

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

*Brookline Preservation Commission*  
**MINUTES OF THE January 24<sup>th</sup> 2021 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Held Virtually using Zoom Online Software**

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

**Commissioners Present:**

8 Elton Elperin, Chair  
9 Elizabeth Armstrong  
10 David King

11  
12 **Staff:** Tina McCarthy

13  
14 Applicant: Lucio Trabucco, Bryan Austin, Michael Forde  
15

---

16  
17 Mr. Elperin called the meeting to order at 3:04 PM. Mr. Trabucco, architect, explains the  
18 reasoning behind the design, showing renderings.

19  
20 Mr. Elperin asks why not make the rear of the building symmetrical (roof does not cover the  
21 entire rear porch. Mr. Trabucco states that he was trying not to detract from the existing house.  
22 Mr. Elperin did not feel it would detract to continue the porch roof across the whole rear  
23 elevation. Mr. King agrees, asks for the applicant to rethink the railings, too traditional. Try a  
24 more modern balcony railing to match the design of the addition.

25  
26 Mr. Trabucco confirms that the only zoning exemptions the project needs is side and rear  
27 setbacks, will confirm dimensions. Approximately 10' in rear; one side abutter is Mr. Austin's  
28 property, the other is a solid brick wall 3 stories high.

29  
30 Ms. Armstrong asks if all 5 units have access to outdoor spaces. Mr. Austin replies that it is for  
31 the first floor only. She asks which unit has space in the original house. Mr. Austin replies that  
32 there is one on the first floor and one on the second.

33  
34 Discussion of how to make the rear read as a residential structure. Mr. King notes that the single  
35 plane at rear is contributing to a more commercial look. Mr. Trabucco disagrees; the rear façade  
36 is not flat. Mr. Elperin suggest varied material vocabulary.

37  
38 Discussion of the treatment of the façade. Mr. Elperin questions the wall in the middle of the  
39 addition that turns to the right, away from the existing building. The height of the second  
40 entrance, being lower than the original entrance, is discussed.

41 Mr. King speaks about the juxtaposition about the new and old, feels the addition is too much  
42 for the space, in particular the dividing wall in the middle of the façade. Too many unrelated  
43 window heights in the overall design. Asks for more care in the design of the glass curtain wall,  
44 and that the connector between the buildings be lowered. Mr. Elperin comments on the  
45 proportions of the panes in the curtain wall, suggests altering the pattern of divisions. He asks  
46 the applicant to remove the shadow line at the roof of the pent house.

47

48 Ms. Armstrong asks the applicant to make the addition more sympathetic to the existing house,  
49 noting that the curtain wall, front entrance & garage facing the street are all design problems.

50 Mr. Elperin confirms that the modern design is the right direction, it just needs some design  
51 adjustment.

52

53 Mr. Austin asks if the general concept of the modern next to the old is supported. Mr. Elperin  
54 and Mr. King agree that the concept is good. Mr. Austin will revise plans and come back to the  
55 subcommittee in about 2 weeks.

56

57

58 Meeting adjourned at 3:53 PM.

DRAFT