

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

Brookline Preservation Commission
MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 19, 2019 MEETING
Brookline Town Hall, 5th Floor Hearing Room, 333 Washington Street

16
17
18
19
20

Commissioners Present

21 David King, Chair
22 Elton Elperin, Vice Chair
23 Jim Batchelor
24 David Jack
25 Richard Panciera
26 Elizabeth Armstrong

Commissioners Absent:

Wendy Ecker
Peter Kleiner

Staff: Valerie Birmingham, Lara Kritzer

Members of the Public: See list

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

28
29
30
31

Approval of Minutes

32 The Commission reviewed the draft minutes for the October 9, 2018. Mr. Jack moved to
33 approve the minutes as written. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

34 The Commission then reviewed draft minutes for the December 11, 2018. Mr. Elperin moved
35 to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

36 The Commission then reviewed draft minutes for the January 8, 2019. Mr. Elperin moved to
37 approve the minutes as revised. Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

38
39
40
41

Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)

42 There was no public comment at this time.

43
44
45
46
47

**Review of the Brookline Reservoir Gatehouse improvements (Annie Blair, Parks and Open
Space Division, Town of Brookline)**

Architect Doug Manley, Spencer, Sullivan and Vogt, and the Town's Landscape Planner, Annie Blair,
presented the revised plans for the Brookline Reservoir Gatehouse restoration. The project has been
awarded and the low bid will allow the Town to do more work than initially planned. They are now
increasing the scope of the exterior work and the interior plans are now 90% complete.

Mr. King noted Dennis DeWitt's comments on the project and that Mr. DeWitt approved of the
bathroom location. Mr. Manley explained that the existing bathroom was in bad condition and that
relocating it within the building allowed them to make it more accessible to park users by moving the
entrance to the exterior. Mr. Elperin noted that the relocation of the bathroom also allowed for the
restoration of the original staircase which is an important architectural element of the building. Mr.
Elperin asked about the proposed cross bar on the exterior door. Mr. Manley confirmed that the idea

48 was to install an astragal or saw cut through the center of the door to replicate the appearance of the
49 double doors which had been located on this façade. The original rendering of the building appears to
50 show two doors in this location but the original doors were long ago removed and there are no
51 photographs available. Mr. Panciera stated that he would be comfortable to have the doors installed
52 without this detail.

53
54 Ms. Armstrong asked if the door would be required to have an electronic operating switch. Mr. Manley
55 answered that the building code only required that they install the required handle and closer and were
56 not planning to install an automatic opener.

57
58 Mr. King asked about the level of the floor within the building. Mr. Manley explained that the
59 bathroom floor would be level with the granite sill to the building. The Parks project to the surrounding
60 site would also adjust the grade surrounding the building so that the path to the roof sloped up to the
61 entrance. They planned to install a 5” deep floor framing system to level out the interior flooring. It
62 was noted that the existing floor stood 10” above the granite floor of the gatehouse and that the new
63 bathroom would only be 5” above it. Mr. King asked if the long term view was that the gatehouse
64 would be accessible through the other door and Mr. Manley and Ms. Blair answered yes. It was also
65 noted that an existing chimney would be used for exhaust.

66
67 Mr. Manley stated that the plans were 90% complete and that they were working on final coordination
68 efforts. He noted that the planned heater had been removed from the plans and that the building would
69 not be used in cold weather. Mr. King asked about the electrical conduit running up the reservoir side
70 of the building. Mr. Manley stated that the conduit was being buried and would be removed from the
71 façade. Mr. Elperin asked if the proposed plumbing would be an issue if both stairs were restored in the
72 future and suggested that the conflict be corrected as part of this project.

73
74 Mr. King stated that he would be happy to endorse the project. Mr. Elperin moved to endorse the plans
75 to restore the gatehouse and construct a new restroom as shown with the stipulation that the floor be
76 lowered, that the saw cut be used instead of the astragal on the exterior door, and with the
77 recommendation that the plumbing be moved out of the existing stairwells. Ms. Blair explained that the
78 additional floor height was needed to avoid going through the granite floors. The design had been
79 shared with the Engineering Department who thought that this was the best solution. Mr. King
80 suggested that the floor height be left to the applicant to decide. The motion was amended to endorse
81 the plans to restore the gatehouse and construct a new restroom as shown with the stipulation that the
82 saw cut be used instead of the astragal on the exterior door, and with the recommendations that the
83 plumbing be moved out of the existing stairwells and that the height of the bathroom floor be lowered
84 if possible. Mr. Jack seconded the revised motion and all voted in favor.

