

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 25, 2022 MEETING**  
**Held Virtually using Zoom Online Software**

**Commissioners Present:**

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

**Commissioners Absent:**

Peter Kleiner  
Alex Villanueva, Alternate

**Staff:** Tina McCarthy, Jake Collins

---

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

Mr. Elperin asked Ms. Armstrong to vote for Mr. Kleiner and Mr. Spiers to vote for Mr. Batchelor.

**Approval of Minutes**

**4/27/2021**

Mr. Spiers asked to be listed as an alternate on line 13; Mr. Elperin asked that line 45 either be clarified or omitted, change “preview” to “purview” on line 204, and change “recoding” to “recording” on line 227, Ms. Armstrong noted that line 46 was probably correct and requested that line 303 read “there are a lot of interests”

Mr. Elperin made a motion to accept the minutes with the revisions. Mr. Panciera seconded the motion.

David King – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, John Spiers – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin – yes

**6/8/2021**

Mr. Panciera noted a misspelling in his name in line 236; Ms. Armstrong asked that line 245 read “it is fine”; Mr. Spiers requested that he and Ms. Armstrong be listed as alternates

Mr. Panciera made a motion to accept the minutes with the revisions. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion. RP motion accept as amended. EE second.

David King – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, John Spiers – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin – yes

48 **6/24/2021**

49  
50 Mr. Elperin requested that differed maintenance” be changed to “deferred maintenance” on line 50 and  
51 requested clarification on line 121; Ms. Armstrong mentioned that the subcommittee mentioned on line  
52 314 had three members, not two

53  
54 Mr. Elperin made a motion to accept the minutes with the revisions. Mr. Panciera seconded the motion.

55  
56 David King-abstain, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, John Spiers  
57 – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin – yes

58  
59 Mr. Batchelor joined the meeting. Mr. Spiers was no longer voting.

60  
61 **Public Comment:**

62  
63 Public comment was opened and closed without any participants.

64  
65  
66 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

67  
68 **17 Crafts Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD)** –Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to  
69 reconfigure the side entrance, move skylights & add bluestone to deck. (German Gallucci,  
70 applicant). **Precinct 13**

71  
72 Mr. Collins presented the case.

73  
74 German Gallucci, owner, agreed with the presentation and noted that he did not consider the  
75 reconfiguration of the steps. He stated that he does not use this entrance, and it is cold and it leaks,  
76 and proposed the sliding glass doors to allow more light into the house.

77  
78 Public Comment:

79  
80 Commission Comment:

81  
82 Mr. King asked if the entrance is the primary entrance to the home. Mr. Galucci replied that it is a  
83 side entrance.

84  
85 Mr. Elperin requested that the applicant supply drawings that show the new steps with rail and its  
86 relationship to the door. Mr. Jack and Mr. Batchelor agreed that drawings are necessary.

87  
88 Mr. Panciera and Mr. King expressed support for the concept of the project but agreed that the  
89 applicant should provide drawings with more specifics and details.

90  
91 The commissioners discussed expectations for additional information and drawings with the  
92 applicant.

93  
94 Mr. Jack made a motion to continue the application and have the applicant supply drawings for the  
95 proposed changes. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.

96  
97 The applicant agreed to continue the application.  
98  
99 David King- yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor-  
100 yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin – yes  
101  
102  
103 **35 Allerton Street (Pill Hill LHD)** –Application for a Retroactive Certificate of Appropriateness  
104 to remove a chimney (Tim Burke, applicant). **Precinct 4**  
105  
106 Mr. Collins presented the case.  
107  
108 Tim Burke, architect, spoke about the reasons for the application. The chimney has water leakage  
109 issues and its removal would benefit the interior design. Noted that the chimney is no longer  
110 functional.  
111  
112 Mr. Elperin asked if the applicant considered supporting the chimney.  
113  
114 Mr. Burke stated he did but that it is expensive and the chimney is barely visible. He noted that it is  
115 even less visible now that the rooftop HVAC box will no longer be removed.  
116  
117 John Gwin, owner, thanked the Commission for its consideration.  
118  
119 Public Comment:  
120  
121 Lisa Macenka, neighbor at 41 Allerton Street, expressed support for the project and stated that her  
122 similar chimney was removed years ago to make the kitchen useable.  
123  
124 Commission Comment:  
125  
126 Mr. Jack asked Mr. Collins if the chimney is visible. Mr. Collins stated that it is minimally visible  
127 from the public right of way.  
128  
129 Ms. Ecker and Mr. Jack stated that they do not oppose the removal of the chimney since there is  
130 another more significant chimney on the building.  
131  
132 Mr. Panciera noted that he preferred the proposal when the box fan was being removed but still  
133 supports removing the chimney.  
134  
135 Mr. Gwin said that the fan box will eventually be removed.  
136  
137 Ms. Armstrong stated that the guidelines argue for keeping the chimney, so the Commission must  
138 state its reasons for making this exception. Noted that the box fan will eventually be removed,  
139 which will make the chimney more visible.  
140  
141 Commissioners and applicant discuss the visibility of the chimney and past exceptions. Mr. Burke  
142 clarified that there is a chimney pot, and the current chimney is wrapped in plastic. Mr. Batchelor  
143 stated that the plastic makes it difficult to assess the impact.

