

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 February 8, 2022 MEETING
Held Virtually using Zoom Online Software

Commissioners Present:

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

Commissioners Absent:

Alex Villanueva, Alternate

Staff: Tina McCarthy, Jacob Collins

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

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

Ms. Ecker and Mr. Batchelor joined.

Approval of Minutes

1/11/2022

Mr. Elperin requested that the date at the top be fixed; Mr. Panciera questioned why line 155 says “replace all the stucco” when the Commission never agreed to that.

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

David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin – yes

1/25/22

Ms. Ecker requested that the word “was” be removed from line 132; Mr. Panciera recommended clarifying lines 215 and 219 and removing extra words in line 259; Mr. King noted that line 266 should read “Garages are **not** attached in LHDs. Ms. Armstrong requested

47 that more context be given on the discussion around moving 25 Cottage Street on line 270 and
48 proposed that staff insert, “Mr. Elperin invited all the Commissioners to state their position.
49 No one opposed moving 25 Cottage Street, given that satisfactory conditions with siting could
50 be agreed upon” at line 273.

51
52 Mr. Elperin made a motion to accept the minutes as revised by Ms. Armstrong, Mr. Panciera,
53 Mr. King, and Ms. Ecker. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

54
55 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – not present, David Jack – yes, Peter
56 Kleiner – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin –yes

57
58 **Public Comment:**

59
60 Mr. Elperin opened and closed the public comment portion of the hearing without any
61 participants.

62
63 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**

64
65 **39 Ackers Avenue** – Application for the partial demolition of the house (Brian Lamacchia &
66 Katherine Driscoll, applicant). **Precinct 14**

67
68 Mr. Collins presented the case.

69
70 Brian LaMacchia, owner, stated that he does not contest the significance finding and is
71 interested in pursuing a lift of a stay, if a stay is imposed.

72
73 **Public Comment:**

74
75 Rob Sterns, neighbor, wrote in the chat box that he is supportive of the applicant’s plans.

76
77 **Commission Comment:**

78
79 Mr. King noted that the building shares a language and scale with other buildings on the block
80 and is significant as part of a group of buildings. Ms. Ecker agreed. Mr. Elperin agreed and
81 noted that he appreciated the social history included in the case report.

82
83 Mr. King made a motion to uphold the initial determination of significance. Mr. Elperin
84 seconded the motion.

85
86 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera –yes, David Jack – yes, Peter Kleiner
87 – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin –yes

88
89 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

90
91 **191 Babcock Street** – Application to install an aluminum fence in the rear yard (Cindy Lee,
92 applicant). **Precinct 8**

93
94 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.
95
96 Cindy Lee, owner, noted that there will be a gap in the fence adjacent to the building to allow
97 access to the cable box, and the fence will terminate at the rocks at the rear of the yard.
98

99 **Public Comment:**

100
101 No member of the public wished to speak on this case.
102

103 **Commission Comment:**

104
105 Ms. Ecker asked what type or material of fence is at the rear of the properties.

106
107 Ms. Lee answered that there are chain link and wooden fences and that her fence would abut a
108 chain link fence.

109
110 Mr. Jack stated that since the fence cannot be seen from Babcock Street and the view from
111 Crowninshield Road is theoretical, the applicant should be allowed to install the kind of fence
112 she wants.

113
114 Mr. Elperin agreed with Mr. Jack and pointed out that, at best, the fence might be seen on-end.
115

116 Ms. Armstrong asked why the applicant was proposing an aluminum fence.

117
118 Ms. Lee responded that she initially proposed a vinyl fence but staff was not supportive of the
119 choice.

120
121 Mr. Elperin noted that the Commission would not permit this in a front yard, but it is fine for
122 this rear yard.

123
124 Mr. Batchelor agreed that the fence should be approved.

125
126 Mr. King argued that the motion should reflect that the visibility is the reason for the approval.
127 If the wood fence in the rear was removed, the Commission may have ruled differently.

128
129 Mr. Elperin made a motion to accept the proposal on the basis that the fence would only
130 minimally visible from the public right of way. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

131
132 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – not present, David Jack – yes, Peter
133 Kleiner – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin –yes

134
135
136 **30 Francis Street** – Application to replace 17 vinyl window inserts with aluminum clad
137 replacements (Gregg Shapiro, applicants). **Precinct 3**
138

139 Mr. Collins presented the case.

140

141 Greg Shapiro, owner, noted that he purchased the house with the existing windows, installed
142 curved storm windows on the bay, and has already replaced vinyl windows at the rear of the
143 building. He mentioned that the replacement inserts will look better than and will be more
144 energy efficient the existing inserts.