85
86 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**

87
88 **64 Westbourne Terrace (The Driscoll School) – Application for the demolition of the school**
89 **(Town of Brookline, applicant)**

90
91 Ms. Birmingham reviewed the case report. The request before the Commission is to initiate the
92 complete demolition on the existing Driscoll School. David Pollack, Chair of the School
93 Committee, was present on behalf of the applicant.

94 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment. A member of the public stated that he
95 lived in the neighborhood and wanted to understand what demolition would entail for the

96 neighborhood. Mr. Pollack stated that the Driscoll School Building Committee had been
97 looking at options for the site and currently planned to put funding for the new school on the
98 ballot in May. If voters did not fund the project, then they would continue to use the existing
99 school building. Mr. Pollack explained that they were applying for demolition review at this
100 time to avoid any future delays with the project but that tonight's decision did not necessarily
101 mean that the building would be removed. That decision would ultimately be made by the
102 Select Board. The resident advocated for the reuse of the building and felt that the town would
103 lose valuable options if they allowed the building to be demolished.

104

105 Mr. Elperin stated that he was not sure whether the gym and 1950s addition were significant
106 but felt that the original structure and its 1929 addition clearly had historical significance. He
107 asked why it could not be saved and repurposed and thought that its demolition would be a
108 terrible waste. Mr. Pollack stated that the Building Committee had looked at numerous options
109 including reusing all or part of the existing building. Ultimately, the construction of a new
110 building on Washington Street was cost neutral, would be cheaper to operate, and would be
111 easier for the school to use. The biggest attraction of the new structure was that it would allow
112 them to increase the amount of available play space on the site by 50%.

113

114 Sarah Stoutland, 104 Westbourne Terrace, stated that the existing building was adequate but
115 did not work well with the existing school program.

116

117 Mr. Jack agreed that the school was a historically significant structure. Mr. King moved to
118 uphold the staff determination of significance for 64 Westbourne Terrace, the Driscoll School,
119 and issue a twelve-month stay on demolition through February 19, 2020. Mr. Jack seconded
120 the motion and all voted in favor.

121

122 **58 Kent Street – Application for the demolition of the house, barn and commercial building**
123 **(Barbara Murphy, applicant)**

124

125 Ms. Kritzer reviewed the case report. The request before the Commission is to initiate the
126 demolition of the existing house, barn, and commercial building on the site. Owner Barbara
127 Murphy was present for the discussion.

128

129 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment. There was no discussion at this time.

130

131 Mr. Elperin noted that the house had lost its original detail but had retained its original volume
132 and design. He thought the commercial building created a nice commercial space at the street.

133 Mr. Batchelor agreed that the house was a nice piece of wood framing and a remnant of the
134 original structures of this area. He also thought that the building's historic relationship to the
135 neighborhood's Catholic Church was significant. Mr. Panciera noted that the buildings had
136 grown over time and thought that it was a nice composition that was worth preserving. Mr.
137 Batchelor moved to uphold the staff determination of significance for 58 Kent Street and to
138 issue a twelve-month stay on demolition through February 19, 2020. Mr. Jack seconded the
139 motion and all voted in favor.

140

141

142 **1618 Beacon Street – Application for the partial demolition of the building (1618 Beacon**
143 **Street LLC, applicant)**

144
145 Ms. Kritzer reviewed the case report. The request before the Commission is to initiate the partial
146 demolition of the row house style building. The Applicant was not present for this discussion.

147
148 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment. An abutter stated that he lived next door
149 and thought that this group of buildings was a distinctive space in the community. He also
150 noted that it abuts the previously discussed Driscoll School.

151
152 Mr. Jack stated that he viewed this block as an ensemble of buildings but that time and zoning
153 had allowed a series of compromises to the structures. Ms. Armstrong agreed and noted that
154 the building was part of the fabric of Washington Square. Mr. Elperin stated that he liked the
155 building but was not a fan of the Swiss chalet style addition to its front façade. He suggested
156 that the building should be preserved but not the addition. Mr. King moved to uphold the staff
157 determination of significance for 1618 Beacon Street and to issue an eighteen month stay on
158 demolition through August 19, 2020. Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all voted in favor.