144  
145 Mr. Batchelor noted that the chimney is not very important and is only minimally visible but  
146 cautioned the Commission about setting a precedent.  
147  
148 Ms. Ecker noted that the chimney is not critical to the house but it is also not a service chimney like  
149 the Commission has seen in other cases.  
150  
151 Mr. Jack stated that its deteriorated condition, its visibility, and its status as a secondary chimney  
152 may be considered reasons to approve removal of the chimney.  
153  
154 Ms. Armstrong remarked that she is not committed to keeping the chimney, but that the  
155 Commission has required other applicants to support their chimneys internally. Requested clarity  
156 on reasons for approval.  
157  
158 Mr. Elperin notes that it is typical for large homes to have two chimneys.  
159  
160 Mr. Batchelor asked if the applicant could reconstruct a wooden frame with brick cladding in the  
161 shape of the chimney.  
162  
163 Mr. Spiers objected to this solution and recommended either retaining or demolishing the chimney.  
164  
165 Mr. King made a motion to approve the removal of the chimney based on the fact that it is  
166 minimally visible and not highly detailed and that there is a more prominent chimney on the  
167 building. Ms. Ecker seconded the motion.  
168  
169 David King- yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor  
170 – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin – no  
171  
172 **179 Babcock Street (Graffam Mckay LHD)-** Continued application for a Retroactive Certificate  
173 of Appropriateness to replace windows (Pamela Bardhi, applicant) Precinct 8  
174  
175 Public Comment:  
176  
177 Paul Johnson, neighbor at 187 Babcock Street, stated that he wants the replacements to be  
178 sympathetic to the others in the building.  
179  
180 Commission Comment:  
181  
182 Mr. Batchelor asked how many windows were replaced. Ms. McCarthy stated that two windows  
183 had been replaced.  
184  
185 Mr. Elperin made a motion to deny the application. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.  
186  
187 David King- yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor  
188 – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin – yes  
189  
190 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**  
191

192 **130 Warren Street** – request to lift the stay of demolition of on the house (130 Warren Street  
193 Realty, applicant). **Precinct 12**

194  
195 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.

196  
197 Robert Allen, attorney, thanked Colin Smith, architect, and staff for the presentation and the owner  
198 for his research.

199  
200 Mr. Smith explained the design intent, noting that the value is in the building’s history, not in its  
201 current architecture.

202  
203 Public Comment:

204  
205 Commission Comment:

206  
207 Mr. Elperin thanked the applicants for the research and paint analysis and noted that items do not  
208 appear to trigger demolition. He expressed concern that the proposal alters the only remaining  
209 original portion of the house.

210  
211 Mr. Smith stated that they are not intending to restore, just rehabilitate the property.

212  
213 Mr. King requested clarification from staff.

214  
215 Ms. McCarthy explained that the project triggered demolition due to the cumulative percentage of  
216 area removed. The chair can overrule if he feels this does not serve the intention of the Demolition  
217 Bylaw.

218  
219 Mr. Elperin reversed the demolition determination, thereby making the case moot.

220  
221 **25 Cottage/222 Warren Street**– Continued request to lift the stays of demolition at 222 Warren  
222 Street and 25 Cottage Street (Warren Cottage Ventures LLC, applicants). **Precinct 14**

223  
224 Tina McCarthy presented the case.

225  
226 Mr. Allen, attorney, reintroduced the project team and noted that moving 25 Cottage enables the  
227 project to proceed.

228  
229 Troy Sober, landscape architect, explained the variations and evolution of the site plans and noted  
230 that he would prefer to wait until the final location of 25 Cottage Street is determined before further  
231 developing the plans. He clarified that they do not intend to rebuild the hillside behind 222 Warren  
232 Street but instead hope to create more useable space at the rear.

233  
234 Tony Filardo, architect, reviewed the changes to 222 Warren Street, including rotating the garage  
235 and changes to keep the conservatory and sleeping porch at the rear. He went on to say that he  
236 believes 25 Cottage Street needs to be sited before the design can be advanced.

