

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 March 8<sup>th</sup> 2022 MEETING**  
**Held Virtually using Zoom Online Software**

**Commissioners Present:**

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

**Commissioners Absent:**

John Spiers, Alternate  
Alex Villanueva, Alternate  
Wendy Ecker

**Staff:** Tina McCarthy, Jake Collins

---

Mr. Elperin called the meeting to order at 6:34 PM.

Ms. Armstrong agreed to vote for Mr. Kleiner.

**Minutes 2/8**

Mr. Panciera- line 105 add after the word what “type or material of fence”

Mr. Elperin- line 46, make garage plural

Mr. Elperin moved to approve the minutes with the noted corrections; Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Elton Elperin –yes  
Elizabeth Armstrong- yes

**Public Comment**

None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**

**39 Ackers Avenue** – Request to lift the stay of demolition on the house (Brian Lamacchia, applicant). **Precinct 14**

Mr. Collins presents the case report.

Tim Burke, architect, explained the owner’s history of work on the house and added that neighbors on either side have done similar projects.

No public comment.

47  
48 Mr. Jack inquired about height of the headers above the finish floor & dormer setback. Mr. Burke  
49 confirms 6'8"; 4'9" setback of dormer from front roof edge. Neighbor's dormer is about 18"  
50 further back. He explained that he could not place this one in the same location due to a different  
51 stair arrangement in this house.

52  
53 Mr. Elperin appreciated the architect following the neighborhood pattern with this design, but  
54 expressed preference for the neighbor's dormer set back. Mr. Burke explained that he had tried  
55 and the current location is as far as it will go back.

56  
57 Mr. Panciera had no objections to the proposal and made a motion to accept as proposed. Mr.  
58 Elperin seconded the motion.

59  
60  
61 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Elton Elperin –yes  
62 Elizabeth Armstrong- yes

63  
64 Mr. Kleiner joined the meeting. Ms. Armstrong to vote for Wendy Ecker.

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

67  
68 **182 Pleasant Street (Crowninshield LHD)** –Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to  
69 install a new railing at the roof of the single story wing to allow occupancy & replace the exterior  
70 door at this location; re-deck the rear porch & install a new rail (Catherine Corman, applicant).

71 **Precinct 8**

72  
73 Ms. McCarthy presents the case report.

74  
75 Peter Buzzelle & Catherine Corman introduce themselves. Ms. Corman explained a past leak that  
76 was the initial reason for the application. House shows evidence of former posts & rails on the  
77 roof. The rear deck was built by former homeowners and is in poor repair.

78  
79 No Public Comment

80  
81 Mr Elperin discussed the design and asked why the posts were being mounted through the roof.  
82 Mr. Buzzelle explained the detail, and that the posts will be pressure treated, clad in mahogany and  
83 that the post will be about 4" or 4 ½", no rubber will come over the mahogany, it will be on the  
84 pressure treated wood underneath the mahogany. Mr. Elperin asked why the rail is 42" high  
85 instead of residential code 36". Mr Buzzell stated that they could be 36" if required. Ms. Corman  
86 explained that they preferred the 42" if possible for safety with children. Mr. Jack asked what  
87 height the rails of the neighbors are. Mr. Buzzelle stated 30-36" to the left; to the right perhaps  
88 higher. Mr. Jack asked how high the outline of the original rail was and suggested building a  
89 second rail above one of the original height. Ms. Corman expressed concern about this proposal.

90  
91 Mr. Batchelor supported the proposed rail at 42". Mr. Elperin agreed that it did not seem out of  
92 scale. Mr. Panciera also agreed.

93

94 Mr. Batchelor moved to accept as proposed, with the described PT posts wrapped in mahogany.  
95 Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

96  
97 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Elton Elperin –yes,  
98 Peter Kleiner- yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes

99  
100 **36 Edgehill Road (Pill Hill LHD)** –Application for a Retroactive Certificate of Appropriateness to  
101 complete mortar replacement (Marne Rizika, applicant). **Precinct 5**

102  
103 Mr. Collins presented the case report.

104  
105 Owner Marne Rizika explains the history of the case and the mortar analysis she obtained. The brick  
106 was damaged as a result of how they removed the mortar. Aggregate and color of the new mortar  
107 was wrong.

108  
109 Mr. Panciera explained that the head joints (vertical) had been cut improperly, overcut on the side  
110 and the mortar not cut deep enough (he shared his screen with detailed photos). Mr. Elperin stated  
111 that he looked and found original tooling under the porch roof, struck flush with vining, purplish  
112 color. Called Judy Selwyn and she offered to take a look as a friend of the Commission.

