

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
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
47

Brookline Preservation Commission
MINUTES OF THE January 12, 2021 MEETING
Held Virtually using Zoom Online Software

Commissioners Present:

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

Commissioners Absent:

Jim Batchelor

Staff: Valerie Birmingham, Tina McCarthy

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

Approval of Minutes

The Commission did not have any minutes to review.

Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

There was no public comment.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION

83 Longwood Avenue – Application for the full demolition of the building (83 Longwood Ave LLC, applicant). Precinct 3

Ms. Birmingham presented the application.

Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, Law Office of Robert Allen Jr., LLP, stated that she had no objection to the significance determination, but did note the many changes to the structure.

Virginia Smith, TMM, precinct 4, commented that it was a charming house important to the streetscape and that she thought the proposal was out of keeping with the neighborhood and asked the Preservation Commission impose a stay of demolition.

Ms. Ecker remarked it would be a loss to lose the one charming house surrounded by brick buildings.

Mr. King commented that the Commission should uphold the initial determination, and that it was architecturally and historically significant.

48 Mr. Elperin stated that the house is not as orphaned as he had originally thought.

49

50 Mr. King moved to uphold staff's initial determination of significance and impose a twelve-month
51 stay of demolition, which would expire on January 12, 2022. Mr. Jack seconded the motion. All
52 voted in favor.

53

54 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

55

56 **228 Pleasant Street (Crowninshield LHD- Precinct 8)** – Continuation - Application for a
57 Certificate of Appropriateness to install fencing, lighting, AC condensers with associated screening,
58 and a security system with cameras (Chadi Kawkabani, applicant).

59

60 Ms. McCarthy presented the application.

61

62 Mr. Elperin remarked about the findings and concerns of the subcommittee and stated that there had
63 been a compromise with the applicant regarding the height of the fences.

64

65 Mr. Kawkabani, owner, described the design of the fence.

66

67 Ms. Ecker commented that she liked the fence and thought it would look nice with the house.

68

69 Mr. Panciera asked about the height of the fence. Mr. Kawkabani clarified the proposal.

70

71 Ms. Ecker asked if the fence would be brown. Mr. Kawkabani stated it would be oil stained.

72

73 Mr. King commented it would be nice if the fence in front of the driveway could be lower. Mr.
74 Elperin remarked that the subcommittee had discussed this on site.

75

76 Mr. King remarked that the lighting appeared all right and low key.

77

78 Mr. Elperin moved to approve the fencing and lighting as shown to the full Commission. Mr.
79 Panciera seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

80

81 **23 Prescott Street (Cottage Farm LHD – Precinct 1)** – Application for a Certificate of
82 Appropriateness to replace existing asbestos roof tiles and synthetic slate roofing with DaVinci
83 synthetic slate (Landmark Properties, applicant).

84

85 Ms. McCarthy presented the application.

86

87 Fred Lavitman, applicant, commented that they did have a few options but preferred this one. Mr.
88 Lavitman went over existing conditions and the proposal with the Commission.

89

90 Ms. Ecker asked about the lifespan of the proposal. Mr. Lavitman answered one hundred years.

91

92 Mr. Kleiner stated that he preferred it be replaced with real slate and the look be uniform, and
93 mentioned that the existing roof cannot be replaced in kind which might offer leeway in this case.

94

95 Mr. Elperin remarked that the Design Guidelines for Local Historic Districts state that synthetic slate
96 should not be used and that real slate should be used. Further, Mr. Elperin asked about color samples
97 and the shingles edges.
98

99 The Commissioners and the applicant discussed the proposal and edges of the shingles. Mr. Lavitman
100 commented on the labor intensive aspect and cost factor, in addition that there was greater risk for
101 breakage with real slate.
102

103 Mr. King referred to the Design Guidelines for Local Historic Districts and commented that the
104 Commission had never approved a material such as this, and that they should insist on real slate.
105

106 Mr. King moved to deny the application and that the applicant could replace the roof with slate. Mr.
107 Elperin seconded the motion. All voted in favor.
108

