

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

Brookline Preservation Commission
MINUTES OF THE October 7, 2019 MEETING
Brookline Town Hall, School Committee Room, 333 Washington Street

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Commissioners Present

David King, Chair
Elton Elperin, Vice Chair
Peter Kleiner
David Jack
Richard Panciera
Elizabeth Armstrong

Commissioners Absent:

Jim Batchelor
Wendy Ecker

Staff: Valerie Birmingham, Lara Kritzer, and Tina McCarthy

Members of the Public: See list

Mr. King called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

Approval of Minutes

There were no minutes to approve.

Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)

No public comment.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

41 Powell Street (Cottage Farm LHD) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace one AC condenser, install two new AC condensers, and install new exhaust vents on the right side of the house (Fred Noyes, applicant).

Ms. Kritzer presented the case.

Fred Noyes, property owner, stated that in regards to screening there is a lot of existing vegetation and felt that an additional fence would be unnecessary. Additionally Mr. Noyes explained that he was eliminating window units on the right side of the house that are highly visible as part of the proposal which would improve the house.

Mr. Elperin asked for clarification in regards to whether the condensers would be for AC or the heat pumps. Mr. Noyes replied that it would be a combination, and that now all floors of the house would be serviced.

Mr. King asked if the piping would be located internally. Mr. Noyes answered that they would be except for the exhaust pipes, which they would paint to match the house. Mr. Elperin asked

47 for clarification in regards to the proposed pipes, and if the applicant could provide a flat
48 option, as originally submitted, in contrast to the elbows. Thomas Gray, K and T Builders,
49 stated that they would look into it, and clarified the number and type of proposed exterior
50 equipment.

51
52 Mr. King asked if the Commission would like a drawing showing the proposed condensers.
53 Mr. Elperin stated that he felt the plan was clear. Mr. Gray stated that there would be three
54 separate pads located next to one another.

55
56 Mr. Elperin asked staff that if the Commission stated that a fence would not be required, could
57 one be required at a future date if it is determined that the vegetation does not screen as well as
58 it does now. Ms. Kritzer stated that it would be difficult to enforce. Mr. Noyes stated that his
59 neighbors do not have a fence around their condensers for additional screening. Ms. Armstrong
60 asked if there was any objection other than the cost of the additional screening and remarked
61 that the Commission should have a good reason for deviating from the Design Guidelines. The
62 Commission discussed the visibility of the proposed location, and Mr. Panciera commented
63 that he felt a fence can sometimes call more attention to the condensers. Mr. Elperin
64 commented that a small enclosure is typical of what the Commission asks for.

65
66 Mr. Elperin made a motion to approve the application with the requirement that there be
67 screening around the condensers, and that the contractor will inquire about using a flat vent
68 instead of a projecting vent with the recommendation that any vent is painted to match the
69 color of the house; a detail of the screening will be provided and reviewed by staff. Mr. Kleiner
70 seconded the motion.

71
72 The Commission VOTED: 6-0-0
73 6 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting
74

75 Mr. Gray asked the Commission that if the vents were below the screening would the elbow
76 vents be acceptable. Mr. Elperin and Mr. King stated that it would be fine.

77
78 **62 Circuit Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD) – Application for a Certificate of**
79 **Appropriateness to replace perimeter fencing along the side and front yard property lines, and**
80 **to install a new gate in front of the front walkway and driveway (Jonathan and Jennifer Cluett,**
81 **applicants).**

82
83 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.

84
85 There was no public comment.

86
87 Mr. Elperin asked to clarify that the proposal did not include fence caps. Jonathan Cluett,
88 property owner, replied that the proposal did not. Mr. Cluett continued to state that the plan
89 was to update the fencing, and that the proposed staining was a recommendation from his
90 landscape architect.

91

92 Mr. Elperin asked about the rear right side property line fence going from 7' existing to 6', as it
93 was originally proposed to stay at 7'. Mr. Cluett remarked that it was a late change, and that he
94 was now proposing a 6' board fence in that location.

95
96 Mr. King asked about lattice fencing and the Design Guidelines. The Commission and staff
97 discussed the wording.

98
99 Mr. Elperin and Mr. King asked for clarification about the proposed driveway gate and left side
100 fencing. Mr. Cluett went over the proposed design and remarked that the idea was to have a car
101 be off of the road.

102
103 Mr. King made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Jack seconded the
104 motion.

105
106 The Commission VOTED: 6-0-0
107 6 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting

108
109 **14 Allerton Street (Pill Hill LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install
110 new lighting on the detached garage, front entry, and side entry (Christopher Wilmott,
111 applicant).

112
113 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.

114
115 There was no public comment.

