

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

*Town of Brookline Preservation Commission*  
**MINUTES OF THE April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2023 MEETING**  
**Held Virtually using Zoom Online Software**

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

**Commissioners Present:**

David Jack, Chair  
Elton Elperin  
David King  
Richard Panciera, Vice Chair  
Elizabeth Armstrong  
John Spiers, Alternate

**Commissioners Absent:**

Peter Kleiner  
James Batchelor

**Staff:** Jake Collins, Tina McCarthy, Victoria Pardo

---

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

Mr. Jack opened the meeting at 6:33 PM.

Mr. Spiers voted in lieu of Peter Kleiner.  
Mr. Batchelor was absent.

**Approval of Minutes**

The Commission reviewed the minutes from the following hearings:

**03/14/2023-**

Mr. King stated line 290 should be changed to “Mr. King disagreed with Mr. Batchelor.”  
Mr. King stated line 299 should be changed to “Ms. Armstrong and Mr. Elperin disagreed.”  
Mr. Elperin stated more needs to be said on lines 258 and 259. “The boss is placed an emphasis on equity which has led to success.” He wanted to know the “success of what?”  
Ms. Armstrong stated on line 201 “god” should be capitalized.  
Ms. Armstrong stated the paragraph near line 57 needs to be edited. “the’s” need to be added.  
Ms. Armstrong stated on line 82 that the word “applicant” should be removed.  
Mr. Elperin stated line 116 to remove “at the report.”

Mr. Panciera made a motion to accept the minutes with the edits. Mr. King seconded that motion.

Elton Elperin- yes, David King- yes, Richard Panciera-yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes, John Spiers- abstained-did not attend that meeting

Mr. Jack stated the minutes were approved as amended.

**Public Comment:**

John Harris, town meeting member and co-chair of climate action Brookline stated that he prefers virtual meetings. Second, he requested the public comment at the beginning at the meeting. Finally, he felt there was a happy medium between architectural preservation and climate technologies. He felt the town of Brookline should do their part in participating in the climate action plan. He wanted to encourage residents to add solar panels on their roofs. He asked to include eco architects and landscape architects as

48 commission members. Also, he asked for the staff to be trained in state-of-the-art sustainable technology  
49 and how they can fit into historic designs.

50  
51 Mr. King responded to Mr. Harris that there is time for public comment at the beginning of every meeting  
52 and that members on the Commission are very concerned about climate change, and a lot of the  
53 commissioners are LEED certified or eco architects. He believed that everyone on the commission  
54 recognizes it is preferable to having solar panels on the south side of the building and there should be a  
55 balance between preservation goals and sustainability goals.

56  
57

### 58 **Subcommittee of 161 Hyslop, April 5, 2023**

59 Mr. King, Mr. Elperin and Mr. Jack were on the subcommittee. There were no comments.  
60 Mr. Jack made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Elperin seconded.

61

62 David Jack- yes, Elton Elperin- yes, David King- yes

63

64 The subcommittee minutes were approved as submitted.

65

### 66 **Site Visit at 25 Cottage, March 24, 2023**

67 Ms. Armstrong stated she, Ric Panciera, and David Jack were present at the previous site visit and would  
68 like that noted.

69 Ms. Armstrong asked to change the sidebar to update the Commission members.

70 Mr. Elperin asked to delete line 131.

71 Mr. Elperin stated line 33 should say, “with much of the intact material compromised, for example wall  
72 studs with rotted lower parts.”

73 Ms. Armstrong asked to change line 50 to show the correct time.

74 Mr. Elperin stated he wanted to add: “Mr. Elperin asked that the exterior sheathing be saved either as part  
75 of an intact move or by reconstruction. Mr. Birnbaum indicated that if sheathing were retained, the  
76 window frames could be mounted, moved outward to maintain their relationship to the new cladding.”

77 Mr. King moved that the Commission approves the minutes of the site visit on March 24, 2023 with the  
78 corrections as submitted. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.

79 Elton Elperin- yes, David King- yes, John Spiers-yes

80

### 81 **PUBLIC HEARING – DEMOLITION**

82

83 **25 Brington Road** – Application for full demolition of a two-family dwelling (Dave Harellick,  
84 applicant). **Precinct 6**

85

86 Mr. Collins presented the case report.

87

88 **Applicant Comment:**  
89

90 David Harellick (applicant) believed the timeline presented by Mr. Collins had incorrect information. He  
91 stated his contractor did not move the home without permission and that Ted Murray gave him verbal  
92 permission to move the building temporarily.

93 They were expecting to receive the approval to make the move permanent, but on a December 15  
94 meeting, the town decided to change its view on porches and setbacks, and stated they would deny the  
95 permit for an as-of-right renovation and addition.