159
160 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

161
162 **14 Allerton Street (Pill Hill LHD) – Discussion on site visit and subcommittee meeting;**
163 **Continuation of Application for a Retroactive Certificate of Appropriateness for the**
164 **replacement of the portico roof at the front entry; and Application for a Certificate of**
165 **Appropriateness to relocate the approved basement access stairs and detached shed**
166 **(Christopher Wilmott, applicant)**

167
168 Ms. Birmingham reviewed the case report. Owner Chris Wilmott was present with Architect
169 Johnathan Stone, O’Sullivan Architects. The Chair opened the discussion to public comment.
170 There was no comment at this time.

171
172 Commission members began their review with the plan for the front porch. It was noted that the
173 elevations were generally correct but that the detailing needed to be revised to match the existing
174 structure. Mr. Elperin noted that the proposed railings did not replicate the ones previously
175 installed on the house, but thought that those railings were not original either. He asked if a
176 guardrail would also be installed on the rear entrance steps. Mr. Wilmott answered that the railing
177 at the rear would match the railing used on the front façade. Mr. Stone added that it was their
178 intent to match the prior railing. It was noted that the railing design was not called out and the
179 Applicant was asked to submit information on its height and detailing.

180
181 Discussion turned to the relocation of the shed. Mr. Elperin stated that he would like to see more
182 information on the screening wall running between the garage and the shed. Mr. Wilmott stated
183 that he planned to use a picket fence like the one used along the sidewalk. It was suggested that the
184 Applicant consider a less open fence to provide visual screening for the generator. Mr. Stone stated
185 that they had planned to match the other fence and understood that it needed to be spelled out. It
186 was suggested that the design of the fence not be transparent and that it be the height of the
187 generator or slightly taller. It was agreed that the design of the fence could be reviewed by staff and
188 one Commission member. Members were asked if they accepted the proposed revisions to the
189 basement stairway. Members agreed that they had no concerns with the proposed change.

190
191 Mr. Elperin moved to retroactively approve the reconstruction of the front entrance porch railing,
192 canopy, columns, and form according to the details as submitted with the condition that the
193 elevations be revised to match the original structure and approved by staff plus one Commission
194 member.

195
196 Mr. Elperin then moved to approve the installation of the guard rail and railing at the rear entrance
197 with the condition that a new enlarged plan be submitted showing the relationship of the garage,
198 shed and fence with the screen wall to be opaque to be reviewed and approved by staff plus one.
199 Mr. Jack seconded both motions and both motions were unanimously approved. Mr. Elperin was
200 designated as the plus one member with Mr. King and Mr. Batchelor agreeing to review if Mr.
201 Elperin is not available.

202
203 Mr. Batchelor left the meeting at this time.

204
205 **187-189 Walnut Street (Pill Hill LHD) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to**
206 **demolish rear pantry projection, decks and stairs and construct a projection to accommodate**
207 **new rear basement level garages, restore original windows, regrade rear and extend existing**
208 **driveways to accommodate new garages, build a stone wall for grade transition, extend**
209 **existing east and west decks across rear of building with lattice storage areas below for AC**
210 **condensers, restore slate work on roof, restore tin diamond pattern shingling, repair and**
211 **replace where needed copper gutters and hip flashing, install new lighting at exterior doors,**
212 **install new fencing along east side to match existing west side fence, and install new venting**
213 **(Marc Charney, applicant)**

214
215 Ms. Birmingham reviewed the case report. Owner Marc Charney was present with Architect Paul
216 Worthington. The Applicants explained that the existing rear addition was in poor condition and
217 that by reconstructing and carrying it down to the lower level, they were able to make use of that
218 space for an attached garage.

219
220 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment. Judy Aronstein, 181 Walnut Street, stated that
221 she liked how they were preserving the front façade and the prominent school views of the rear
222 façade. She was excited to see the historic features retained. Her only concern was that the
223 proposed fence be more open in its design to allow views through the landscape. She noted that the
224 existing fence was a wide picket and that they would prefer to see that retained on the right side.
225 Mr. Charney stated that the fence on the left side of the property was an offset picket fence which
226 they had planned to use on the right side as well. He stated that they could remove one side of the
227 pickets to open up the view for the neighbor.

