

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

*Brookline Preservation Commission*  
**MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 25, 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

**Commissioners Present**

David King, Chair  
Elton Elperin, Vice Chair  
Wendy Ecker  
David Jack  
Richard Panciera  
Elizabeth Armstrong

**Commissioners Absent:**

Jim Batchelor  
Peter Kleiner

**Staff:** 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 – DEMOLITION**

Commission Member Wendy Ecker recused herself from the Newbury College demolition reviews as she is a resident of the neighborhood.

**150 Fisher Avenue** – Application for the full demolition of the building (Welltower Trs Holdco LLC, applicant)

Attorney Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert stated that she was representing the new owners of all five of the former Newbury College properties before the Commission at this time. Her clients, Welltower Inc., were working with the Town's Newbury Campus Zoning Study Committee and the Newbury Zoning Architectural Subcommittee on the proposed redevelopment of the site and were ready to work with the Commission and its staff on the future building designs. It was noted that the study committee was set up by the Town in the spring to look at future uses for the site. Ms. Gilbert stated that Welltower had hired Robert Stern Architects and Finegold Alexander Architects to design the new structures.

45 Ms. McCarthy presented a general history of the development of Newbury College campus  
46 which applies to all five sites before continuing into the case report for the Academic Building  
47 at 150 Fisher Avenue.

48

49 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time.

50

51 Mr. Elperin stated that he found the ca. 1950s building to be a relatively thoughtful and  
52 attractive example of this style of building. It was noted that the building had been listed as  
53 “Non Contributing” on the Fisher Hill National Register Historic District nomination. Ms.  
54 Kritzer explained that all none of the mid-twentieth century development in Fisher Hill had  
55 been fifty years old when the nomination was completed and that this may have impacted how  
56 those buildings were reviewed during the nomination process. It was noted that a nomination  
57 completed today might look differently at those sites. Mr. Elperin stated that he liked the  
58 vertical elements of the building on the rear façade.

59

60 Mr. Jack stated that he understood that one of the reasons behind the Fisher Hill National  
61 Register Historic District was to protect the residential quality of the area. He thought that it  
62 was ironic that the Commission was now considering the historic significance of one of the  
63 buildings that threatened that design. He agreed that the building was a good design for the  
64 1950s and was indicative of the period and style. Mr. Jack moved to uphold staff’s initial  
65 determination of significance and impose an eighteen month stay of demolition which would  
66 expire on May 25, 2021. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

67

68 **146 Hyslop Road** – Application for the full demolition of the building (Welltower Trs Holdco  
69 LLC, applicant)

70

71 Ms. Kritzer presented the case report.

72

73 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment. Dr. Howard Ecker, 161 Hyslop Road,  
74 stated that he was a diagonal abutter to the house and that his wife, Wendy Ecker, was a  
75 member of the Brookline Preservation Commission and had recused herself from this  
76 discussion. He stated that he is a member emeritus of the Fisher Hill Neighborhood  
77 Association and was disappointed that there was not a better turn out from the neighborhood on  
78 this issue. He noted that this building has been constructed as a residential structure and that  
79 Olmsted’s firm had designed Fisher Hill as a residential neighborhood. The house had also  
80 been used as a single family home until it was purchased by the previous institution. He had  
81 nothing against Welltower or capitalism but did not think that the further development of the  
82 area was appropriate for the neighborhood.

83

84 Dr. Ecker stated that the next building to be reviewed, the Holland House at 125 Holland Road,  
85 was the former home of Rabbi Shubow, who was present at the White House when President  
86 Truman recognized Israel, and was historically significant for this association. He noted that  
87 the Fisher Hill Neighborhood Association had worked in the past to prevent development in  
88 the neighborhood. They had worked with Newbury College and its predecessor, Cardinal  
89 Cushing College, to ensure that the changes made by the institutions worked with the character  
90 of the neighborhood. Dr. Ecker noted that these institutions had restored other historically

91 significant buildings and felt that Welltower needed to be conscientious about this issue. He  
92 felt that the best solution for 146 Hyslop Road might be to replace the house with two single  
93 family homes which were in keeping with the nature and character of the neighborhood. Dr.  
94 Ecker offered to provide any additional historical information on the neighborhood which the  
95 Commission might find helpful. He thought that 146 Hyslop was a significant building, and  
96 that the Holland House was even more so.