96 Mr. Harellick was hoping it to be an as-of-right project. He stated that he tried to save the house and avoid  
97 triggering demolition. He stated they had a design in 2021 to keep the building as is on the exterior by  
98 splitting the lot and constructing a new house on the second lot. He stated he did not get approval to  
99 construct a building on the second lot. He stated the lot is a ¼ acre, where all the other lots on the street  
100 are an 1/8 of an acre. He stated there was a garage on the lot formerly.

101 He stated he didn't feel that the house is significant. He believed the high school overshadows the  
102 building. He felt 25 Brington lost its character by association due to its proximity to the T station and the  
103 high school. He asked the Commission to help him move forward with this project.

104 Ralph Kilfoyle (architect) stated he tried to salvage the home and the foundation.

105 **Public Comment:**  
106

107 Dave Porter is a neighbor who lives on Clark Road. He believed the applicant put in a lot of effort to save  
108 the house. He hopes that the applicant is allowed to proceed with this project.  
109

110 Eli Epstein and his wife Valerie are direct abutters to 25 Brington Road. He stated it has been trying for  
111 them to watch the construction over the past few years. They were under the impression that the house  
112 would remain intact, and keep the character of the historic street. They hope the house to remain as it was  
113 before. Ms. Epstein didn't understand if the purpose was to keep the house, why would they strip and gut  
114 the house? She felt the house was significant, and in good condition when the Harellicks bought the house.  
115 She felt it was a part of the neighborhood, and asked the Commission to view the street holistically.  
116

117 Ms. Armstrong stated they received several letters expressing opinions on the significance of the house.  
118

119 **Commission Comment:**  
120

121 Mr. King stated he thought the house was significant.

122 Mr. Elperin agreed with Mr. King. He didn't think it was uniquely significant, but more so that it is a  
123 contributing member to the neighborhood. He stated that even though it had been stripped and is up on  
124 supports, it is easy to see the integrity of the shape of the house, and what it would be if it were returned  
125 to grade, reclad and retrimmed.

126 Mr. Panciera agreed that the house is significant.

127 Ms. Armstrong agreed, and pointed out that a finding of significance does not mean that there has to be a  
128 yearlong wait unless the applicant's intent is to wait out the stay and truly demolish the building. She  
129 encouraged the applicant to engage in design review with the Commission.  
130

131 Mr. King made a motion to uphold the significance. Mr. Elperin seconded that motion.

132  
133 David Jack- yes, Elton Elperin- yes, David King- yes, Richard Panciera-yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes,  
134 John Spiers-yes

135  
136 Mr. Jack stated the motion passed and the house was found significant.  
137

138 The applicant stated that they will wait out the demolition stay. Mr. Collins stated the stay will end April  
139 11, 2024.  
140

141

## 142 **PUBLIC HEARING – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

143  
144

145 **182 Walnut Street (Pill Hill LHD)** – Continuation of an application for modifications to a previously  
146 issued Certificate of Appropriateness to install a pergola in the rear yard (Studio2112  
147 Landscape Architecture, applicant). **Precinct 5**  
148

149

149 Ms. McCarthy presented the case report.  
150

151

### 152 **Applicant Comment:**

153  
154 Lynne Giesecke (architect) stated they did research on the preservation restriction, and found that those  
155 viewsheds were not inhibited by the pergola. She stated they contractors and mocked up the pergola in its  
156 boldest view.

### 157 **Public Comment:**

158  
159

159 None.

160  
161

### 161 **Commission Comment:**

162  
163

163 Mr. Elperin asked about the louvers on the pergola. Ms. Giesecke responded that there are wooden  
164 louvers that provide the ability to hide utility piping. She stated they are 3.75 inches above the frame of  
165 the pergola.  
166

167

167 Mr. King asked if this does not impede the view from the viewpoints that are described in the  
168 preservation restriction?  
169

170

170 Ms. McCarthy stated that the pergola could not be considered a substantial obstruction. She stated the  
171 restriction was hidden in the registry of deeds.  
172

173

173 Ms. Armstrong stated they still needed to decide whether it was still appropriate from the public view for  
174 an LHD. Ms. Armstrong stated she felt it was appropriate. Mr. Panciera and Mr. King agreed.  
175

176

176 Mr. Elperin made a motion to accept the design as presented. Mr. Panciera seconded the motion.  
177

178

178 David Jack- yes, Elton Elperin- yes, David King- yes, Richard Panciera-yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes,  
179 John Spiers-yes

180  
181 Mr. Jack stated the motion was approved.

182  
183  
184 **67 Crowninshield Road (Crowninshield LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to  
185 install AC condensers and exterior vents and to install a wooden fence along the right  
186 property line (Kent Duckham, applicant). **Precinct 2**

187  
188 Mr. Collins Presented the Case Report.

