

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 April 08, 2019 MEETING
Brookline Town Hall, 5th Floor Hearing Room, 333 Washington Street

Commissioners Present

David King, Chair
Elton Elperin, Vice Chair
Jim Batchelor
David Jack
Richard Panciera
Wendy Ecker

Commissioners Absent:

Elizabeth Armstrong
Peter Kleiner

Staff: Valerie Birmingham, Lara Kritzer, Tina McCarthy

Members of the Public: See list

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

Approval of Minutes

Mr. King moved to postpone the review of minutes from the February 19th, 2019 meeting until April 23rd, 2019.

Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)

There was no public comment at this time.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

138 High Street (Pill Hill LHD) – Continuation of Application for a Retroactive Certificate of Appropriateness to address past violations including the installation of a 42” wrought iron fence along the front property line on top of the stone retaining wall and stone cap; copper downspouts on all facades; replacement on the rear of the right side of the house of one French door with 48”x80” french doors and two 26”x70” 15 lite fixed wood sash windows on either side; replacement on the rear of the left side of the house of one door with a 30”x80” wood door and installation of a 26”x36” two over two window; and installation of a new french door and fixed side lights on the rear of the house. (Diarmuid O’Neill, applicant).

Ms. Birmingham presented the case. At its December 19, 2018 public hearing, the Brookline Preservation Commission passed a motion to continue the application to a subcommittee which would conduct a site visit and report back to the full Commission. The subcommittee conducted a site visit on February 15, 2019 and requested the applicant provide quotes for removing the downspouts and connecting the gutters into one downspout; and the relocation of the wrought iron fence. The applicant provided quotes to staff, which are included in this

47 report. On March 20, 2019 the subcommittee met to review the provided quotes and discuss the
48 application. The subcommittee reviewed the application on an item by item basis. The
49 subcommittee passed a motion to bring the retroactive application back to the full Commission
50 with the recommendation that the fence, doors and windows be retroactively approved; and
51 that the applicant will submit to the full Commission options for the alteration of the
52 downspouts to review and discuss. The applicant has submitted two revised options. The first
53 is the alteration of the two elbows reset to be 90 degrees to the house with the two downspouts
54 being maintained; the second is the alteration of the two elbows to run into a copper leader
55 head and one downspout.

56
57 The Commission decided to hear each issue separately, beginning with the downspouts.

58
59 Mr. Worthington (architect) explained that they would prefer two downspouts, feeling that the
60 leader head is not a good solution and that the angle of the elbows is the source of the aesthetic
61 problem. Mr. Worthington proposed rotating the elbows to make the profiles less visible.

62
63 Mr. Elperin asked why this roof required two downspouts at both corners of the front façade,
64 while at the rear there were only two, one at each corner. He noted that historically, there had
65 only been two, one at each corner of the façade. Mr. O'Neill (Owner) stated that the previous
66 gutters had rotted because they were not draining properly.

67
68 Mr. Elperin asked if the contractor that installed the gutters provided a calculation
69 substantiating the need for extra drainage. Mr. O'Neill stated that he had. Mr. Elperin asked if
70 the Commission could see this calculation. Commission members discussed options for
71 increasing the capacity of the gutters to a 4" diameter pipe and replacing the existing neck with
72 one at a 90 degree angle. Mr. Worthington explained that the wooden gutters have a restricted
73 opening that is only 1 1/2" around, and that 30 degrees is the flattest elbow available.

74
75 Mr. Elperin moved to approve the downspouts centered on the corner board and angled 30
76 degrees to the soffit. Mr. Batchelor seconded the motion.

77
78 The Commission voted 6-0 in support of the motion. The motion passed.

79
80 Regarding the fence:

81
82 Mr. King summarized the finding of the subcommittee, which felt that the fence was like
83 others in the neighborhood and did not want to ask for it to be removed.