116
117 Mr. Wilmott stated that the proposed garage security lighting would be low voltage and most
118 likely be motion detected; further, Mr. Wilmott remarked that the proposed sconces were much
119 smaller as requested by the Commission.

120
121 Mr. Elperin stated that the proposed lighting looked fine.

122
123 Mr. King made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Jack seconded the
124 motion.

125
126 The Commission VOTED: 6-0-0
127 6 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting

128
129 Mr. King left the public hearing as he had a personal conflict with the next application.

130
131 **10 Lenox Street (Cottage Farm LHD)** – Request to amend the existing Certificate of
132 Appropriateness for the new additions and renovations to the property to include revisions to
133 the approved plans including revised retaining walls and ramps; new handrail designs; new
134 bollards; new mechanical and fire department connections, vents and enclosures; relocating the
135 transformer; changing the standing seam roof on the barrel dormer to a flat seam metal roof;
136 installing new antennas and cameras; locating the dumpster, compost and recycling areas;
137 altering a basement window for the elevator exhaust; new downspouts and gutters; new

138 overhead door in the addition; new playscape structures and materials; new exterior lighting;
139 new raised paving and curbs; and fencing (Trustees of Boston University, applicant).

140
141 Ms. Kritzer presented the case.

142
143 Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, Law Office of Robert L. Allen, Jr. LLP, introduced the applicants.
144 Mike Lindstrom, studioMLA Architects, remarked that some parts of the revised application
145 are time sensitive due to construction schedule.

146
147 The Commissioners opted to discuss the items one by one.

148
149 Parking lot post lights: Ms. Dopazo Gilbert stated that the police had requested additional
150 lighting, and that because they were revised to be a little taller, there would be fewer in total.
151 Mr. Elperin asked about the timing of the lights. Walt Meissner, Boston University, answered
152 that it depended on the time of year, and that Boston University did not want to have a lot of
153 light pollution.

154
155 Mechanical condenser by the playground: Mr. Elperin asked if it would be fenced. Mr.
156 Lindstrom replied that it would be.

157
158 Bollards on Lenox Street and fire connection: Mr. Lindstrom stated that the bollards were to
159 protect both the transformer and the fire connection. Mr. Elperin asked if there could be any
160 exceptions. Mr. Lindstrom stated he did not believe so. Mr. Kleiner asked if the bollards could
161 be moved in more. Jordan Swenton, studioMLA Architects, answered that they could not as
162 Eversource had required minimum distances, and they also had to align with the fire
163 department's requirements for the fire connection. Mr. Elperin stated that it was unfortunate
164 that the transformer would be located there.

165
166 Trash enclosure: Mr. Panciera asked if it was going to be stained or painted. Mr. Swenton
167 answered that it would be natural cedar to match the building.

168
169 Mechanical enclosure by Lenox Street: Mr. Lindstrom stated that the plan was to remove every
170 other board due to a manufacturer's requirement for the equipment. Mr. Elperin remarked that
171 the removal of every other board lightened the design.

172
173 Window wells: Mr. Elperin asked if they would be corrugated. Mr. Lindstrom replied that that
174 was what they were thinking but had not provided the detail. Mr. Lindstrom stated that they
175 would be softened with landscaping.

176
177 Mr. Lindstrom went over the design for the proposed change in grade for the artificial turf, rear
178 bollards, irrigation boxes and hose bibb location, retaining wall, knox box, and the ramp
179 handrail design.

180
181 Barrel roof dormer: Mr. Lindstrom explained that it was a design change not a material change
182 that was raised due to constructability concerns from the contractor. Mr. Elperin remarked that
183 the flat seam was preferable.

184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229

Mechanical vent on south roof slope: Mr. Panciera asked if it would be the same color as the roof. Mr. Lindstrom remarked it would not. Mr. Elperin stated that it could be painted.

Antenna: Mr. Elperin asked if it could be located on the back side of the roof. Ms. Dopazo Gilbert stated that the fire department had done a test and determined the front side of the roof to be the best location. Mr. Panciera commented that the location was unfortunate. Mr. Kleiner asked if the antenna could be moved to the side wall of the center dormer to be tucked out of view as best as possible. Mr. Lindstrom answered that that would be possible. The Commissioners agreed that was the best solution.

Gutters: Mr. Elperin asked about the material for the proposed metal gutters. Mr. Lindstrom replied they were proposing galvalume. The Commissioners discussed the proposal and felt that the best design was to retain copper downspouts and gutters on the existing house, and to allow the proposed galvalume on the new addition and connector.

Ceiling light fixtures in the porte cochere: Mr. Elperin asked for clarification where the lights would be mounted. Mr. Lindstrom clarified the locations. Mr. Elperin commented that he was not opposed.

