

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

Brookline Preservation Commission
MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 14, 2020 MEETING
Denny Room, Brookline Public Health Building, 11 Pierce Street

Commissioners Present:

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

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff: Valerie Birmingham, Lara Kritzer

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

Approval of Minutes

Members reviewed and made edits to the draft minutes for the November 12 meeting at this time. Mr. Elperin moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

Members reviewed the draft minutes for the December 10 meeting at this time. Mr. Elperin moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Ms. Ecker seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)

No public comment.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

40 Dunster Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD - Continuation) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install exterior outdoor lighting in the rear, side, and front yards (Michael and Casey Buckley, applicants)

Ms. Birmingham presented the case report. Dan Gordon, Landscape Architect, was present on behalf of the owners and expressed their wishes to have the current lighting plan approved. He explained that the current proposal involved fewer lights which would be more controlled.

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

47 Mr. King asked about the height of the proposed light posts and was told that they would be 8' to
48 10' tall. Mr. King asked if one side could be mirrored. Mr. Gordon answered yes, that the fixtures
49 could be configured to control the light in this way and that they would be open to doing it if the
50 Commission required it. Mr. Elperin thought that the current proposal was much better than the
51 previous one. He thought that it was a compromise to allow the post lights along the driveway but
52 did not know of a better alternative. He pointed out that the site still included uprights for several
53 trees at the top of the driveway. He thought that the uprights should be removed but that the plan
54 was otherwise a good one.

55
56 Mr. King agreed that the up-lighting should be removed. Mr. Batchelor thought that the uprights
57 were reasonable in their proposed location. Mr. King stated that he wanted to have the post lights
58 screened to reduce or eliminate the spread of light to surrounding parcels and reduce the
59 neighborhood impact. Mr. Gordon suggested that they could also back plant the lights with
60 evergreens to reduce their neighborhood impact and that they could accommodate either option.

61
62 Mr. Elperin moved to accept the revised lighting plan with the uprights to be completely removed
63 from the project and the carriage lights to be screened to eliminate light trespass. Mr. Batchelor
64 stated that he was not concerned with the up-lighting of the trees and thought that the applicant had
65 done a good job of removing elements that would impact the view from Dunster Road. Ms. Ecker
66 agreed that the up-lit trees were set back on the site. Mr. Elperin felt that uprights were not an
67 appropriate treatment within an historic district and was concerned that the lighting would compete
68 with the historic house. Mr. Kleiner noted that there were great examples of well-lit historic
69 structures and thought that lighting could be considered separately from historic character. He did
70 not mind the proposed up-lighting on the site. Mr. King agreed that many historic buildings were
71 well lit but noted that these were generally landmarks and not neighborhood residential structures.
72 He expressed concern that this could lead to a significant change in the character of residential
73 districts which are primarily darker in nature. Mr. Batchelor felt that the primary visibility to the
74 site was from Dunster Road and did not think that the uprights would be visible from that location.

75
76 Mr. Batchelor moved to amend the motion to allow four uprights to be installed as shown on the
77 submitted plans as long as they are not brightly lit and will not impact the public ways in the
78 Chestnut Hill North Historic District. Mr. Kleiner seconded the motion. The amended motion was
79 passed by a vote of 5-2 (King, Elperin).

80
81 **16 Prescott Street (Cottage Farm LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to
82 install new landscape features including new fencing, gates, stone wall, exterior lighting, built in
83 grill, steel screen wall, 9'5" steel and wood pergola, spa, 16'x45' swimming pool, steel swing set,
84 granite paving and decking; rebuild brick wall (Miguel and Laura de Icaza, applicants)

85
86 Ms. Kritzer presented the case report. Ryan Wampler, Mathew Cunningham Landscape Design,
87 was present for the discussion.

88
89 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time.

90
91 Ms. Ecker asked if the project included a pool house. Mr. Wampler stated that it did not. A
92 question was raised about the metal fencing proposed around the existing wood door facing Euston
93 Street. Mr. Wampler explained that the door only opens in and could not be modified to open out
94 as required to meet the pool code requirements. Mr. Wampler explained that their proposed

95 solution was to install a secondary metal fence and gate around this door to meet the building
96 requirement.