109 **41 Powell Street (Cottage Farm LHD – Precinct 1)** –Application for a Certificate of
110 Appropriateness to reconstruct the front porch and steps, and install lighting (S. E. Ritch and
111 Associates, applicant).
112

113 Ms. McCarthy presented the application.
114

115 Sarah Ritch, applicant, commented on existing conditions and went over the proposal.
116

117 Fred Noyes, owner, stated that they were trying to stay in character of the house.
118

119 Mr. Jack remarked that it is a magnificent house and that he liked the existing metal railing as it is
120 minimal and does not detract from the original design. Mr. King agreed.
121

122 Mr. Panciera commented that wood would be an oddity.
123

124 Ms. Ritch asked about a simple metal rail. Mr. Elperin stated that the Commission would usually like
125 to review it.
126

127 Mr. Noyes asked if metal would be more in keeping with the house. Mr. Elperin remarked that it
128 does not try to be something it is not, and is more functional. Mr. Panciera agreed.
129

130 Mr. Jack stated he had no issue with the light fixture and asked for clarification on the dimensions.
131 Ms. Ritch answered it is what is there now.
132

133 Mr. Elperin moved to deny the wood railing but approve the concept with a steel rail, as well as the
134 rest of the application. Final details are to be reviewed and approved by staff and an empowered
135 subcommittee of one. Mr. Jack seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The empowered
136 subcommittee would include Mr. Panciera.
137

138 **55 Devon Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD – Precinct 13)** –Application for a Certificate of
139 Appropriateness to remove a rear one story addition and infill with new french doors, rebuild rear
140 side bay and install new wood double hung window, and alter the fenestration on the first floor on
141 the rear elevation (Noury-Ello Architects, applicant).
142

143 Ms. Birmingham presented the application.
144
145 Claudia Noury-Ello, applicant went over the proposal, and commented that it was an effort to reign
146 in the existing mish mash of windows on the rear elevation.
147
148 Mr. Elperin commented that the design improved the rear elevation. Mr. Kleiner remarked that the
149 design was really nice. Mr. Jack stated the design was very clean and sensitively done.
150
151 Mr. Elperin stated it would be difficult to insist on single pane windows in this case due to the
152 minimal visibility from a public way, and the fact that the existing windows are insulated.
153
154 Mr. Panciera stated that it was minimally visible, and that the Commission has allowed other
155 applicants to have insulated glazing when it was that degree of limited visibility and there was a mix
156 of windows.
157
158 Mr. Jack moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. King amended the motion to state that
159 the insulated windows are allowed only because of the minimal visibility and fact there are existing
160 thermal pane windows in those locations. Mr. Jack accepted the amendment to the motion. Mr.
161 Panciera seconded the motion. All voted in favor.
162
163 **12 Osborne Road (Graffam McKay LHD – Precinct 8)** –Application for a Certificate of
164 Appropriateness to enclose a rear first floor porch (Teresa L Swartzel LLC, applicant).
165
166 Ms. Birmingham presented the application.
167
168 Teri Swartzel, applicant, remarked that they want to match existing details as much as possible and
169 that if the Commission was OK with it, they would like to change the windows to be double hung.
170
171 Ms. Swartzel and the Commissioners discussed the window configuration. Ms. Ecker stated that she
172 liked the proposal with casement windows, as it was more typical for this type of enclosed porch.
173 Mr. King stated it was fine to enclose the porch and he was OK with either type of windows. Mr.
174 Panciera stated that he preferred the casement windows but would not object to double hung.
175
176 Kathleen Parish, owner, remarked that they thought the casement windows might be a safety issue.
177
178 Mr. Jack asked if the windows could be awning windows with a hinge at top. Ms. Swartzel answered
179 that it might be an issue. Further, Ms. Swartzel remarked that she did not believe the windows on the
180 rest of the house were original.
181
182 Mr. Elperin stated that a revised drawing should be submitted.
183
184 Mr. Elperin moved to approve the proposal to enclose the rear porch with double hung windows.
185 Final revised plans and details are to be reviewed and approved by staff and an empowered
186 subcommittee of one. Mr. Jack seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The empowered
187 subcommittee would include Mr. Kleiner.
188
189 The meeting adjourned.