113 Mr. Batchelor expressed concern about going beyond the color and tooling of the mortar, as the  
114 Commissioners themselves are not preservation consultants. He emphasized the need to rule on the  
115 color and the tooling of the mortar, which the Commission is qualified to assess. He stated that the  
116 applicant wants the mortar to match the original and we should determine if this work matches.

117  
118 Public Comment:

119  
120 Judy Selwyn stated that masonry work is irreversible and the Commission should consider it very  
121 important, the review will help the homeowner. She offered to look at the house and give advice to  
122 the owner about the technical aspects of the mortar.

123  
124 Commission Comments:

125  
126 Mr. Elperin suggested continuing the case to get Ms. Selwyn’s feedback. Ms, Rizika supported this  
127 suggestion. Mr. King stated that using the circular saw to cut mortar joints is inappropriate to work  
128 on historic masonry.

129  
130 Mr. Kleiner expressed concern about the Commission providing preservation consulting services.  
131 Mr. Batchelor asked that a revised application be prepared.

132  
133 Mr. Elperin moved to deny the application. Mr. Panciera seconded the motion.

134  
135 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes, ,  
136 Elton Elperin –yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes

137  
138  
139 **182 Walnut Street (Pill Hill LHD)** –Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the  
140 existing front walkway, restore entrance steps and add approximately 38’ of wall to match the  
141 existing stone wall and cap. Add set of five steps in the East side yard with associated regrading. In

142 the rear yard, install a 20'x14' pergola with gas fire pit, a reflecting pool, 128' of stone walls, endless  
143 pool with pool enclosure, fences and gates in the utility area, and a 10'x10' maintenance shed. Replace  
144 the west garage window with a door. (Studio2112 Landscape Architecture, applicant). **Precinct 5**  
145

146 Ms. McCarthy presented the case report.  
147

148 Lynne Giesecke, landscape architect explains the proposal intention. She explained that the pool is  
149 built into the grade, heights shown on the grading plan. The fence was located to be as minimal as  
150 possible.  
151

152 Mr. Batchelor asked for clarification on the fence for the pool. Mr. King asked for clarification on  
153 the materials of the stone wall. Ms. Giesecke confirmed that the new stone would match the existing,  
154 bluestone cap with Milford pink stone. Joints will also be matched. In the rear the wall is fieldstone,  
155 it is not visible from the street due to the grade; this wall will also be built to match the existing.  
156

157 No Public Comment  
158

159 Commission Comments:  
160

161 Mr. King expressed concern about the design of the shed, which does not compliment the house.  
162 Mr. Elperin agreed, stating the importance of its relation to the house. Mr. Batchelor asked if the  
163 shed could be moved up by the driveway circle as it will be very visible in the location by Walnut  
164 Street. Ms. Giesecke asked if they could keep the design of the shed if in a less visible location. Mr.  
165 Batchelor stated that he would be ok with it back by #7 (pool). Ms. Armstrong agreed and expressed  
166 concern for the intention of the preservation restriction; she felt that no shed should be located by the  
167 Walnut Street entrance. Mr. King & Mr. Panciera agreed.  
168

169 Mr. Elperin expressed reservations about the stainless steel fence. Ms. Giesecke explained that the  
170 only intention behind the fence was minimal visibility. Several Commissioners preferred black for  
171 the fence. Mr. Jack preferred the fence as submitted.  
172

173 Mr. Elperin questioned the height of the 4' fence. Ms Giesecke explained that it was a backdrop for  
174 the grill; total height is reduced by the grade change up to the street. Mr. Elperin was comfortable  
175 with the height of the wall based on the grade change. Mr. Batchelor expressed preference for 42"  
176 high. Mr. King agreed.  
177

178 Mr. Elperin moved to accept proposed with the shed moved up by the pool; using black rather than  
179 stainless steel fence, and reducing the stone wall from 48" to 42". Mr. King seconded the motion.  
180

181 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes,  
182 Elton Elperin –yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes  
183  
184

185 **17 Crafts Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD)** –Revised application for a Certificate of  
186 Appropriateness to reconfigure the side entrance, move a skylight, and expand and add bluestone  
187 pavers to an existing patio (German Gallucci, applicant). **Precinct 13**  
188

