain the overall project viability. The structure is a simplified 1895 Queen Anne currently being used a commercial space for a hair salon, that has had a lot of work done on it and is in no way comparable to a well-maintained Queen Anne structure.

To mitigate the loss of the structure, Schwarzmann said his team intends to prepare historic documentation (Form Bs) and install interpretive panels on the new project. Before demolition, they will also offer to the building for free to anyone willing to move the building off the site.

#### Commission Questions

Gordon said she was confused by the feasibility study and Mann said the project was tight to begin with, so the loss of units is significant. Mann indicated maintaining the historic structure on-site would not allow for development to go as planned and result in loss of units. Turner explained that each option they explored for moving the building on-site resulted in other design consequences. Gordon questioned why they needed to maintain some recycling and trash outside the building. Schwarzmann explained they needed to give cars 24-25 feet to safely turn in and out of the building. Walter said he thought this was a historically significant property, but the overall project is so valuable to the city that it outweighs saving the building if there is no way to find financing. He was in favor of lifting the delay. Glenn agreed with Walter. He also added developers do not move forward on projects that there is no city support for. Gordon stated she wanted assurance that if they lift the delay they would deliver the proposal as promised and that there would be no gaping holes left if permitting did not go as planned. Loukas said she agreed about the options, and she could not come up with an idea that would feasibly preserve the structure making everyone happy. She also noted the Triad team worked really hard with them to try to preserve this structure. She wanted the permits in hand before demolition could proceed and asked the team to be helpful financially and physically if someone was willing to move the house. Schwarzman said they would offer up to \$20,000.00 to anyone agreeing to

move the house. Field said the next step for the project would be for the Site Plan Review with the Planning Board.

**Motion-** A motion was made by Glenn to lift the 2-year demolition delay with the following list of conditions. Walter seconded the motion made by Glenn.

- The applicant will take measures to photograph and document the history of building to donate to the city’s historic records;
- The applicant will take measures to install Interpretive Panels of the history of Watertown Square that will be included in the proposed development.
- The applicant must be sure a Form B has been submitted on the property.
- The applicant will offer up to \$20,000.00 to any party interested in moving the structure, while they simultaneously search for a party interested in salvaging the building parts, in the event a party is not found to remove it.
- Demolition will only take place once all permits have been secured to execute plans approved at Site Plan Review.
- If any changes are necessary due to Site Plan Review, the applicants will come back to the Historical Commission for additional review, which will not restart the demolition delay.

**Poll-** Glenn, Walter, Gordon, Loukas all agreed with the motion made by Glenn.

### C. Motion and Voting Process

- i. Historically Significant and Preferably Preserved- Loukas reported that the Demolition Delay identifies factors that must be made. Moving forward all motions must identify whether a structure is historically significant and a separate motion must be made about whether the structure is preferably preserved.
  - ii. How Motion are Worded- Loukas reported that from now on, they will make negative motions for example if a property is being determined “not a motion will be made, which will keep things moving Preferably Preserved.
  - iii. Roll Call Votes,” Loukas and Field reported that a person who makes a motion cannot vote against it.
5. Agent Report- Field reported the new sequence for appointment of new commissioners will be for the Resident Advisory Committee to interview potential new candidates, and then on to the City Manager who sends the vetted candidate to City Council for actual appointment.

Currently there is one candidate who has been vetted by the Advisory Committee and City Manager and now is before the City Council.

6. CPC Update- Walter reported that Walker Pond is on the Waltham border, behind BJ's and the Housing Development, also bordering on Gore Estate. It was an abandoned area located next to an industrial area. It has not been very attractive, and the city is going to come to CPC for money to create a brand-new park which we are hoping will be very nice. It will likely be for mainly passive use, with space for community gardening, a children's play area and currently there are plans available for viewing up on the CPC website. Walter reported that if this goes through, it will be one of their most expensive projects. Walter also stated he is still ready for anyone to make suggestions on projects they are interested in moving forward as a priority for CPC money. He will take any suggestions back to the meeting scheduled for next month. Loukas mentioned the Fowle House, North Branch Library.

## 7. Adjournment

**Motion-** Gordon made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Walter seconded the motion.

**Poll-** All members present agreed with the motion made by Gordon.