97
98 Continuing its discussion of fencing, Members reviewed the new fencing proposed for the NE and
99 SE corners of the house to enclose the rear yard. It was noted that this fencing would be very
100 contemporary in design and that the NE fencing would not be visible because the alley was a
101 private way. Mr. Elperin wondered if the fence on the SE side of the property should be modified
102 to have more vertical elements and asked about the posts. Mr. Wampler explained that they had
103 tried to keep the fence simple to maintain the brickwork as the most prominent element. Mr.
104 Elperin reiterated that the horizontal fence was a very modern element for the property. He thought
105 that they would ideally want to have a simple gate surrounded by plantings so that only the gate
106 was visible. The dimensions and design of the fence were discussed further.

107
108 Mr. King asked about the placement of the fence and how it would meet the building. Mr.
109 Wampler explained that the fence would extend from the corner of the house to the jump in the
110 height of the wall. This placement allowed them to use the fence to meet the pool enclosure
111 requirements as well as to screen the generator from public view. Mr. King stated that he was less
112 concerned with the modern nature of the fence than with its opaque appearance. Mr. Kleiner stated
113 that he was fine with the fence design as proposed.

114
115 Discussion turned to the proposed stone walls. The design called for 4" to 5" wide stone veneer
116 which Mr. Wampler stated was intended to pick up on the horizontal lines of the brick coursing.
117 The walls would be consistent with the proposed renovations and new addition and would be
118 sculptural elements in the landscape. The steps to the house would be solid monolithic granite
119 while those leading to the wood deck would have granite risers with lawn treads.

120
121 The generator would be installed within a stone wall surround and sunk 1' into the ground to
122 minimize its impact on the terrace and street. Mr. Elperin expressed concern about the noise
123 associated with generators and wondered if Tesla batteries or other energy solutions could be
124 considered. Mr. Batchelor preferred the use of stone walls over wood fences to limit the amount of
125 sound escaping the site. Mr. Wampler stated that the generator had been recommended by the
126 energy consultant and was not something that they had chosen for the site.

127
128 Ms. Ecker asked if the stairs would have railings. Mr. Wampler answered no, that all of the stairs
129 would have three steps or less. Mr. Kleiner stated that he would rather see the stone walls made of
130 larger pieces which were more in the nature of the materials. He thought that the thinner layers
131 were not characteristic of historic stone walls. Mr. Elperin agreed and thought that the walls looked
132 too light for such a large house. Mr. Wampler explained that the walls would be very low and that
133 they were trying to get more courses into them with the thinner layers. Ms. Armstrong agreed with
134 the concerns raised about the scale of the smaller layers in the stone walls compared to the massing
135 of the house. Mr. Jack thought that the walls as proposed worked well with the new contemporary
136 addition to the rear façade. It was also noted that the stone walls shown in the renderings were
137 taller than the ones that would be installed on the site.

138
139 Mr. Batchelor thought that the installation of the generator was an issue. Mr. Elperin asked if the
140 generator could be lowered further into the ground. Mr. Wampler answered that it could but that
141 this would expose more stone wall around the terrace. Mr. Batchelor agreed that it would be better
142 to eliminate the generator from view and either sink it into the ground or remove it from the

143 project. The Applicants were asked to report back to the Commission on why they were not using a
144 battery alternative and to address the auditory as well as the visual screening of the equipment.
145

146 Members reviewed a rendering of the proposed new walls with the house. Members thought that
147 the overall result would be elegant and modern. Mr. Panciera stated that he would prefer to see
148 more variation in the color of the stone if possible. A question was also raised about how the walls
149 would be ended. Mr. Wampler stated that the ends would be solid stone and that the drawing
150 showed the construction more than the finished appearance. Mr. Jack felt that the Applicant had
151 shown that they had the expertise to finalize the design of the wall. Other members agreed.
152