189 Mr. Collins presented the case report.

190  
191 Owner German Gallucci explained that the skylight is not new, it is just relocated.  
192  
193 No Public Comment  
194  
195 Commission Comments:  
196  
197 Mr. Elperin stated that the proposal was satisfactorily clear. Commissioners asked for clarity on the  
198 type of sliding door. Mr. Gallucci stated that the existing was aluminum but that he was willing to  
199 replace it so that it would match the new wood door.  
200  
201 Mr. Jack moved to accept the application as submitted with the new railing to match the existing and  
202 that the sliding doors should both be wood of the same dimension. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.  
203  
204 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes,  
205 Elton Elperin –yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes  
206  
207 **44 Circuit Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to  
208 remove the existing front entrance & replace with two wood, insulated glass windows. Create a new  
209 entrance on the façade, installing a wood entry door and sidelights and adding a covered porch.  
210 Extend the existing second floor dormer at the façade & add two new wood windows with insulated  
211 glass; build a new third floor dormer & install a wood, insulated glass window. (RLAW, PC,  
212 applicant). **Precinct 13**  
213  
214 Ms. McCarthy presented the case report.  
215  
216 Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert introduced the case and explained the intentions. She noted that no abutters  
217 oppose the proposal and that there was one support letter.  
218  
219 John Day, architect, confirmed that there had been an addition, though he thought it was added in  
220 the 1950’s based on the construction type. He reviewed the plans  
221 .  
222 Sydney Ashbury, owner, thanked the Commission, and had nothing further to add.  
223  
224 No Public Comment  
225  
226 Mr. Elperin stated that he felt an exception to the guidelines could be made due to the number of  
227 changes to the home over time. Mr. Jack agreed. Mr. King did not support this view, as many LHD  
228 homes have been altered, it is not the job of Preservation to improve all the irregular facades or design  
229 flaws. He asked where the line is between historic additions and non-historic additions. Mr. Panciera  
230 did not feel that the changes would take anything away from the house or its subsequent additions.  
231 Mr. Jack noted that the sizes of the additions compared to the original house dominated the current  
232 composition.  
233  
234 Architect and Commissioners discussed the possible age of different elements of the home.  
235  
236 Mr. King expressed an aversion to homogenizing the homes in LHDs, taking away the asymmetries.  
237 Ms. Armstrong agreed and felt that the exception to the guidelines was too large.

238  
239 Mr. Elperin suggested to remove the new dormers from the proposed plan. Mr. Panciera agreed that  
240 either one or both of these new dormers should be removed. Mr. Batchelor felt that there had been  
241 so many changes that he did not have an objection to the porch or new entrance, but agreed with  
242 removing the new dormers. Mr. Kleiner asked that the new entrance roof not be connected to the  
243 existing sun porch.  
244  
245 Mr Elperin moved to accept a proposal to change the location of the front door and requested alternate  
246 designs be investigated for the entrance and the proposed dormers, including the possibility of no  
247 new dormers at all. Mr Batchelor seconded the motion.  
248  
249 David King – no, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera -yes, David Jack – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes,  
250 Elton Elperin –yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- no  
251  
252 Subcommittee, not empowered: Mr. Elperin, Mr. Kleiner, Mr. Jack  
253  
254 Ms. Armstrong asked that the reason for the departure from the guidelines be stated. Mr. Elperin  
255 explained that it was due to the extent of past alterations and that the tradition of change for this  
256 home could be continued. Mr. Kleiner stated that if they could prove the location of the original  
257 front door that would help. Mr. Panciera did not feel the original door was relevant; he agreed with  
258 Mr. Elperin’s statement that the relevant history is just change, and lots of it.  
259  
260 **Other Business:**  
261  
262 Jake Collins presents the violation at 182 Babcock, and asked the Commission to vote to decide if  
263 the situation is illegal under 40C and, if so, instruct the Planning Director to take enforcement  
264 action.  
265  
266 Mr. Batchelor moved to find the situation illegal under 40C and asked the Planning Director to take  
267 enforcement action. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.  
268  
269 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – not present, David Jack – yes, Peter Kleiner  
270 – yes, Elton Elperin – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes  
271  
272 Reappointments:  
273  
274 Ric, David, Peter and Wendy needed reappointment. Wendy will not be seeking reappointment and is  
275 leaving Brookline as of April.  
276  
277 Elections:  
278  
279 Positions will run through September, when elections will be held again to comply with the election  
280 dates required in the Commission’s Rules and Regulations.  
281  
282 Mr. Elperin nominated Mr. Panciera and Mr. Jack to be co-vice chairs. DJ nominated Elton to be  
283 chair.  
284

285 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – not present, David Jack – yes, Peter Kleiner  
286 – yes, Elton Elperin –yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes  
287  
288 Mr. Elperin nominated Mr. Collins to be secretary.  
289  
290 David King – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Richard Panciera – not present, David Jack – yes, Peter Kleiner  
291 – yes, Elton Elperin –yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes  
292  
293 Meeting adjourned at 10:03 PM.