189  
190 **Applicant Comment:**

191  
192 Omar Badri (applicant) stated the fence was originally approved for a 4 ft. picket. He stated his neighbors  
193 had concerns about the privacy, and he wanted to oblige their requests. They wanted to be thoughtful to  
194 hide the vents.

195 **Public Comment:**

196  
197 Segi Stefanos Schlosser (neighbor, 61 Crowninshield Road) stated she had asked the Badri’s to raise the  
198 fence 6 feet. She supports the Badri’s consideration of raising the fence, and thanks them for their  
199 consideration. She stated there are 4 vents facing their house, and she wanted to know what the vents will  
200 do, and how they will affect her.

201  
202 **Commission Comment**

203  
204 Ms. Armstrong asked about the relationship of the neighbor’s house to the building, and why this would  
205 be an exception of the fence height guideline.

206  
207 Mr. Collins clarified the applicant is asking to propose a 48-inch fence instead of 42 feet, and have it be  
208 solid, not open. He also clarified the vents are minimally visible and properly screened.

209  
210 Mr. Elperin didn’t believe the Commission should allow the fence to be over 42 inches and closed in  
211 nature.

212  
213 Mr. King agreed the fence should be open and to stick to the guidelines in respect to height. He stated  
214 there should be a drawing showing the fence and transitions which should be reviewed by staff.

215  
216 The Commission discussed the visibility of the vents.

217  
218 Mr. Badri stated the vents will be painted.

219  
220 Mr. Panciera stated he didn’t have an issue with the location of the condensers. Mr. Jack agreed.

221  
222 Mr. King moved to accept the proposal as submitted with the exception of the fence, which should be ‘6  
223 ft along the side until it reaches flush with the front of the house where it will transition to 42-inch-high  
224 open fence. The fence and transition should be drawn and should be reviewed by staff. Ms. Armstrong  
225 seconded the motion.

226  
227 The applicant stated this was acceptable.

228  
229 David Jack- yes, Elton Elperin- yes, David King- yes, Richard Panciera-yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes,  
230 yes, John Spiers-yes  
231  
232 Mr. Jack stated the motion passes.  
233  
234  
235 **25 Cottage Street (Olmsted Richardson LHD)** – Continuation of the discussion of strategies to move  
236 the building to the previously approved new location (RLAW, applicant). **Precinct 14**  
237  
238 Ms. McCarthy Presented the relocation plan for 25 Cottage.  
239  
240 **Applicant Comment:**  
241  
242 Ms. Dopazo Gilbert reiterated the proposal to move the building. She stated they will be going to the  
243 zoning board of appeals Thursday evening.  
244  
245 **Public Comment:**  
246  
247 None.  
248  
249 **Commission Comment**  
250  
251 Mr. Elperin was pleased to know they are moving the main body of the house. He believed any wood that  
252 could be saved should be.  
253  
254 Mr. Panciera asked whose responsibility it is to monitor the materials? He wanted to make sure that it is  
255 documented where those materials go.  
256  
257 Ms. McCarthy stated they asked for salvage at the well tower project and 108 Center. They asked the  
258 applicants to provide an inventory of what materials they were removing and where they sent those  
259 materials. They did not regulate what or who or why they would sell those to. The agreement was to not  
260 throw them away.  
261  
262 Mr. Panciera stated he would like a letter from the applicant explaining where the material is going and  
263 what is going to happen to it.  
264  
265 Ms. Gilbert stated if there are additional timbers, she would agree to call salvage companies. If the  
266 salvage companies do not want the material, the applicant would like an automatic way to get rid of them.  
267 She did not want to spend a lot of money to prepare the timbers for a company, but they could put them  
268 aside for salvage companies. She will provide evidence that they reached out.  
269  
270 Ms. McCarthy asked if they were willing to work with the state of Massachusetts that has free resources  
271 for this. She stated she will provide their number and reach out to them to see what they will need.  
272  
273 Mr. Birnbaum stated if someone is willing to come out in a timely manner, they will cooperate.  
274  
275 Mr. King and Mr. Panciera thought this was a reasonable way forward.  
276  
277 Mr. Elperin stated it is an opportunity for the Commission to learn about the salvage process.

278  
279 Mr. Panciera expects to see most of the original framing to be retained and reinforced. Replacing would  
280 only be done if that element was beyond repair. He expects to see evidence of the original framing still  
281 there after it is moved. He does not expect to see a lot of the framing replaced with new materials.

282  
283 Mr. Birnbaum responded that the original framing will remain.

284  
285 Mr. Steven Siegel responded that they are trying to work with what is there.

286  
287 Mr. Birnbaum stated they will have to use 2x6 and full insulation on interior to meet current code.

288  
289 The Commission discussed the code with the applicant.

290  
291 Ms. McCarthy clarified that Brookline chose to adopt an accelerated code. It is not clear at this time what  
292 calculations they are using. She stated the commission should vote to accept or request additional  
293 information.