84
85 Mr. Elperin thought that the ornament on the fence was inappropriate for this house and asked
86 if they could be removed. The applicant stated that the ornament was the same as that on the
87 fence across the street and could not be easily removed. The commissioners discussed the
88 feasibility of removing the ornament. Mr. King stated that the subcommittee recommended
89 keeping it as installed. Mr. Batchelor agreed.

90
91 Ms. Ecker moved that the fence should stay as it is. Mr. King seconded the motion.

92

93 The Commission voted 6-1 in support of the motion. The motion passed.

94

95 Regarding the windows and doors:

96

97 Mr. King summarized the findings of the subcommittee, that these windows and doors would
98 not have been approved, but that it is not in the best interest of the Commission to ask for their
99 removal. The subcommittee recommended to leave the windows and doors as is.

100

101 Mr. Batchelor asked if the windows and doors should be replaced with single pane. Ms. Ecker
102 noted that allowing them to remain set a bad precedent and that replacing windows and doors
103 is a common issue in historic districts. Mr. Jack concurred, but stated that he was willing to
104 allow inappropriate materials in this case due to the distance from the street and limited
105 visibility. Mr. Panciera agreed that in this case there was not enough impact to force the
106 change.

107

108 Mr. Jack moved that the windows and doors be approved as installed. Mr. Panciera seconded
109 the motion.

110

111 The Commission voted 5-0 in favor of the motion, with Mr. Elperin abstaining from the vote.

112

113

114 **36 Upland Road (Pill Hill LHD) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install**
115 **an AC condenser unit to the left of the property, between the house and garage. (Olivia**
116 **Fischer, applicant).**

117

118 Ms. McCarthy presented the case. The application proposes to install an AC condenser unit on
119 the left side of the house, screened by a slatted cedar fence and evergreen plantings.

120

121 Owner Olivia Fischer stated that the pipe running on the exterior of the house to the 3rd floor
122 mechanical room cannot be located on the interior because it is inflexible copper. It would
123 require the pipe to make bends around items in the wall, which would create joints vulnerable
124 to leaks in the future. She expressed the strong desire not to take down interior wall finish.

125

126 Mr. King & Mr. Elperin noted that on the plans the closets seem to be in a good location to run
127 pipes inside. Ms. Fischer stated that it is not the case. The Commission discussed other
128 options for the pipe, including Mr. Batchelor's suggestion that the pipe enter at the second
129 floor. Mr. King asked if the applicant had considered locating the mechanical room in the
130 basement. Ms. Fischer explained that the system she was proposing is a special energy saving
131 system that only works if the air handler is on top. Other options required more condensers
132 and were twice as expensive.

133

134 Mr. Jack expressed the feeling that there were alternative locations for the pipe. Mr. Panciera
135 stated that he would not condone external pipes if there was any way to locate them on the
136 interior.

137

138 Mr. Elperin asked if the proposed system would be ducted to the other floors. Ms. Fischer said
139 that it would, using the closets in the center of the house. Mr. Elperin asked if the pipe could
140 be installed with the ducts, in the closets.

141
142 Mr. Batchelor asked if the applicant could provide a second opinion on the feasibility of
143 locating the pipes on the interior from a mechanical engineer. Ms. Fischer stated that she had
144 already consulted with six contractors.

145
146 Mr. Batchelor made a motion to create a subcommittee which would attend a site visit with
147 Ms. Fischer and her mechanical engineer, to explore alternative locations for the pipe. Mr.
148 Elperin seconded the motion.

149
150 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

151
152 **75 Crowninshield Road (Edward and Barbara Boches, applicants)- Continuation of**
153 **Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for changes to the house include the**
154 **following: New railings on the side entrance porch, rear porch, and second floor balcony;**
155 **new vertical wood lattice to be installed below the side entrance and rear porches; new**
156 **replacement gutters; replace existing chain link fence surrounding backyard with new wood**
157 **fence; replace existing stone treads and brick risers with new bluestone treads and risers.**