153 Wrapping up the fence and stone wall discussion, Mr. Elperin asked that the SE fence design be
154 revised to include more verticality. Mr. Batchelor moved to approve the installation of the
155 proposed stone walls, fencing and generator with the conditions that with respect to the generator,
156 the applicant look into the alternative use of batteries and that if the generator is necessary, that it
157 must be surrounded by a 4' tall stone wall situated as close to the unit as the proposed fence for
158 screening purposes and that the generator be either sunk into the ground or the height of the
159 surrounding wall increased so that it is fully screened from view and that with respect to the SE
160 fence, that the Applicants submit a revised design that adds vertical elements to the fence. Mr. Jack
161 seconded the motion and all voted in favor.
162

163 Discussion turned to other proposed landscape elements beginning with the pergola, metal structure
164 and swings. Mr. Wampler explained that that metal sculpture would stand 8' above grade and that a
165 hornbeam hedge would be planted between the structure and surrounding brick wall to help screen
166 it from public view. Members were fine with the installation of both the sculptures and the swing
167 set. In regards to the proposed pool, it was noted that the site had previously had two pools and that
168 this addition to the site would not really be visible from the public way. Mr. Kleiner noted that the
169 brick perimeter wall surrounding the rear yard provided a lot of leeway for proposed changes to the
170 yard. It was noted that both the pool and its surrounding deck would be flush to the ground. It was
171 noted that the spa surround would have the same character as the stone walls on the site. The steel
172 and wood design of the pergola was also reviewed at this time.
173

174 Mr. Elperin moved to accept as drawn the pool, pergola, spa, swing set, and metal sculptural walls.
175 Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all voted in favor.
176

177 The outdoor kitchen element was noted to be set into a surrounding stone wall and countertop. Mr.
178 Elperin stated that he did not like to see appliances set into stone walls but was not sure that it
179 would be visible from a public way. It was noted that the SE fence and brick wall would screen it
180 from public view. Members discussed the appropriateness of these fixtures within the local historic
181 districts. Mr. King moved to accept the grill and its surrounding stone wall as presented, even
182 though the Commission prefers not to see permanent structures for grills or generators installed
183 within the Districts, because in this case the grill is set well back from the public way with minimal
184 visibility and will be screened from view by both the proposed new fencing and the existing brick
185 wall. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion and all voted in favor.
186

187 Mr. Wampler stated that they would revise the proposed lighting plan and Commission Members
188 agreed to continue this discussion to a later meeting. Mr. Elperin asked about the proposed down
189 lights on the pergola. Mr. Wampler explained that they would be full cut off lights with minimal
190 visibility to the street which would be located between and not on the columns. Ms. Armstrong

191 noted that this was a very urban setting in comparison to the previous project on Dunster Road.
192 Mr. Wampler explained that the strip lights on the metal sculpture were intended to give it a lantern
193 effect. Mr. Batchelor moved to continue review of the lighting design to a future meeting when
194 revised plans were available. Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all voted in favor.
195

196 Mr. Wampler asked if the proposed path lights would be more acceptable if they were spaced out
197 differently and whether up-lighting could be approved for any of the trees. Members did not think
198 that it would be appropriate for the trees in front of the house. The Applicants were asked to
199 consider what lighting was actually needed and revise the plans accordingly. Ms. Armstrong
200 reiterated that this was a very different site from the property on Dunster Road which was set back
201 from the street in a suburban setting. She asked the Applicants to consider the surrounding street
202 lights and did not see a need for much new lighting on the site. Members did agree that some
203 lighting would be needed below the pergola as it was essentially a path to the spa.
204

205 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**

206
207 **199 Clark Road** – Application for the partial demolition of the house (Nathan and Emily Spunt,
208 applicants)
209

210 Ms. Ecker recused herself from this discussion and Ms. Armstrong voted in her place. Ms.
211 Birmingham presented the case report.
212

213 Shayna Galinat from the Law Office of Robert Allen and Owner Nathan Spurn were present for the
214 discussion. They explained that the project would involve the partial demolition of the house and
215 asked the Commission to consider the amount of alterations that had been made to the building
216 over time. Ms. Galinat also noted that some historic elements of the house would be restored in the
217 process.
218

219 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Elperin
220 moved to uphold staff's initial determination of significance and impose a twelve month stay of
221 demolition which would expire on January 14, 2021. Mr. King seconded the motion and all
222 voted in favor.
223

