

Brookline Preservation Commission
MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 2, 2016 MEETING
School Committee Room (5th Floor), Town Hall, 333 Washington Street

Commissioners Present:

David King, Chair
Elton Elperin, Vice Chair
Wendy Ecker
Paul Bell
Giti Ganjei Saeidian
Peter Kleiner

Commissioners Absent:

Kirstin Gamble Bridier
Rosemary Battles Foy
James Batchelor

Staff: Marissa Barrett, Meghan Hanrahan Richard, Ashley Clark

Members of the Public: See list

Mr. King began the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

BUSINESS

1. Approval of minutes.

No Minutes were submitted for approval.

2. Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)

No public comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS- LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

6:40 p.m. **78 Powell Street** (Cottage Farm LHD) – Review of final plans for Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness after ZBA review (78 Powell Street Trust, applicant).

[Ms. Ecker recused herself.]

Ms. Barrett presented the report for 78 Powell Street and began with the Statement of Significance. She stated that the commission recommended a wood panel detail be used above the windows where they were lowered down two feet. She asked the commission to analyze this detail to see if it was successful. The case went to the Planning Board and ZBA and there were no additional changes required by either board and the project was approved. The commission requested final review after approval by Planning Board and the ZBA.

Bailey Gaffney with Law Office of Robert L. Allen Jr. and Dan Britton the homeowner were present to hear the case.

The applicant had a request to consider a new design element for the proposed roof deck, citing a concern over the mechanics of the roof deck. Since the deck size has been reduced to 15x15, there was a concern over snow load and weight management. The deck has about a foot of decking material sitting underneath the railing. There is a concern over different roofing material on two portions as well as weight on the roof. The applicant is now requesting to extend the wood material out to the edge.

Kent Duckham, the project's architect, stated that it makes sense structurally to bear the weight on the outside walls and not have to go back and restructure. The continuity of lines on the deck enhances- like a cornice and it makes sense not to look at an ugly rubber roof. The intention is to clean up messy lines. Framing is necessary around the highest point to fit over the hip. The hip is at the highest at the center of the deck. The beams span from the house out to the exterior wall.

Mr. Elperin questioned if the proposed change will work if structurally. The members of the committee discussed aesthetics and safety factors such as stepping over the railing.

The commission's interest is over the visual impact for the public. There is a concern regarding placing a new structure over the existing hip because of the added height. It was discussed that there were no design changes from the ZBA or Planning Board. There was discussion over how the deck will be supported and over dead load and structure.

Mr. Duckham drew a sketch of how the deck would be supported to be reviewed by the commission.

The commission discussed the windows and revision of the proposed wood panel above the lowered header. There was concern to keep the triad of windows against the cornice.

The commission discussed the difference with the wood and the shingles above. There was general agreement by the commission that shingles would look better and be a more appropriate treatment.

No public comment.

Mr. Bell moved to approve the plans as presented with the condition that the new proposed panel above the windows on the north elevation of the carriage house and the panels be put back to shingles and on the roof deck approved as presented subject to design review by staff of the structural system, Mr. Kleiner seconded, and the commission:

Amendment to the motion: Subject to not increasing the line of the deck and the cornice line and floor of the deck. Subject to design review with staff.

VOTED unanimously to approve the requested changes with the amendment above.

Update on windows from Mr. Duckham: Two people came to look at the windows. They are nice on the inside but on the outside they are rotted and in really tough shape. Both people said they can replace it exactly as it is even using the same glass by taking it out and putting it back in. One company is Boston Sash who does historic replacement windows by taking window back to shop and replacing perfectly. Mr. Duckham brought in samples windows for the committee.

The staff put forth a recommendation to save the side windows, citing guidelines put forth by the Preservation Department. There was discussion over a concern with keeping the sash part of the window. A comment was made to remove the sash and replace with similar sash.

Mr. Duckham commented that the restoration costs exceeded costs of a new window. He described the windows as having putty glazed exterior, mahogany, and will last 100 years.

Mr. Bell inquired what was decided the last time they voted. The staff referred to the guidelines that recommend rehabilitation and only in the case the window cannot be rehabilitated replacement is acceptable.

The commission previously decided to have the windows inspected. They have not been inspected by a rehabilitation expert to date to assess if the windows can be rehabilitated or the extent of the damage. The staff again recommended restoration for all windows if possible. There was a discussion over losing historic fabric when replacement occurs. Based on the decision last time, they still want to see restoration specialist. The commission endorsed the view put forward by the staff.