228
229 John Carpenter, 68 High Street, noted that the roof of the building is in bad condition and asked
230 how the applicant planned to restore it. Mr. Charney answered that their roofer had examined it and
231 had come up with a plan to restore the existing mansard. Mr. Carpenter stated that he believed the
232 existing tin roof to be a later addition and encouraged the use of slate shingles instead. Mr. Charney
233 and Mr. Worthington stated that they believed the tin roof was original to the structure. Mr. King
234 noted that it was appropriate to maintain the existing materials on the building and that it was up to
235 the owner whether he wanted to apply to change them.

236 Mr. Worthington went on to explain that they planned to reuse the existing cobblestone on the site
237 along the driveways. He explained how and where the retaining walls would be installed behind the
238 building and reviewed their height with Commission members. It was noted that the center of the

239 site was relatively flat. Mr. Elperin stated that they would like to see the proposed grades and asked
240 that the fence details be superimposed on that revised site plan. He also asked to see a plan that
241 showed the elevations of the site through the driveway.
242

243 Mr. Elperin asked why the site did not have just one driveway. The Applicants explained that the
244 idea was to create two separate single family homes. Mr. King asked about the window details. Mr.
245 Worthington stated that the only new windows would be in the rear addition and the rest of the
246 house would maintain its existing windows. Mr. King asked for more information on what
247 materials would be used where in the driveway. Mr. Charney stated that they had planned to use
248 asphalt paving with cobblestone edging. Mr. King stated that he was generally fine with the design
249 but would prefer to see pavers used across the front edge of the driveways.
250

251 Ms. Aronstein expressed concern with runoff on the driveway, explaining that the rear yard of both
252 sites was four feet lower than the front. Mr. Elperin noted that the building department would
253 require the applicants to address water and drainage issues. He thought that the design was nice and
254 would improve the building but also wanted to see a more developed site plan.
255

256 Mr. Panciera asked how the Applicants planned to marry the new deck with the original detailing.
257 Mr. Worthington explained that they planned to use cedar board with trefoil cutouts to replicate the
258 existing railing design. The new railing would be spaced a little more widely but the pattern would
259 continue across the new deck. It was noted that the new addition would be wood clapboard sided
260 with wood garage and pedestrian doors.
261

262 Mr. Elperin moved to approve the general intent of the design with the requirement that a more
263 fully developed site plan showing the grading, materials, and design elements as well as a section
264 of the driveway and fence and an enlarged drawing of the wood addition be submitted for review
265 and approval by an empowered subcommittee.
266

267 The new lights at the rear of the building were noted to be lantern style on the side porches only.
268 Ms. Armstrong asked if the subcommittee should be empowered or a staff plus one. It was agreed
269 that a subcommittee of Mr. Elperin and Mr. King would review the updated plans. Mr. Elperin
270 moved to approve the concept of the design with the final details of the fully developed site plan
271 showing the grading, materials, and design elements as well as a section of the driveway and fence
272 and an enlarged drawing of the wood addition be submitted for review and approval by an
273 empowered subcommittee of Mr. Elperin and Mr. King and staff. Ms. Armstrong seconded the
274 motion and all voted in favor.
275

276 **75 Crowninshield Road (Crowninshield LHD) – Application for a Certificate of**
277 **Appropriateness to paint or stucco over the existing brick facades, to remove trim board**
278 **around a second story window, to install a new trim board, wood moldings and detailing, and**
279 **a watertable on the front, left, and right facades, and to replace the existing front entry door**
280 **and railing (Edward and Barbara Boches, applicant)**
281

282 Ms. Kritzer reviewed the case report. Owners Edward and Barbara Boche and Architect Richard
283 Leaf, Leaf Designs, were present for the discussion. Mr. Boche stated that they had a lot of
284 experience with historic projects and found it hard to believe that this house was historic. They
285 were trying to make the building more in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood and felt that
286 the existing front façade was flat. It was noted that the ribbon windows were part of the issue but
287 that these were new windows that they did not want to replace. Instead, they felt that added more

288 detail to the front façade would make a difference. Mr. Boche read a letter of support from Paul
289 and Caroline Sax, 78 Crowninshield Road, into the record and noted that Frances and Daniel
290 Givelber, 71 Crowninshield Road, had also voiced their support.