224 **124 Dean Road** – Application for the partial demolition of the house (Fiona Fennessy and Michael
225 Kutka, applicants)
226

227 Ms. Birmingham presented the case report. Architect David Buchanan and Owner Michael Kutka
228 were present for the discussion as well. Mr. Buchanan stated that it was a beautiful, well-
229 maintained house and that they were proposing some partial demolition for a small addition. He
230 agreed that the house had retained its historic character.
231

232 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Jack
233 moved to uphold staff's initial determination of significance and impose an eighteen month stay
234 of demolition which would expire on July 14, 2021. Mr. Kleiner seconded the motion and all
235 voted in favor.
236
237

238 **280 Harvard Street** – Application for the partial demolition of the commercial building (Hamilton
239 Charitable Corporation, applicant)

240
241 Ms. Kritzer presented the case report. Shayna Galinat from the Law Office of Robert Allen was
242 present on behalf of the property owner. She explained that a future project was expected to require
243 the partial demolition of the building and that they would be happy to work with the Commission
244 in the future.

245
246 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. Mr. King
247 moved to uphold staff’s initial determination of significance and impose an eighteen month stay
248 of demolition which would expire on July 14, 2021. Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all
249 voted in favor.

250
251 **41 Mason Terrace** – Request to lift the stay of partial demolition of the house (Robert Desimone,
252 applicant)

253
254 Ms. Kritzer presented the case report. Architect Paul Worthington was present with the plans to add
255 a new garage and addition to the house. He explained that the property currently had no garage and
256 that they would like to install an easier entrance as well as a family room on the rear façade that
257 connected existing interior spaces. The garage was designed with a flat roof to have as little impact
258 as possible on the house. He explained that they had tried to mitigate the impact on the apartment
259 building at the rear of the property and were moving the rear deck to the top of the garage for more
260 privacy.

261
262 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. Members
263 began by reviewing the location of the stairs to the rear deck and the windows on the side and rear
264 facades. Mr. Elperin suggested that the Applicant consider using something other than the proposed
265 cast stone urn on the roof of the wood ornamented garage. He thought that the heavy cast stone
266 feature would seem odd resting on top of a wood structure, and that it would look more in place on
267 a brick or stone pier. Mr. Worthington thought that it was an appropriate addition to the structure
268 and noted that it was not attached to the building.

269
270 A question was raised about the rear setback of the property. Mr. Worthington stated that they
271 would need zoning relief for the new addition, which would be approximately 10’ from the
272 property line as proposed. It was noted that the project had not been evaluated for its proximity to
273 the rear property line and the apartment building on that site. Mr. Batchelor thought that this was a
274 big issue and did not think that the Commission should take a position on the project before it had
275 been considered by the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Elperin agreed that it
276 would be hard to approve the project without knowing what the ZBA and neighbors thought of the
277 addition’s proximity to the apartments along the rear property line.

278
279 Members discussed how to proceed. Mr. King stated his concern that the new addition was too
280 close to the apartment building and thought that the request for relief would be a reach. Mr.
281 Batchelor noted that it was hard to make a determination as the site plan was not of the same
282 quality as the elevations. He suggested that the Commission either continue the discussion until
283 more information on the zoning relief process was available or send the project to a subcommittee.
284 Ms. Armstrong stated that she would prefer to hear from the ZBA and Planning Board before

285 making a decision. It was agreed that the Commission would provide direction for a future review
286 after the zoning relief issues had been addressed.

287
288 Mr. Elperin stated that he would like to see a section of the site which included the apartment
289 building at the rear. He also had concerns with the proposed stone veneer on the foundation. Mr.
290 Worthington stated that the veneer would have 3-6” corner pieces so that the thinness of the stone
291 veneer would not be seen. Mr. Elperin noted that the original house had a full stone foundation and
292 thought that the proposed thin stone veneer would not be convincing next to it. Mr. King preferred
293 them to use concrete if the veneer was not at least 4” stone. It was also noted that the rear addition
294 was proposed to be clapboard to match the house. Mr. King suggested that it be finished in shingle
295 or another material to differentiate it from the house.