Security cameras: Mr. Lindstrom explained that they had attempted to minimize the number of cameras while still covering the area. Mr. Swenton clarified the types of security cameras proposed. Mr. Panciera asked if they could be a darker color. Mr. Swenton stated he would look into it. Mr. Kleiner asked if there were any other camera options for the one by the front door. Mr. Lindstrom stated that they could alter the proposal from one projecting camera above the front door to two smaller wall mounted cameras on either side to be a darker color if possible. The Commissioners preferred this design change.

Garage side door: Mr. Lindstrom explained that the originally approved overhead door had caused operational concerns. Mr. Panciera asked if the proposed door could have side lights in an attempt for the door to read larger on that façade. Mr. Kleiner agreed that there should be more divided lights. The Commissioners and Mr. Lindstrom discussed various design options for the door. The Commissioners remarked that the proposed commercial style door did not work as currently designed.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Kleiner made a motion to accept the proposal to amend the existing Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted except for the antenna, gutters, security cameras, and garage side door which would be altered as discussed during the hearing except for the garage side door; a revised garage side door design was to be reviewed and approved by Mr. Kleiner and staff; Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

The Commission VOTED: 5-0-0
5 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting

230 Mr. King returned to the public hearing

231

232 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**

233

234 **59-61 Brington Road** – Application for partial demolition of the house (WC Brington 59,
235 LLC, applicant).

236

237 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.

238

239 Elizabeth Michelman, 53 Brington Road, introduced herself and stated she was not sure what
240 the proposed alterations included. Mr. King explained that the Commission would not be
241 reviewing any proposed plans at this time.

242

243 Mr. Elperin commented that he assumed the stucco was still underneath the aluminum siding.
244 Mr. King remarked that he felt the house could be restored, though asked the Commissioners if
245 the integrity was compromised. Mr. Jack stated that the massing is very consistent and that he
246 thought of the houses as an ensemble; additionally, Mr. Jack remarked that he thought the
247 houses were significantly contributing to the streetscape.

248

249 Mr. Jack made a motion to uphold staff’s initial determination of significance and impose a
250 twelve month stay of demolition which would expire on October 7, 2020. Mr. Elperin
251 seconded the motion.

252

253 The Commission VOTED: 5-1-0

254 5 in favor, 1 against and 0 abstained from voting.

255

256 **191 Clyde Street** – Application for partial demolition of the locker building (The Country
257 Club, applicant).

258

259 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.

260

261 Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, Law Office of Robert L. Allen, Jr. LLP, introduced the applicant,
262 Steven Ballard, Director of Facilities for The Country Club.

263

264 There was no public comment.

265

266 Mr. Elperin asked if the application was for full demolition. Ms. Dopazo Gilbert answered that
267 it was for partial demolition, and that the applicant intended to return to the Preservation
268 Commission at a future hearing to ask for the stay to be lifted.

269

270 Mr. Elperin made a motion to uphold staff’s initial determination of significance and impose a
271 twelve month stay of demolition which would expire on October 7, 2020. Mr. Jack seconded
272 the motion.

273

274 The Commission VOTED: 6-0-0

275 6 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting.

276
277 **1762 Beacon Street** – Request to lift the stay of partial demolition of the house and full
278 demolition of the detached garage – continuation (1762 Beacon, LLC, applicant).
279
280 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.
281
282 Jeffrey Allen, Lawson & Weitzen, LLP, stated that the applicants had presented a unique
283 opportunity to bring the building back to original condition, and that the proposed was more of
284 a restoration than a renovation. Additionally, Mr. Allen remarked that the immediate abutter at
285 1760 Beacon Street was a vocal supporter of the project, and that the project has received
286 approval from the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals. Stephen Sousa, architect,
287 explained design changes that have occurred since the Preservation Commission last saw the
288 design to accommodate both neighbor and the subcommittee’s requests, and that they would be
289 obtaining a landscape architect to finalize the plan. Additionally, Mr. Sousa explained that the
290 Commission had four options to review of the design of the front entry.
291
292 Lydia Shrier, 17 Corey Road, stated that she felt Mr. Sousa had been very responsive about
293 neighbor’s concerns; however she thought there was still one remaining issue around the roof
294 deck. Ms. Shrier remarked that the roof deck appears to not fit in with the rest of the careful
295 design, it is aesthetically not appealing, and she was concerned about the use and noise in
296 general.
297
298 Sharon Slodki, 1768 Beacon Street, commented that her main concern was the roof deck as it
299 doesn’t fit in with the building and appeared massive.
300
301 Phoebe Compton, 1760 Beacon Street, stated that she was pleased with her abutters and felt
302 they were doing a great job restoring the building versus what could have been done to the
303 building.
304
305 Mr. Allen clarified that the proposed roof deck would only be accessed by the third floor unit.
306
307 The Commissioners discussed the proposed roof deck. Mr. King remarked that the
308 subcommittee had thought it would be difficult to view from the street. Mr. Kleiner stated that
309 the abutter’s views looking down on the roof deck is out of the purview of the Preservation
310 Commission, and remarked that there were other Town Bylaws to handle noise and abutter’s
311 concerns.
312
313 Mr. Elperin remarked that the rear reveal, pushing the addition back to maintain the quoins,
314 and the landscape were improvements since the subcommittee saw the design, however stated
315 that he was torn in regards to the front entry porch.
316
317 The Commissioners discussed the front entry porch and the four different options that were
318 shown. Mr. Kleiner stated that if the applicant were to go with the plan to replicate the first
319 opening, brick infill around a stained glass window, the applicant would have to use existing
320 brick salvaged from the inside face of the entry. Mr. Panciera and Mr. Elperin stated they
321 preferred the option with the divided light on top. Ms. Armstrong agreed, and commented that