291
292 Mr. Leaf stated that he had experience with historic homes and thought that this was a challenging
293 project. He had tried to develop a palette to make it more attractive by drawing from the
294 surrounding brick and stucco homes. They planned to paint the house a medium gray color,
295 including the brick, to make it more uniform. Crown molding trim detail would be installed along
296 the roof edge as well. The left façade already had some trim and a watertable, and these details
297 would be continued. They also proposed to install paneling around the windows to make them
298 more horizontal and similar in size. The panels would be painted a dark, accenting gray color.

299
300 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment. There were no comments at this time.

301
302 Mr. Jack noted that Crowninshield was the town's newest LHD and that the Commission was still
303 feeling its way through these reviews. This was also the last house built in the District and while it
304 does not blend in with the surrounding houses, it is typical of its era. Mr. Jack expressed concern
305 with making radical changes to the fabric of the house. He understood that their proposed design
306 was an attempt to make it blend into the surrounding fabric but thought that it was a standard mid-
307 twentieth century garrison colonial. He questioned whether it was more appropriate to
308 acknowledge the character of the house as it is, or to try and make it blend in with the surrounding
309 neighborhood when it does not and never did.

310
311 Ms. Armstrong asked which proposed alterations should be considered radical changes to the
312 building. Mr. Jack thought that the addition of the watertable and painting the brick were two
313 examples. Ms. Armstrong noted that painting brick was against the Commission's design
314 guidelines. Mr. Jack asked members to consider what the latitude should be for an already
315 renovated building in a new historic district.

316
317 Ms. Armstrong stated that she was sympathetic to the applicants wish to improve the appearance of
318 the building and did not think that the existing two tone color scheme was attractive but was
319 concerned that the proposed work was not in keeping with the design guidelines. She did not feel
320 that the proposed work would radically change the existing building.

321
322 Mr. Panciera thought that the radical changes had already been made in 2013 and that the current
323 proposal only reinforced what the building had become. He thought that there was room here to
324 take the good and make it better. However, he did have concerns with painting the brick and adding
325 a traditional cornice to a modern house. He thought that it was an odd, eclectic house in the
326 neighborhood.

327
328 Mr. Elperin agreed that the 2013 renovations had already altered the garrison colonial design. He
329 thought that the applicants could either go back in the direction of the original structure or continue
330 its move towards a modern design, which was his suggestion. He thought that they should simplify
331 the proposed detailing and lose the pork chop/dog ear trim detail at the outer edges of the gable-
332 end. He had no problem with painting the stucco or losing the two tone appearance of the building.

333
334 Mr. King thought that the proposed changes moved the house in two directions. He thought that the
335 design should either move the building more towards being a modern structure or towards being a
336 garrison colonial. He noted that the proposed cornice detail was a traditional element that was not

337 in keeping with the rest of the structure. He also thought that the lower windows should have a
338 more vertical element.

339
340 Mr. Boche stated that he thought they were following Chapter 40C by relating the house more to its
341 surroundings. Mr. Leaf stated that they wanted to give the house the more of the feeling of an early
342 nineteenth century structure. Mr. Boche stated that he did like the ideas of simplifying and
343 modernizing the house and stated that he was open to working with a subcommittee on the design.
344 Mrs. Boche liked the idea of addition vertical elements to the building.

345
346 Ms. Armstrong raised the question of whether painting the brick can be justified and felt that this
347 was something that the full Commission needed to address. Mr. Jack stated that whatever the
348 Commission approved would need to be explained as to why all of these changes would be
349 allowed. He expressed concern that this might lead to other applications to change the design of a
350 building and that this could decision could set a precedent. Mr. Boche questioned the historic
351 significance of the house and wondered why it would not be appropriate to make it look more like
352 others in the district.

353
354 Mr. King moved to continue discussion of this project to a subcommittee. Mr. Elperin seconded the
355 motion and all voted in favor. Mr. King, Mr. Panciera, and Mr. Jack were appointed to the
356 subcommittee.