296
297 Mr. Kleiner questioned how the copper roof over the garage would terminate at the house without
298 interfering with the existing windows. Mr. Worthington stated that it would not extend all the way
299 to the side façade of the house. Mr. Kleiner noted that there was a conflict between the front and
300 west facades views and suggested that the addition be held back farther from the corner of the
301 house. He suggested that the pedestrian door could be recessed into the garage so that the roof was
302 not necessary. Mr. Kleiner also questioned how the balusters were recessed into the shingle walls
303 surrounding the deck and thought that a simpler solution would be stronger. He suggested either
304 bringing the shingles down or doing only the railing in its place. He also noted that the gutters
305 needed to be resolved on this same façade and thought that there was a lot going on there.

306
307 A question was raised about the proposed garage door design and whether they were too Craftsman
308 in style for the existing house. Mr. Panciera suggested that a simple paneled door would be more
309 appropriate to the house. Mr. Worthington stated that he had picked up the garage door design from
310 existing rectangular panels on the turret. Ms. Armstrong agreed that this house was very different
311 in style from a Craftsman and that a different treatment might be more appropriate here. Mr. King
312 stated that he would be fine with having a garage door that was different from the rest of the house.
313 He thought that the building should have one style, though, and was not sure that the proposed door
314 was the right one for the building.

315
316 Mr. Kleiner stated that he was not sure whether overlapping the roof on the west elevation was the
317 right solution for the addition. Mr. Worthington explained how the addition would connect to the
318 house and that it would have a minimal overhang. Mr. Elperin agreed that it would help the project
319 to pull the addition away from the corner so that there was no overlapping. Mr. Batchelor also
320 thought that the Commission needed to fully review the other side of the addition where it faced the
321 public path.

322
323 Ms. Ecker left the meeting at this time and Ms. Armstrong voted in her place.

324
325 Mr. Elperin moved to continue the discussion until after hearing from the Planning Board and
326 Zoning Board of Appeals on the zoning relief needed for the project, noting that when it does come
327 back the Commission would like to see the questions already raised about the alignment of the
328 walls and detailing of the addition addressed as well as a section showing the relationship of the
329 new addition to the apartment building at its rear. Mr. Batchelor seconded the motion and all voted
330 in favor.

331
332

333 **290 Tappan Street** – Request to lift the stay of partial demolition of the house (290-292 Tappan
334 Street LLC, applicant)
335

336 Ms. Birmingham presented the case report. Attorney Shayna Galinat, Law Office of Robert Allen
337 and Architect Kecia Lifton, Finespace Architects, were present on behalf of the property owner.
338 Ms. Galinat explained that the owners had applied for partial demolition review in July and had
339 initially planned to come back in September before hitting a delay with the Planning Board. The
340 project has been reviewed four times by the Planning Board and one Zoning Board of Appeals
341 meeting and they had worked closely with the neighborhood to develop the currently proposed
342 plans.
343

344 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. Mr. King noted
345 that the new roof would be 6’ taller than the existing one but did not think that the building would
346 look all that different from the street. Mr. Elperin agreed that the new height would not stand out
347 with the surrounding buildings. He asked why they were choosing to change the windows from
348 four-over-one to six-over-one in design. Ms. Lifton stated that the owner had requested the change
349 as they thought the windows would look less fussy. She noted that there were still some six-over-
350 one windows on the building where the windows would be very wide. Members asked if the stucco
351 and X style bracing on the front façade would be removed and Ms. Lifton answered yes. She also
352 confirmed that the building already had two units in it. Members noted that the new rear façade
353 was less busy than the existing one.
354