97

98 Alison Giuliani, 201 Hyslop Road, supported Dr. Ecker's concerns for the area. She had  
99 recently purchased her ca. 1900 house in part for the historic neighborhood.

100

101 Carlos Ridruejo stated that he was a Town Meeting, Advisory Committee, and Newbury  
102 Campus Zoning Study Committee member as well as an architect and agreed that this house  
103 and the Holland House were significant to the neighborhood. He thought that they added to the  
104 residential character of the neighborhood and should be preserved.

105

106 Mr. Panciera agreed that this is a substantial building in good condition which contributes to  
107 the character of the neighborhood. Mr. King moved to uphold staff's initial determination of  
108 significance and impose an eighteen month stay of demolition which would expire on May 25,  
109 2021. Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

110

111 **125 Holland Road** – Application for the full demolition of the building (Welltower Trs  
112 Holdco LLC, applicant)

113

114 Ms. McCarthy presented the case report for the property, which is also known as the Holland  
115 House.

116

117 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment. Mr. Ridruejo stated that this was a very  
118 special property with an architectural character that was difficult to define. He noted that he  
119 house had semi-industrial masonry qualities to its design which were unique to the site and  
120 neighborhood. He had been in the house and explained that the one later addition was for a fire  
121 stairs as the interior had been renovated for Newbury College.

122

123 Wendy Ecker, 161 Hyslop Road, explained that the property had once been well landscaped  
124 but that this had been concreted over and altered by Newbury College. Dr. Ecker added that  
125 the house had always reminded him of the Dutch House on Netherlands Road which was  
126 brought to Brookline from Chicago after the Columbian Exposition.

127

128 Mr. Elperin moved to uphold staff's initial determination of significance and impose an  
129 eighteen month stay of demolition which would expire on May 25, 2021. Mr. Jack seconded  
130 the motion and all voted in favor.

131

132 **124 Holland Road** – Application for the full demolition of the building (Welltower Inc,  
133 applicant)

134

135 Ms. Kritzer presented the case report for the Mitton House, the former Student  
136 Center/Dormitory, and Carriage House/garage.

137 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment. Ms. Gilbert stated that Welltower planned  
138 to preserve the Mitton House, which is in good condition, but would be demolishing the  
139 Student Center to make way for its new buildings. Mr. Ridruejo asked for more information  
140 on what was original to the Mitton House and what was a later addition.

141  
142 Members agreed that it was clear that Mitton House was a significant element of the  
143 neighborhood. Ms. Kritzer reviewed the history of the property and the later construction of the  
144 Student Center and garage. It was noted that the garage was of a piece with the Mitton House  
145 but that the Student Center was notably different. Mr. Elperin noted that the Student Center  
146 was similar to the Academic building but was built later, in the 1960s, and was a clunkier  
147 example of mid-century construction. Mr. Panciera did not see any characteristic elements in  
148 the later building. Mr. King expressed concern that allowing the Student Center to be  
149 demolished would negatively impact the Mitton House. Members reviewed how the two  
150 buildings were connected and noted that they could be easily separated without damage to the  
151 historic structure.

152  
153 Members discussed whether the Student Center should be considered historically significant.  
154 Mr. Jack stated that the 1960s building was a creation of its era and noted how the building had  
155 been designed to work with the Mitton House to create a quadrangle, one of the few college  
156 campus elements of the property. He suggested that the Commission consider how all of the  
157 buildings worked together on the site to create a single significant landscape. Mr. Elperin  
158 agreed that the quadrangle space was purposely created using two very different buildings. Ms.  
159 Armstrong noted that the buildings looked less agreeable together in the photos than they did  
160 when one was on the site.