357
358 **Abbottsford Road (Graffam-McKay LHD) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness**
359 **to replace windows on rear bumpout and rear entrance door, to remove an exterior fire**
360 **escape, to install new vent on left façade, and to install one additional A/C condenser next to**
361 **the exiting unit (Henry Cheng and Moireade McSweeney, applicant)**

362
363 Ms. Kritzer reviewed the case report. Architect Hector Rodriguez was present on behalf of the
364 property owners. Mr. Rodriguez explained that the planned changes to the rear addition were
365 intended to blend it into the existing façade, and that the change in the door style was intended to
366 match an existing door on the front façade.

367
368 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment. There were no comments at this time.

369
370 Mr. Elperin thought that the changes to the rear façade were handsome. It was noted that the
371 windows to be replaced were ca. 1990s thermal replacement windows. A question was raised about
372 the style of the door and it was noted that it would be a true divided light door with thermal glazing
373 and that a storm door would be installed over it. Members had no concerns about the removal of
374 the fire escape, changes to the vents or the placement of the new a/c condenser.

375
376 Mr. King moved to accept the application as submitted. Mr. Jack seconded the motion and all voted
377 in favor.

378
379 **NEW BUSINESS AND UPDATES**

380
381 **18 Spooner Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD) – Advisory review of proposed attached garage**
382 **(Will and Gray Hughes, owners)**

383
384 Architect Liz Cahill, Owners Will and Gray Hughes, and Attorney Jennifer Gilbert were present at
385 this time to present a proposed plan to install a new detached garage in the left side yard adjacent to

386 the house. It was noted that this presentation was to seek the Commission's impressions of the
387 design and that there was no current application before the Commission for this change. The
388 Architect gave a PowerPoint presentation outlining the reasons for the new garage and its proposed
389 location as well as its visibility from the street. It was noted that the property had an existing garage
390 in the rear corner of the site and that there were drainage issues in this location. She noted that the
391 Owners also wanted to install a separate addition on the rear façade and that the 160 ft. driveway
392 currently slopes down to the rear of the site. The new addition would extend six feet farther out and
393 would be raised a full story on the site to the level of the existing first floor. They had wanted to
394 attach the garage to the house but understood that this was generally not allowed. The old garage
395 measures 22' by 20' and the new would be 25' by 25'.

396

397 Mr. King stated that he would not be in favor of this proposal. He noted that the proposed location
398 adjacent to the house was not in line with the design guidelines. He noted that they had an existing
399 garage in the back yard that was in keeping with the neighborhood. He suggested that there could
400 be other solutions such as permeable pavers that would be a better fix for the current flooding
401 problems. Mr. Elperin agreed and thought that the view proposed by the project was one which the
402 Commission generally tried to avoid. He believed that Spooner Road was currently free of similar
403 attached garages.

404

405 Mr. Panciera, Mr. Jack, and Ms. Armstrong also agreed. Ms. Armstrong expressed concern with
406 the prominence of the garage doors and felt that there were ways to address the problems with the
407 current garage. She suggested that the drainage should be addressed by a civil engineer and noted
408 that it would not be fixed by the construction of a new garage. Mr. Elperin and Mr. Panciera
409 agreed.

410

411 **Appointment of Subcommittee to Review Violation Process and Develop New Rules and** 412 **Regulations**

413

414 Members had previously discussed establishing a subcommittee to look at developing a consistent
415 process for when and how violations should be issued. Ms. Armstrong moved to form a
416 subcommittee for the purposed of reviewing the violation process and developing new rules and
417 regulations. Mr. King seconded the motion and all voted in favor. Mr. King, Mr. Elperin, and Ms.
418 Armstrong were appointed to serve on the subcommittee.

419

420 **Other Business**

421

422 Mr. King suggested that the Commission should consider establishing a subcommittee to look at
423 developing design guidelines for changes on Beacon Street. This process would be similar to the
424 one recently completed for Harvard Street. Mr. King moved to form a subcommittee to develop
425 design guidelines for the Beacon Street National Register District. Ms. Armstrong seconded the
426 motion and all voted in favor.

427 Mr. King reminded members that elections would be held at the March meeting.

428

429 The meeting was adjourned at 10:04 PM.