158
159 Ms. Kritzer presented the case. At the February Commission Meeting, the Applicants had
160 proposed changes which included adding new trim and architectural detailing, painting the
161 existing masonry, and replacing the front door and stair railings. These items were referred to a
162 subcommittee which met on Wednesday April 3. The Applicant has decided to not go forward
163 with the changes to the architectural detailing at this time. After discussing the proposed
164 painting of the brick, the Applicants have asked to postpone a decision on this item until
165 additional information can be collected in support of the change. The subcommittee has
166 finished their review of the proposed front door and new entrance step railings and has referred
167 it back to the full Commission for a vote at this time. The Applicant has proposed to replace
168 the existing ca. 2013 Craftsman style front door with a new contemporary style wood door.
169 The entrance step currently has wrought iron railings which may date back to the original 1967
170 structure. The Applicants propose to install the same horizontal railings here which are
171 proposed for the side and rear entrances to the building.

172
173 Mr. Boches stated that the railing on the front porch is not original and much of the brick or
174 stone on the building has been replaced. He also noted that the rendering in the case report is
175 not to scale, it is less chunky than the drawing makes it look. He brought some printing of the
176 proposed paint colors for the brick and handed them out, asking that the Commission to add the
177 brick painting to the items under consideration at this meeting.

178
179 Mr. Jack proposed taking the application in steps, one item at a time: doors, painting brick,
180 railings, lattice, fence and steps.

181

182 Mr. Panciera summarized the subcommittee findings, confirming that they looked at the doors
183 and railings, but not the fence. The subcommittee recommended accepting the doors and
184 railings.

185
186 Regarding the door:

187
188 Mr. Elperin asked if they had considered a full glass door. He felt the proposed door was a
189 strong move toward modern design, and that a more neutral design might work better. The
190 applicants expressed desire to have the wood color for interest, also noting that it is set back
191 from the street. Mr. Jack stated that a full glass door would lack privacy.

192
193 Mr. Batchelor moved to accept the proposed door. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

194
195 The Commission voted 6-0 to approve the motion. The motion passed.

196
197 Regarding the railings:

198
199 Mr. Elperin recommended equally spaced railings. The proposed railings are a very dramatic
200 statement and not easily recognizable as modern design. Neutral design would help unify
201 different elements. Ms. Ecker stated that the railing design goes with the windows. Mr.
202 Boches said he would be fine with evenly spaced rails.

203
204 Mr. Batchelor made a motion to approve horizontal rails, leaving the design to the owners'
205 discretion. Second

206
207 The Commission approved the motion 6-0. The motion passed.

208
209 Regarding the lattice:

210
211 Mr. Elperin expressed that the design was fine but also suggested horizontal orientation for the
212 slats.

213
214 Mr. Boches said he preferred the horizontal.

215
216 Mr. Elperin motioned to accept the horizontal lattice. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

217
218 The Commission voted 6-0 in support of the motion. The motion passed.

219
220 Regarding the fence:

221
222 Mr. Elperin asked if the fence posts would be on the inside, leaving the outside clean. The
223 applicants said yes.

224
225 Mr. Jack made a motion to approve the proposed fence. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.

226
227 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

228
229 Regarding the treads:
230
231 Mr. Elperin noted that the existing steps had a cleft edge, while the proposed steps have a
232 smooth edge. Mr. Panciera said he preferred the smooth edge.
233
234 Mr. King motioned to accept the stair treads as proposed. Mr. Batchelor seconded the motion.
235
236 The Commission voted 6-0 in support of the motion. The motion passed.

237
238 Regarding painting the brick:
239
240 Mr. Elperin noted that the Commission's guidelines are correct, unpainted brick should not be
241 painted. This house, however, has no integrity. The images of proposed painting shows
242 improvement over existing conditions.
243
244 Mr. Batchelor said that the applicants should be ok with the technical issues of painting brick, it
245 traps moisture and fails. Mr. Panciera suggested using vapor permeable paint or stain. He also
246 noted that the brick looks bad as is, and that the building itself is unique. Commissioners
247 offered additional suggestions to increase the success of the project.
248

249 Mr. Batchelor motioned to approve the painting of the brick in this case, with the note that it is
250 usually not permitted. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.
251
252 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