161  
162 It was noted that this property was listed as a “Non-Contributing” property in the Fisher Hill  
163 National Register District, presumably because of the later construction. Members discussed  
164 this distinction and Mr. Jack thought that if all of the buildings were listed as a single site on  
165 the National Register, than they should be looked at as a whole in this case as well. Mr.  
166 Panciera stated that the courtyard/quadrangle was conceived as a single composition and gave  
167 an academic feeling to the site. Mr. Elperin agreed that the Commission should find the whole  
168 complex as significant. Mr. Elperin moved to uphold staff’s initial determination of  
169 significance and impose an eighteen month stay of demolition which would expire on May 25,  
170 2021. Mr. King seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

171  
172 **117 Fisher Avenue** – Application for the full demolition of the building (Welltower Inc,  
173 applicant)

174  
175 Ms. McCarthy presented the case report for the buildings at 117 Fisher Avenue which include  
176 Edwards Hall, East Hall, and the Athletic Team Building.

177  
178 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time.

179  
180 Mr. Jack stated that the former residence, Edwards Hall, was the original building in the Fisher  
181 Hill neighborhood and one of the only structures to predate Olmsted’s original design. He  
182 noted that it was one of only a few wood frame structures in the neighborhood and having been

183 built in the 1880s, was a fairly early example of Stick Style architecture as well. He noted that  
184 there were a few other examples of the Stick Style from the 1880s in Brookline but that the  
185 style had not been common at that time. He found the house to have an asymmetry that was  
186 intriguing and felt that the Commission needed to acknowledge this part of the historic record.  
187 Mr. Jack had also looked closely at the East Hall, the original stable for the property. While the  
188 building had been significantly altered over time, he had found some evidence of early  
189 raftertails on the side façade as well as a partial fieldstone foundation and thought that it could  
190 be considered significant as part of the residential compound. Regarding the Athletic Team  
191 Building, Mr. Jack had originally thought it had been built as a garage until he recognized the  
192 chimney pot and other surviving architectural elements.

193  
194 Mr. Elperin asked if there was any additional information on the original appearance of the  
195 East Hall. Ms. McCarthy explained that there was very little documentation on the building.  
196 She was not sure when it had been converted but believed that it was sometime after the 1978  
197 survey of the area. It was noted that the form of the building exhibited Arts and Crafts  
198 architectural elements. Mr. Jack thought that the building was older than its current appearance  
199 based on its stone foundation and reviewed the architectural elements that he had seen on site.  
200 Mr. King stated that it was hard to believe that it was an older structure based on its later  
201 alterations and asked if it was worth preserving based on those changes. Mr. Jack found the  
202 building to be intriguing but recognized that time had not been kind to the building. He noted  
203 that all three structures were isolated and individualized by the surrounding sea of asphalt  
204 paving.

205  
206 Mr. King moved to uphold staff's initial determination of significance for Edwards Hall, 117  
207 Fisher Avenue, and impose an eighteen month stay of demolition which would expire on May  
208 25, 2021. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

209  
210 Concerning the East Hall building, Mr. Elperin thought that it interesting that it took this form,  
211 but believed it was an insubstantial structure on a significant site. Mr. Panciera thought that the  
212 form was a dead giveaway that the structure was historic. Mr. Jack stated that he had been  
213 unable to see the north side of the building due to the surrounding fencing on the site but  
214 thought that there was enough there to err on the side of caution. Mr. Jack moved to uphold  
215 staff's initial determination of significance for the East Hall building and impose an eighteen  
216 month stay of demolition which would expire on May 25, 2021. Mr. Panciera seconded the  
217 motion, which failed to pass by a vote of 2 – 3 (Mr. King, Mr. Elperin, and Ms. Armstrong).  
218 Staff's determination was not upheld and the building was determined to be Not Significant.

219  
220 Members reviewed the Athletic Team Building and Mr. Elperin asked if it was known when it  
221 had been built. Ms. McCarthy stated that it first appeared on the 1907 Bromley Atlas and may  
222 have been a garden shed. The property was noted to be a Contributing site in the Fisher Hill  
223 National Register Historic District. Mr. King moved to uphold staff's initial determination of  
224 significance for the Athletic Team Building and impose an eighteen month stay of demolition  
225 which would expire on May 25, 2021. Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

226  
227

228 Mr. King moved to find the final building, the East Hall shed, to be Not Significant. Mr. Jack  
229 seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