145

146 **Public Comment:**

147

148 No member of the public wished to speak on this case.

149

150 **Commission Comment:**

151

152 Mr. Jack asked if all the replacement windows are going to be 1/1 and if the new windows will
153 be custom or standard.

154

155 Mr. Shapiro answered that the windows will be custom, and there will be no change to the
156 window configuration.

157

158 Mr. Spiers voiced support for the proposal and noted that the new windows are an
159 improvement.

160

161 Mr. Elperin questioned how the new windows will fit in the casings. He noted that the vinyl
162 windows leave a reveal between the windows and casing, while the aluminum windows project
163 forward of the casing. He suggested that the new window sit behind the casing and offered to
164 review the windows on site.

165

166 Mr. Batchelor reminded the commission that the applicant has a right to replace as existing and
167 noted that the Commission should make it possible to make modest improvements without too
168 much expense.

169

170 Mr. Spiers agreed that no undue burden should be created, given the fact that the applicant can
171 replace the windows in kind.

172

173 Mr. King agreed and wondered if the applicant would agree to go over the details with a
174 subcommittee. He believed approval was warranted regardless.

175

176 Mr. Shapiro noted that he does not really understand what Mr. Elperin is talking about
177 regarding the window detail.

178

179 Mr. Elperin answered that the question is related to the casing and noted that he believed that
180 Mr. Shapiro could make it look better without much additional work.

181

182 Mr. Shapiro noted that would like it approved quickly due to the extended wait times for
183 windows.

184

185 Mr. Elperin offered to meet with contractor.

186

187 Mr. Shapiro agreed to schedule a meeting.

188

189 Mr. Batchelor noted that while the consultation is great idea, he is only in favor if the
190 contractor agrees and the cost of the changes is manageable.

191

192 Mr. Batchelor made a motion to approve the request with the understanding that the applicant
193 will consult with Mr. Elperin on the detailing and see if the proposed inserts can be affordably
194 modified to be more historically appropriate. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

195

196 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – not present, David Jack – yes, Peter
197 Kleiner – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin –yes

198

199 **225 Pond Avenue** – Application to construct an addition at the rear of the house (Nima
200 Yadollahpour, applicant). **Precinct 5**

201

202 Ms. McCarthy presented the application.

203

204 Nima Yadollahpour, architect, noted that while he designed the addition with a contemporary
205 aesthetic, he took great care to respect the scale and materials by proposing a simple design. He
206 went to on to explain that he wanted to keep the dormer similar to the existing, which is why
207 he used divided lite windows.

208

209 **Public Comment:**

210

211 Thomas Kennedy, abutter since 1975, expressed support for the project.

212

213 **Commission Comment:**

214

215 Mr. Elperin noted that while the style is in contrast to the existing building, it is designed well.

216

217 Mr. Jack asked how the roof of the dormer will attach to the existing roof and if the standing
218 seam roof will be visible.

219

220 Mr. Yadollahpour stated that the connection is a bit lower than the ridge line and will not be
221 visible from Pond Avenue.

222

223 Mr. Batchelor expressed support for the proposal, as it protects the façade.

224

225 Mr. Panciera asked if the chimney will be retained.

226

227 Mr. Yadollahpour confirmed that it will.

228

229 Mr. Panciera mentioned that he does not have a problem with the materials of the dormer since
230 it is new construction.

231
232 Mr. King noted that the dormer is inset on the sides and the setback is good.
233
234 Mr. Panciera made a motion accept the proposal as presented. Mr. Elperin seconded the
235 motion.
236
237 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Peter Kleiner
238 – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin –yes
239
240 Ms. McCarthy reminded the Commissioners that it needs to appoint a Commissioner to serve
241 on the Community Preservation Act Commission.
242
243 Mr. Elperin nominated Mr. Spiers to serve on the Community Preservation Act Commission.
244 Mr. Jack seconded the nomination.
245
246 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – not present, David Jack – yes, Peter
247 Kleiner – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin –yes
248
249 Meeting adjourned at 8:04 PM.