237  
238 Public Comment:

239

240 Maureen Meister, architectural historian who has published works on Richardson and those in his  
241 studio, asked about the local historic district and the relationship relationship to demolition delay.  
242 After explanation, she expressed concern about moving 25 Cottage Street and stated that attached  
243 garages are inappropriate for these buildings.  
244

245 Commission Comment:

246  
247 Mr. King proposed starting off the discussion by clarifying the goals of the project.  
248

249 Mr. Elperin explained the Commission's support for moving 25 Cottage Street, concerns about the  
250 current proposed location, and the impacts of the eventual third house. Requested input from other  
251 Commissioners.  
252

253 Mr. Batchelor believes that 25 Cottage Street has moved too far and would feel more comfortable  
254 if it was moved half the distance. He stated that he believes that the present relationship  
255 undermines the historic homes and would prefer to see 39 Cottage Street remain at the rear of the  
256 lot.  
257

258 Mr. Panciera stated that the primary goal should be protecting 25 Cottage Street. He does not  
259 believe it is getting the respect it deserves, as the siting undermines the character. The building is  
260 situated too close to Cottage Street.  
261

262 Mr. Allen expressed frustration about the Town allowing the house to deteriorate to its current  
263 condition. He noted that they could just let the property sit there, and they are trying to work with  
264 the current situation.  
265

266 Mr. King told the applicant that garages are not attached in local historic districts and three car  
267 garages are generally not allowed. He believes that the paving, the circular drive, and the landscape  
268 planning are not compatible with the feel of the site and make it unrecognizable.  
269

270 Ms. Armstrong reminded everybody that the Commission discussed moving 25 Cottage Street at  
271 the beginning of the process, and there was a lot of opposition. The case was made that moving 25  
272 Cottage Street was essential to the project. As a starting point, the Commission must commit to a  
273 stance on moving the building. Mr. Elperin invited all the Commissioners to state their positions.  
274 No one opposed 25 Cottage Street if satisfactory conditions are agreed upon. Mr. Jack agreed with  
275 Ms. Armstrong's comments.  
276

277 Ms. Ecker left the meeting. Mr. Spiers was appointed to vote for Ms. Ecker.  
278

279 Mr. Spiers believes moving 25 is a reasonable solution.  
280

281 Mr. Elperin stated that the next question is where the building should be located.  
282

283 Mr. Spiers noted that the while the Commission generally discusses houses, the landscape is  
284 critical in this case.  
285

286 Mr. Elperin requested that the design team propose alternate solutions to the location of 25 Cottage  
287 Street and the landscape design behind 222 Warren Street. Mr. Panciera asked for the contours of  
288 retaining walls to be more organic and follow the slope of the land.  
289  
290 Mr. Sober agreed that they can study the rear of 222 Warren Street after finalizing the location of  
291 25 Cottage Street. He believes they should come to a middle ground.  
292  
293 Mr. King asked if the applicant had explored shared drives, as the two drives are putting a lot of  
294 pressure on the site. Mr. Sober responded that shared drives reduce interest in the property among  
295 buyers. Mr. King countered that there was a large property of seven luxury homes in Chestnut Hill  
296 that have a shared drive.  
297  
298 Mr. Elperin stated that as a preservation-minded buyer has yet to be found and the applicant has  
299 offered to remove the materials in the H.H. Richardson bedroom, it appears that owning the parts  
300 seems like the only option. Mr. Allen reiterated that an historic easement for the bedroom is not  
301 feasible.  
302  
303 Mr. Panciera asked whose job it is to contact people who may be interested in acquiring the  
304 materials in the bedroom. Mr. Spiers believes that the Commission should serve in this capacity.  
305 Mr. Allen supports the Commission doing outreach to find a home for the materials in the  
306 bedroom.  
307  
308 Mr. Elperin made a motion to establish a subcommittee to write the content of the interpretative  
309 panel. Mr. Panciera seconded the motion. Mr. Allen confirmed intention to make the panel.  
310  
311 Mr. Elperin, Ms. Armstrong, and Mr. Jack were appointed to the subcommittee.  
312  
313 David King- yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor  
314 – yes, John Spiers – yes, Elton Elperin – yes  
315  
316 Mr. Spiers asked if the applicant has sufficient information about what the Commission is asking  
317 for. Mr. Allen confirmed that they do.  
318  
319 Other Business:  
320  
321 Appoint a representative to Community Preservation Act Commission  
322  
323 Mr. Batchelor and Mr. Spiers both expressed interest interested in the role. The Commissioners  
324 opted to postpone a vote until the next meeting. Staff asked the Commissioners to think about what  
325 projects they would like to see.  
326  
327 Meeting adjourned 10:15 PM.