230

231 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

232

233 **157 Babcock Street (Graffam McKay LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of  
234 Appropriateness to replace a chain link fence with a 6’ white cedar fence along the rear  
235 property line and a 6’ white cedar fence that would drop down to 42” along the right side  
236 property line (Majed Hazaimet, applicant)

237

238 Ms. Kritzer presented the case report. No one was present on behalf of the applicant.

239

240 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment. Daniel and Frances Givelbar, 81  
241 Crowninshield Road, asked if the new fence would be painted and Ms. Kritzer answered that  
242 there was no information on that at this time. The Givelbars stated that a metal fence behind  
243 157 Babcock Street had already been removed without review. Diane Blau, 87 Crowninshield  
244 Road, asked who they should talk to about having the remaining wire fence removed. Kristina  
245 Colbert Lourie, 163 Babcock Street, also expressed concerns with the proposed new fence and  
246 its design.

247

248 Mr. Elperin stated that the Commission needed to see drawings to better understand how the  
249 new wood fence would intersect the existing fencing and how it would drop down in height.

250 Mr. King agreed and thought that the side yard could be fenced but that it should be more  
251 visually open. Members asked whether the wood fence would end at a brick pier and how it  
252 would transition.

253

254 David Sheena, 167 Babcock Street, noted that a different fence was shown in this area on the  
255 rendering for 151-153 Babcock and asked if two fences were proposed for this area. Ms.  
256 Armstrong asked about the design guideline requirements for side yard fencing.

257

258 Ms. Armstrong noted the open nature of the fence in the adjacent property’s rendering and  
259 thought that it would behoove both property owners to coordinate their fencing choices. Trina  
260 Murphy, a representative for the project at 151-153 Babcock Street, explained that the  
261 rendering’s fence was based on a casual conversation which they had had with the owner of the  
262 property about extending the existing fence along the property line. She explained that this had  
263 only been a general discussion and that nothing concrete had been planned for the fencing.

264

265 Mr. Elperin moved to continue the public hearing to the next meeting contingent on the  
266 applicant providing additional drawings of the proposed fence, how it would intersect the  
267 existing fencing, and how it would transition in height to address the Commission’s questions.

268 Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

269

270

271

272 **151 and 153 Babcock Street (Graffam McKay LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of  
273 Appropriateness to construct two new two family houses, one on each vacant lot (151-153  
274 Babcock Street LLC, applicant)

275  
276 Ms. Kritzer presented the case report.

277  
278 Attorney Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert was present on behalf of the property owner, Ozan  
279 Dokmecioglu, along with Architect Kent Duckham and project representatives Trina Murphy  
280 and Aurel Garban. Ms. Gilbert passed out six letters of support for below grade garages from  
281 neighbors of the property and explained that they had held two neighborhood meetings to date.

282  
283 Mr. Duckham stated that they had previously come before the Commission for an advisory  
284 review and that they had incorporated those suggestions into the current application. The  
285 Commission had suggested flipping the driveway to the other side of the site to maintain the  
286 pattern of the streetscape. They had agreed that this was a good idea as it would move the mass  
287 of the building away from 157 Babcock and reduced the number of approvals that they needed  
288 to request for the project. They viewed the front of the building as a bridge between the local  
289 historic district and the apartment buildings to the right. Mr. Duckham explained how the  
290 buildings changed along the street and that the new building was intended to step up to the  
291 apartment building and create an edge for the historic district. He had incorporated a strong  
292 cornice line and banding from the surrounding buildings and revised the front building to be  
293 long with a narrow façade to the street. The roof on the long façade was now broken at the  
294 center to give the appearance of two separate buildings and he explained how he had used  
295 horizontal lines and shingle flair design elements on the facades. The floors were now close to  
296 matching the floor heights in the surrounding buildings and Mr. Duckham thought that it  
297 aligned better with the front entrances along Babcock Street.