322 she had concerns with the matching of the brick infill and look of that option. Mr. Jack agreed
323 with Ms. Armstrong. Mr. Kleiner remarked that he felt the option with the brick infill would
324 look reasonable and that the other options would disrupt the rhythm of the intended original
325 design. Mr. King agreed with Mr. Kleiner, and remarked that the option with the clear window
326 with divided lights on top would have a fishbowl effect at night. Mr. Elperin asked the
327 Commissioners if they felt the stained window would have to match the existing. Mr. King and
328 Mr. Kleiner remarked that while the brick should match, the stained window could be different.
329 Mr. Kleiner commented that the proposed design should maintain the spirit and integrity of the
330 original design. Ms. Armstrong asked staff if the existing design of the front entry was original
331 to the building. Ms. McCarthy answered that she believed it was as it is identical to its
332 neighbor. Ms. Armstrong stated since it is believed to be original she would be OK with the
333 brick infill option.

334
335 Mr. Kleiner asked about the downspouts. Mr. Sousa commented that they would be copper.

336
337 Mr. Elperin made a motion to lift the stay of demolition to allow the full demolition of the
338 detached garage, and the partial demolition of the building with the conditions that the entry
339 porch be designed so that the second arch is infilled and replicated with brick salvaged from
340 the building, and that the stained glass not replicate the existing; a mock-up is to be reviewed
341 and approved by the subcommittee which consisted of Mr. King, Mr. Elperin, and Mr. Jack;
342 final details to be reviewed and approved by staff. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

343
344 The Commission VOTED: 5-1-0
345 5 in favor, 1 against and 0 abstained from voting.

346
347
348 **PUBLIC HEARING – WARRANT ARTICLE 21**

349
350 Jesse Gray, submitter of Warrant Article 21, commented that updates and refinements had been
351 made since the Preservation Commission last discussed the proposed Warrant Article 21. Ms.
352 Kritzer stated that the changes had been sent prior by staff to the Commissioners for review.

353
354 Lisa Cunningham, submitter of Warrant Article 21, stated that those in the audience were there
355 in strong support of Warrant Article 21 and that she felt it is a very important move for
356 Brookline, and that she hoped the Preservation Commission would vote favorably to support.

357
358 Mr. King asked for any staff comments. Ms. McCarthy commented that she would have liked
359 to have seen a study that was not based upon stretch code standards, as historic buildings are
360 exempt from the stretch code.

361
362 Mr. Gray further explains the purpose of the proposed bylaw and that it will help transition
363 Brookline to a fossil free future.

364
365 The Commissioners and Mr. Gray discussed possible cost impacts, as well as the concern of
366 the over insulating of and possible impacts on historic buildings. Mr. Kleiner commented that
367 the insulation of historic buildings was outside the purview of the Preservation Commission.

368 Mr. Gray stated that a recent change to the Warrant Article was the inclusion of a yet to be
369 developed waiver process, and that if the bylaw is passed and unknown issues arise, then it
370 could be amended at a future Town Meeting. Mr. Kleiner commented that the Preservation
371 Commission is already reviewing mechanical equipment, however stated that this could be an
372 issue for the maintenance of historic chimneys. Ms. Armstrong stated that the problem of a
373 climate crisis should be recognized, and the Preservation Commission should support the
374 Warrant Article and handle future situations as they arise.
375

376 Ms. Armstrong moved that the Preservation Commission endorse Warrant Article 21 subject to
377 review of the final version. Mr. Kleiner seconded the motion
378

379 The Commission VOTED: 6-0-0
380 6 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting.
381

382 The meeting adjourned.