253
254 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**
255

256 **73 Seaver Street – Continuation of request to lift the stay of partial demolition of the**
257 **house (73 Seaver Street LLC, applicant).**
258

259 The eighteen month demolition delay on the house and garage at 73 Seaver Street was initiated
260 in October 2018. Ms. Birmingham reviewed the case. At its December 19, 2018 public
261 hearing, the Brookline Preservation Commission moved to continue the applicant's request to
262 lift the stay of demolition to a subcommittee that was not empowered. The subcommittee
263 conducted a site visit of the property on January 15, 2019 and reviewed a revised set of plans
264 on site. The subcommittee met again on March 7, 2019, and reviewed a second revised set of
265 plans and moved to bring the request to lift the stay of demolition back to the full Commission.
266 The subcommittee recommended that the applicant keep the rear eyebrow dormer, reexamine
267 to the extent possible the replacement of the front curved windows, retain the front porch, and
268 retain all four chimneys with further discussion by the full Commission.

269
270 The current revised plans include the existing rear eyebrow dormer to remain, the existing front
271 porch to remain and be repaired as required, the curved windows to be replaced with custom
272 curved sash windows by Boston Sash, the removal of the rear chimney on the left side of the
273 house and the retention of the remaining three chimneys.

274
275 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment. There were no comments at this time.
276
277 Mr. stated that the new plans reflect the intent to restore the entire house. Replacements will
278 be in-kind and three of the chimneys will be retained, supported structurally on the interior.
279 Saving the back chimney is not possible; other than that we have responded to your concerns.
280
281 Mr. King summarized the recommendations of the subcommittee, saying that keeping the
282 original chimneys was a priority. The subcommittee agreed that the 4th chimney could be
283 eliminated, though they wanted to keep all. There was a discussion about landscaping, but this
284 is not within the prevue of the Commission. All other proposals the committee made were
285 accepted.
286
287 Mr. Elperin stated that he was pleased with the decision to keep the three chimneys and with
288 the plans overall. He asked if the curved replacement sash would be stock size windows, since
289 the dimensions in the window schedule are not custom.
290
291 Mr. said the company will do any size; they will be made to order as exact replacements.
292
293 Mr Elperin asked if the casings would be replaced on the curved windows as well. Will it
294 conceal the aluminum fin?
295
296 Mr. stated that the casings will be replaced, a 5/4 casing will stand proud.
297
298 Mr. Elperin said in his experience, it needs to be furred out. He asked these details to be
299 reviewed by staff.
300
301 Mr. Elperin made a motion to accept the proposal, with the request that the window casings
302 conceal the frame, to be reviewed by staff. Mr. Panciera seconded the motion.
303
304 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.
305
306 **64 Dudley Street – Request to lift the stay of partial demolition of the house (Rony and**
307 **Sharon Shapiro, applicants)**
308
309 The eighteen month demolition delay on the house at 64 Dudley Street was initiated in March
310 2019. Ms. Kritzer reviewed the case. The applicant has requested that the Commission
311 consider lifting the stay of demolition based upon its review of the proposed plans to replace
312 the existing pool house which is located in the rear right corner of the building. The proposed
313 new structure would be located in the same footprint as the existing pool house but would be
314 finished in stucco with double hung windows and detailing to match the rest of the house. A
315 vaulted skylight is proposed for the center of the otherwise flat roof which may be partially
316 visible from Dudley Road.
317
318 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment. There were no comments at this time.
319

320 Applicant stated that the new pool house will be built on the footprint of the old pool house and
321 sided with stucco to match the house. The design will pick up the pilasters and cornice details
322 of the existing house.

323
324 Mr. Elperin asked if the stucco would be real stucco. The applicant replied that it would.

325
326 Mr. Elperin asked if the cornice would be the same as the dining room. He noted that it looked
327 different on the plans. The applicant stated that it was the same, the drawing is accurate but
328 misleading. There is something in front of it that makes it look different.