298  
299 Turning to the site plan, Mr. Duckham explained that the driveway would rise from 48' to 56'  
300 at the center of the driveway to hide the garages from view. The garage in the front building  
301 has been relocated to the rear façade and the entry to the second unit moved forward on the  
302 front façade to the high point of the driveway. Mr. Duckham also noted that the third-floor  
303 balconies had been removed and the front façade revised to have the entry open onto a long  
304 porch similar to the houses on the street. Mr. Duckham explained that the rear building would  
305 be treated as a carriage house with a basement garage for four cars and would be entered  
306 through a single garage door at the end of the driveway. He felt that that the revised design was  
307 a valid approach for the neighborhood and created a bridge between the 2 ¾ floor house at 157  
308 Babcock Street and the apartment building. He also thought that the Mansard style roofs on the  
309 new building created a nice transition.

310  
311 Mr. Duckham reviewed the square footage of the house at 157 Babcock Street and stated that it  
312 was three units and was roughly 7,000 sf. of space. Their front building would be 6,065 sf. in  
313 size on a 6,158 sf. lot. The rear lot was 9,425 sf. in size and the new building would be 5,928  
314 sf. Mr. Duckham stated that they were proposing two two-family buildings because this is a  
315 predominantly two- and three-family building neighborhood. The prior plan had required four  
316 special permits but the current plan and lot configuration would require only one special permit

317 for shared driveway access and parking. Mr. Duckham ended by explaining that the house had  
318 been moved back from the sidewalk to be 22' back from the street.

319  
320 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment. Paul Bader, 145 Babcock Street, explained  
321 that he lived in the adjacent apartment building which had 25 owner occupied units facing this  
322 property. He was concerned with the relocation of the driveway to the far side of the property  
323 as it moved the building much closer to their apartment building. He noted that the apartment  
324 building had only a narrow alley between the two properties and was concerned that a closer  
325 building would block the light and negatively impact their apartments. He explained that 157  
326 Babcock had only six windows facing the new buildings and added that the trees shown  
327 between the new buildings and the apartment building appeared to be located in the apartment  
328 building's existing driveway.

329  
330 A resident of 143 Babcock Street shared Mr. Bader's concerns about moving the driveway to  
331 the left side of the lot. He noted that their apartment building was sandwiched between a three-  
332 story apartment building on Freeman Street and this lot. He thought that the new building  
333 looked like it was outside of the boundary of the historic district and was concerned that the  
334 close proximity of the new building to their lot would create too much shade.

335  
336 Frances Givelbar, 81 Crowninshield Road, explained that she lived behind the proposed rear  
337 building and wondered how much open space would be left on the lot. Mr. Duckham explained  
338 that the building was required to be 30' back from the rear lot line. The new decks would  
339 extend 10' into that setback, providing 20' of open space.

340  
341 Members reviewed the site and proposed location of the driveway. Mr. Bader questioned the  
342 feasibility of retaining the three large trees along that property line given the closeness of the  
343 building to the property line. David Sheena, 167 Babcock Street, asked if any other existing  
344 trees would be retained. He noted that the other properties in the historic district generally had  
345 only one house on a lot which was the same size as the two new lots in this location. He  
346 thought the new buildings were enormous and unnecessarily large for the area. It was also  
347 noted that this was an IT2 zone which required a variance for a three-family unit and that most  
348 of the neighborhood was actually made up of one- and two-family homes. Looking at the  
349 rendering, it was noted that 157 Babcock Street was large in comparison with the surrounding  
350 homes but that it was balanced by the large amount of green space surrounding the building.

351  
352 David Lourie, 163 Babcock Street, thought that the proposed house would be about three times  
353 the size of any other house in the neighborhood. He noted that many properties had a rear  
354 building but that these were generally modest carriage houses or garages and that a rear  
355 building of the size proposed here was uncharacteristic of the local historic district.

356  
357 Mr. Duckham stated that they had already checked the trees along the shared property line with  
358 the apartment building and that three of them were healthy and had canopies taller than the  
359 proposed building. It was noted that a retaining wall and stockade fence currently ran along  
360 that same property line. Mr. Duckham stated that the project would meet the Town's open  
361 space requirements in terms of both useable and landscaped open yard. It was noted that the  
362 FAR for the area was 1. Mr. Duckham agreed that most of the houses were two-families but



363 noted that the rowhouses farther up Babcock Street were generally three family buildings. The  
364 proposed new building met height requirements and would stand 39' above the sidewalk which  
365 was lower than 157 Babcock but taller than the apartment building which stands 36.6' tall. Mr.  
366 Duckham stated that parking on the site had seemed like a major issue for the neighbors so  
367 they had hidden it inside the building and behind the hill in the driveway. He noted that the 157  
368 Babcock Street had a large garage and that several properties in the area had carriage houses.