The commission would approve restoration unless the windows cannot be restored. To date, the staff has not been convinced that they have been inspected.

The plan is to coordinate with staff to work out details of the windows and decide what can be saved.

7:15 p.m. **90 Ivy Street** (Cottage Farm LHD) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove existing wood fence, rear wall, and steps and construct a 9' to 10' high side and rear yard brick wall with pedestrian gate (Peter Ames c/o Nicholas and Oliver Ames, applicants).

Timothy Perk, the project's architect, was present to represent the owner who was not present.

Ms. Barrett presented the Statement of Significance, proposed alterations, and applicable guidelines. She shared there were three letters of support of the project from the ZBA.

Mr. Perk shared a concern that Saint Mary's Court is busy with commercial activity. It is noisy and a visual distraction to 90 Ivy Street. The proposed brick wall would be constructed in keeping with the current architectural style. The owner of St. Mary's Court is also in support of this project. This is a way to reinforce the corner and make the delineation clearer. The idea of the project is to build a wall in traditional way in finish and design.

No public comment.

There was a discussion over the trucks idling as a noise disturbance, specific comments on the placement of the brick wall and discussion over the 6ft guidelines. The proposed plan, where the existing wood fence is, the proposed brick wall would be a little higher than the existing. For approval, what is visible is under consideration. The longest run of the wall is in line with the view from the front of the house.

There was also a concern over the BU student apartment balcony views being obstructed and what the best solution to comply with guidelines is. The zoning requires 6 or 7 feet depending on how it is read.

The commission voiced support of brick for this area but concerned over height and views from Saint Mary's Court and Ivy Street. The purpose of wall height is to not create neighbor obstructions; this does not seem to be an issue for this proposal.

The commission noted a difference between boundary of commercial and residential. The design will look better than the existing fence.

Mr. Elperin motioned to approve the design as proposed understanding it is in violation with 6ft height but approving on the grounds that it is located in commercial back alley way and is minimally visible from a public way and is an improvement over the existing, Ms. Ganjei Saeidian seconded, and the commission:

VOTED unanimously to approve the requested changes.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION

3. 39 Jordan Road– Request to partially demolish a house (Aaron Mayo and Nicole McClelland, owners).

Ms. Barrett presented the Statement of Significance.

The architect for the project, Thomas Jonack, was is present to hear the commission’s comments and is asking for approval for a partial demolition. The homeowner wants to add additional living space. He further shared, the homeowners bought the house because they love the appearance and would like to keep front untouched and remove the addition.

There was a discussion over the work had been done, with only one permit on record from 1937. Some elements of the house do not match the design. Mr. Bell commented that this building meets the criteria to be historically significant.

Mr. Bell moved to uphold the building is historically significant, Mr. Elperin seconded, and the commission:

VOTED unanimously to uphold that the building is historically significant.

Mr. Bell expressed concern over the protection of retaining walls in the rear of the house.

7:20 p.m. ~~172 Buckminster Road—Request to demolish a garage (Katherine Stewart owner)~~ *Postponed by Applicant*

NEW BUSINESS

7:30 p.m. **Hancock Village** –Review and Comment on Project Eligibility for a Chapter 40B Comprehensive Permit for Puddingstone at Chestnut Hill.

Staff presented a brief description over Puddingstone at Chestnut Hill project. The staff is asking the commission for comments to put in letter to Mass Development.

The project includes 226 new units proposed and 350 parking spaces underneath the 6 story building.

The commission expressed concern over the proximity to a corner building. The site is National Register eligible. To date, preservation has proposed that it be put on the National Register. There was a general question over if this new site is a compromise; does it negatively impact the existing concept of

the Garden Village? The Garden Apartment Design is the historic element. The primary element is the garden style design. It was a post-WWII and originally housing for veterans.

There was a comment from the commission to be submitted: What is proposed is clearly not in keeping with the Garden Village post-WWII design and intent. It disrupts the flow of open space and destroys the scale and is gross contrast to the scale of existing buildings. It separates E2 and E1 from their open space which is the essence of the design. The pattern of buildings to open space would be destroyed. Six stories and material is not compatible.

Crown and Shield Project Update

Mr. Elperin updated the commission on the Crown and Shield project. The tweaking is mostly over. There were questions raised about what point does design review team stop. The architect has accepted a lot of input. In this case, the neighborhood has been strong and adamant which was a major factor.

Prepared by: Ashley Clark

Respectfully submitted by,

Marissa C Barrett