329
330 Mr. Batchelor asked a question about the right side ell, wondering if the whole roof of the pool
331 house could rise up a couple of feet. The applicant stated that it could not, the windows were
332 in the way. He pointed out that he had matched that cornice to the cornice line extending over
333 the dining room. There was further discussion about plans and volumes.

334
335 Mr. King moved to lift the stay of demolition with the plans as presented. Ms. Ecker seconded
336 the motion.

337
338 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

339
340

341 **89 Woodland Road – Application for the full demolition of house and garage (Beverly**
342 **Basile and Arthur Sandberg, applicants)**

343
344 An initial significance determination was issued by staff in March 2019. Ms. McCarthy
345 reviewed the case. The request before the Commission is to initiate full demolition on the 1907
346 Colonial Revival single-family home and garage.

347
348 Ms. Duff (Attorney) noted that the garage is in a state of disrepair and asked if it would be
349 possible to hold separate hearings for the house and garage.

350
351 Robert Basile (Owner) said that he was planning to build a house on the site. He stated that he
352 did not expect a favorable outcome tonight and was planning to wait out the delay.

353
354 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment. No public comments at this time.

355
356 Ms. Ecker inquired whether this would be an 18 month delay. Ms. Birmingham confirmed that
357 it would.

358
359 Mr. Batchelor asked for clarification on the historic maps. Ms. McCarthy provided
360 clarification.

361
362 Mr. Elperin, Mr. Jack and Mr. King expressed admiration for the design and integrity of the
363 house and garage. Mr. King asked if Mr. Sandberg would consider keeping it and building an
364 addition. He stated that option would be preferable.

365

366 Mr. King moved to uphold staff's initial significance determination for both the house and
367 garage, imposing an eighteen month demolition delay until October 9th 2020. Mr. Elperin
368 seconded the motion.

369
370 The Commission voted 6-0 to support the motion. The motion passed.

371
372 **119 Payson Road – Application for the partial demolition of the house (Joseph Allen &**
373 **Mary Kenda, applicant).**

374
375 An initial significance determination was issued by staff in March 2019. Ms. McCarthy
376 reviewed the case. The request before the Commission is to initiate partial demolition on the
377 1941 Colonial Revival single-family home.

378
379 Ms. Duff (attorney) noted that the request is for partial demolition and the proposed addition is
380 in the back where there is non-original fabric. She stated that if the stay is imposed, her client
381 will work to have it lifted.

382
383 Mr. Allan stated that he did not agree with the “mirror image” description in the report, and
384 noted some differences between the homes. He also said that the siding in the rear is vinyl.

385
386 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment. There were no comments at this time.

387
388 Ms. Ecker stated that this house is significant because it is part of a group. Mr. Jack agreed
389 that the homes read as an ensemble, with similar massing.

390
391 Mr. Batchelor moved to uphold the initial significance determination made by staff, imposing a
392 twelve month demolition delay until April 9, 2020. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

393
394 The Commission voted all in favor. The motion passed.

395
396 **28 Denny Road - Application for the partial demolition of the house (Brian and Julia**
397 **Clay, applicants)**

398
399 An initial significance determination was issued by staff in March 2019. Ms. McCarthy
400 reviewed the case study. The request before the Commission is to initiate partial demolition on
401 the 1938 Colonial Revival single-family home.

402
403 Mr. Clay asked if the Commission could list on the website which properties are historic. Ms.
404 Birmingham stated that the lists had been updated and had just been posted to the website.

405
406 Mr. Batchelor motioned to uphold the initial significance determination, imposing an eighteen
407 month demolition delay until October 9th 2020. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

408
409 The Commission voted all in favor. The motion passed.

410

411 Mr. Jack asked staff to look into the possibility of doing preservation awards. Mr. Batchelor
412 agreed that it was a good idea. Ms. Birmingham said staff had planned on it.

413

414 Ms. Kritzer asked the Commission if they would mind receiving black & white copies of case
415 reports at meetings, to reduce the number of color copies made. The Commissioners agreed.

416

417 The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 PM.

DRAFT