355 Ms. Armstrong left the meeting at this time.
356

357 Mr. Kleiner suggested pulling the left façade roof in so that it would be coplanar with the
358 projecting gable end. Ms. Lifton explained that they had considered it but felt that it diminished the
359 focal point of the gable-end to have them in the same plane. Members reviewed the plans and a 3D
360 rendering of the corner. Mr. Batchelor stated that the plans were good and thought that the 3D
361 image was very helpful. He added that a lot of work had already gone into the plans submitted and
362 that this was not an LHD or National Register property. Mr. King agreed but thought that Mr.
363 Kleiner had a good point about changing the left façade. Members agreed to leave the decision on
364 whether to change it to the applicant. Mr. Batchelor thought that the old roofline was strange but
365 charming. He was not sure that it could be retained with a taller roof, though, and agreed that it
366 needed to morph into a new form. Mr. King moved to lift the stay on demolition based on the plans
367 as submitted. Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all voted in favor.
368

369 **46 Station Street** - Request to lift the stay of partial demolition of the building (Mordejai
370 Burnstein, applicant)
371

372 Ms. Kritzer presented the case report. Architect Mark Humphrey, CME Architecture, and Owner
373 Mordejai Burnstein were present for the discussion. Mr. Humphrey explained that the front façade
374 of the building was not structurally sound and that the roof was buckling. They were proposing to
375 reconstruct the exterior facades and reconfigure the interior space. As part of this work, the
376 entrances would be recessed. They proposed to salvage the brackets and some of the original
377 detailing and would use the same size windows and window sill heights as the existing building.
378 The new exterior would have wood siding and no new masonry was proposed.
379

380 Mr. King opened the discussion to public comment and there was none at this time. Mr. Panciera
381 asked how the diamond pane windows would be constructed. Mr. Humphrey stated that they would
382 be aluminum clad double pane windows with the diamond pane grill suspended between the panes
383 of glass. Mr. Elperin asked if a grill would be affixed to the exterior façade as well. Mr. Humphrey
384 stated that they were generally only between the panes of glass and that they were using aluminum
385 because the wood windows would be too expensive. Mr. Elperin noted that a standard storefront
386 window was proposed below the decorative transom and wondered if a Marvin or other window
387 manufacturer might have a Simulated Divided Light product that could be installed over the
388 storefronts. Mr. Humphrey stated that they were trying to make the renovations work financially
389 for the owners. Mr. Elperin stated that he was having a hard time understanding how the decorative
390 window would look. Mr. Panciera noted that installing the grill between the panes of glass would
391 lose the texture and shadow lines of the existing window. Members discussed whether it was better
392 to do nothing in the transom and use clear glass instead. Both Mr. King and Mr. Elperin agreed that
393 they were not convinced by the proposed diamond pane solution.

394
395 Mr. Batchelor thought that it was good that the building was being restored and preferred to see
396 them use no diamond pane windows as they would not look real. Mr. Humphrey explained his
397 previous discussions about the diamond pane windows with the Planning Board. Mr. King
398 suggested installing a laser cut grill on the exterior of the window and Members discussed whether
399 this would truly mimic the appearance of a divided light window. Mr. Batchelor stated that he did
400 not want to see the wrong things preserved here and Members agreed that no diamond pane
401 windows were a cleaner approach. Mr. Humphrey stated that he would also remove the proposed
402 diamond pane windows from the east façade of the building and simplify it. Mr. King moved to
403 approve the request to lift the stay of demolition based on the plans as revised to remove the
404 diamond pane transom windows and appointing Mr. Elperin to an empowered subcommittee of one
405 to review the revised plans when available. Mr. Panciera seconded the motion and all voted in
406 favor.

407
408 **NEW BUSINESS AND UPDATES**

409
410 **Discussion and vote on providing letter of support for the full application for the Fiscal Year**
411 **2020 Survey and Planning Grant project: The Lindens and Vernon/Harris Street**
412 **Neighborhoods Survey**

413
414 Ms. Kritzer and Ms. Birmingham explained that the Town was submitting an application for
415 Massachusetts Historical Commission funding through their 2020 Survey and Planning Grant
416 Program to complete additional survey work in The Lindens and Vernon/Harris Street
417 neighborhoods. A letter of support from the Commission was requested for the project. Mr.
418 Batchelor moved to support staff's application for Survey and Planning Grant funds and to write a
419 letter of support for the project to the Massachusetts Historical Commission. Mr. Jack seconded the
420 motion and all voted in favor.

421
422 The meeting adjourned at 10:12 P.M.