

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

Brookline Preservation Commission
MINUTES OF THE April 4th, 2022 Site Visit

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

Commissioners Present:

Ric Panciera
Jim Batchelor
Elizabeth Armstrong

Staff: Tina McCarthy

Applicant: Kyle Sheffield, Kim Cleary (window restoration specialist)

Public: Mike Zarren

Mr. Panciera called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM at 53 Powell Street.

Commissioners viewed the windows at the rear and left elevations from Amory Street and Powell Street and discussed visibility. Mr. Sheffield explained the decision to restore double hung windows and the front door. He explained the challenges with the sunroom door.

Ms. Armstrong felt that the cost was not a good reason to decide against restoration. Mr. Batchelor agreed and stated that the replacement of the sunroom doors on the North elevation was too close to the street to waive the requirements of the guidelines.

Mr. Sheffield showed plans and explained the reasons for the changes in window locations at the rear elevation. He cited programmatic requirements on the interior as well as the desire for symmetry in the design. Mr. Panciera stated that achieving symmetry with the rear elevation fenestration may not be a goal compatible with preservation.

The site visit moved to the interior of the house, where window restoration specialist Kim Cleary explained his assessment of the existing windows and recommended restoration techniques. On the third floor, Mr. Cleary confirmed his recommendation that the casement windows be replaced rather than restored. The proposed replacements are wood true divided light sash from KSD Woodworking with insulated glass. Discussion of difficulty fitting storms to casement windows followed.

Ms. Armstrong raised concerns for the leaded glass windows at the rear elevation. She stated that they are visible from the public way. Mr. Sheffield explained that the owners would like to remove them and reuse on the interior.

Commissioners then discussed the details of window replacement, reaching the following recommendations for the full Commission at the next hearing:

- 3rd floor casements conditions warrant replacement. On the rear, no objection to proposed wood Simulated Divided Light sash due to limited visibility.

44 • Existing aluminum clad replacement windows ok to replace with wood Simulated Divided
45 Light sash, as this condition is existing. Designer’s choice on muntin arrangement as there
46 is no evidence of historic pattern.

47 • Sunroom doors replace with mahogany doors to match existing in existing openings.
48 Single pane on the driveway side, Simulated Divided Light ok to the rear due to visibility.

49

50 Consensus was not reached about the rear elevation. Mr. Batchelor expressed concern for the
51 proposed window re-arrangement on the second floor, as it is visible from Amory Street. Ms.
52 Armstrong had similar concerns, especially about the leaded glass windows.

53

54 A follow-up meeting was planned, and there was no vote taken to refer the application back to the
55 full Commission at this meeting.

56

57 Meeting adjourned at 6 PM.