369  
370 Mr. Elperin stated that he did think that the applicant had made several improvements to the  
371 project including removing the front deck and relocating the garage. He was concerned,  
372 though, that there was no correspondence between the rendering and the landscape plan. He  
373 noted that the new front porch was proposed to stand 8.5' above the sidewalk but was shown  
374 with only 13 risers, which was not actually enough for such a rise. He suspected that the  
375 building would look much higher above grade in real life than it did in the rendering, which he  
376 did not think could be believed as real. He also agreed that placing the new buildings closer to  
377 the apartment buildings would negatively impact those structures. Mr. Elperin stated that he  
378 was concerned with the density on the site and wondered if the grade of the driveway should be  
379 lowered to reduce the height of the building. He thought that the proposed development was  
380 unlike the rest of the district and was too dense as proposed.

381  
382 Ms. Armstrong noted that the previous application had proposed a more solid fence between  
383 the properties to enclose the side yard and noted the impact that the changes had on the plan.  
384 She agreed that the site needed more open space. Ms. Armstrong stated that she had sympathy  
385 for those living in the apartment building but that something would be built here and all that  
386 could be done was to try and mitigate the impact. Mr. King disagreed, though, that construction  
387 of large new buildings was a given for the site. Ms. Gilbert explained that the property had  
388 been one large site at 157 Babcock Street but had now been legally divided to create two legal  
389 buildable lots in addition to the original property. The only zoning approval that was needed  
390 for these lots is for the shared driveway.

391  
392 Commission Members discussed the density of the proposed design and its appropriateness to  
393 the historic district. Mr. King stated that he did not feel that the density had changed since the  
394 advisory meeting. He felt that it would be a failure of the Commission to allow the construction  
395 of buildings that did not fit into the character of the historic district. Mr. King thought that the  
396 proposed building was double the size of the other homes in the district and needed to be  
397 reduced by half. He noted that the size of the buildings created additional problems with  
398 parking and a strange situation with the side entrance to the second unit. He thought that the  
399 rear building looked like it had its rear façade facing Babcock Street. He stated that they were  
400 stuffing too much onto limited sites and were creating an awkward situation in the process. He  
401 noted that the Commission had reviewed other new buildings in the local historic districts, such  
402 as the house on Walnut Street in Pill Hill, and had worked hard to make sure that they fit the  
403 neighborhood in question.

404  
405 Ms. Ecker felt that the applicants needed to take care that the any new structure fit well  
406 between the two surrounding buildings. Ms. Armstrong agreed with Mr. Elperin's point and  
407 noted that this design would never be allowed elsewhere or at the center of this historic district.  
408 Mr. Panciera wondered if the mansard style roof had only been chosen because it lent itself to

409 accommodating more space into the building envelope and increasing the square footage of the  
410 house. Mr. Jack stated that he had empathy for the architect who was being asked to create a  
411 design for a challenging program. He thought that this program was too ambitious for this site,  
412 noting the concerns about car clearances for turning and how the size of the project was  
413 impacting the design. He agreed with the other comments made by Commission members and  
414 thought that the applicants were asking the site to do too much.

415

416 The question of forming a subcommittee was raised. Mr. King stated that he did not think this  
417 project was ready for a subcommittee as there were still too many issues to address. Mr.  
418 Elperin suggested that they bring the buildings down closer to grade. The question of lowering  
419 the garages below grade was also discussed. Mr. King thought that the project needed to be  
420 fundamentally rethought before it came back to the Commission. Ms. Kritzer asked if the  
421 Applicant wished to continue this discussion to a future meeting when a revised plan was ready  
422 to review. Ms. Gilbert answered yes and agreed to continue the discussion to a future meeting.  
423 The Applicant will contact the Commission when they are ready to proceed. Mr. King moved  
424 to officially continue the discussion to a future meeting. Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all  
425 voted in favor.

426

427 The meeting adjourned at 9:13 P.M.