294  
295 Mr. Panciera voted to make a motion to accept the package and allow them to move the core, two story  
296 main structure of the building with the understanding that the remaining parts of the building will be set  
297 aside and be allowed to be used for salvage. If they are not salvaged, the owner can do with what they  
298 want. Details to be reviewed by staff.

299  
300 Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.

301  
302 David Jack- yes, Elton Elperin- yes, David King- yes, Richard Panciera-yes, Elizabeth Armstrong- yes,  
303 John Spiers-yes

304  
305 Mr. Jack stated Ric's motion passes.

306  
307  
308

### 309 **PUBLIC HEARING- WARRANT ARTICLES**

310  
311 **Article 16**– Amend the Zoning Map and Articles 3 and 5 of the Town's Zoning By-Laws to create a  
312 new zoning district (T-5 NH) to set forth building massing requirements in two  
313 existing T-5 (two-family) zoning districts north of Beacon Street to encourage reuse  
314 and deter demolition (Department of Planning and Community Development)

315  
316 Ms. Maria Morelli (planner, Town of Brookline) explained warrant article 16 as a stopgap measure to  
317 deal with the demolitions that have been affecting the T-5 district.

318  
319 Mr. Collins stated the Commission could write a letter to support the warrant article, or take no  
320 action. It will be compiled into a book forwarded to the Advisory Committee at town meeting in a  
321 combined report.

### 322 **Public Comment:**

323  
324  
325 Ms. Nancy Heller (town meeting member precinct 8) and other petitioners believe this is a good idea,  
326 and that this is important for the Town of Brookline.

327  
328 Mr. Edward Dumas (111 Thorndike street) favors this. He is trying to understand if this is going to  
329 solve the problem. He didn't understand why this keeps happening and how the town addresses the  
330 core problem. He was asking about 509 part 4.C, the relationship of the form and streetscape. He was  
331 posing if this language just needs to be tightened up? He wonders what went wrong, because the  
332 design review would seem to be enough. He speculated if the building department is not requiring the  
333 special permit, and therefore the design review. Is it tightening building department procedure,  
334 tightening up 4.C? He doesn't want any unintended consequences from the proposal if there is a way  
335 to simply solve the issue.

336  
337 **Commission Comment:**

338  
339 Mr. King asked Ms. Morelli that the district overlaps with the preservation district and how that  
340 works.  
341 Ms. Morelli stated it did overlap with 2 LHD's, Crowninshield and Graffam- McKay. She stated that  
342 with design review, unless you have objective measurable standards, it will be difficult to have  
343 standards to enforce. She states qualitative guidelines give shape to design review, but whenever  
344 possible, if you want a dimensional outcome it is best to codify that as best as possible. She stated  
345 this is complimenting guidelines in LHD's by codifying dimensional requirements reflected in the  
346 existing context.

347  
348 Mr. King asked about a house in Graffam-McKay on Osborne that had an addition to the rear.

349  
350 Ms. Morelli used this as an example of how a project can meet zoning requirements and might not  
351 meet the requirements of an LHD. She stated this is where her proposal could fill that gap.

352  
353 Mr. Elperin stated he is in favor of the intention, which is to slow down the demolitions. He has  
354 questions on the attempts to be more specific about shapes. He brought up 36 Osborne, and how the  
355 commission thought a flat roof was a better solution, for example. He was not in favor of dictating  
356 roof shapes, because he has found flat roofs work well, depending on how the building as a whole is  
357 designed. He felt that design review was capable in 509, but not ensured, and he did not know how to  
358 tighten it up. He asked why they would be regulating story heights.

359  
360 Ms. Morelli responded that this is one way to slow the pace while the town takes more time with  
361 massing studies for contemporary styles. She believed if the commission likes the 40% of the floor  
362 below rule, then what would a building look like incorporating a flat roof under those parameters?  
363 She felt she couldn't eliminate certain roof types without studies. She responded to Mr. Elperin's  
364 story height question. She stated they have a max height of 35 feet. She stated the deputy building  
365 commissioner thought there should be parameters for story heights if they want to define half stories  
366 and stipulate 2 ½ stories, but she could see if they have 2 ½ stories and 35 feet for max height it  
367 might not be necessary to stipulate each story height.

368  
369 Mr. King asked about the change in zoning. He asked about the comma reference.

370  
371 Ms. Morelli said there are stages of intervention when talking about zoning updates. She stated  
372 zoning can get more specific to codify the form that is already there. Not as much of a zoning change  
373 as much as filling in the gaps. She recalled 509, and that you can't discern this neighborhood district



374 from Beacon street. By having those geometric standards, it fills in the gap, and provides specificity  
375 that reinforces the form that is already there.

376  
377 Ms. Armstrong was curious about not including mansard or gambrel roofs.

378  
379 Ms. Morelli responded that they did a survey of 19-20 streets affected by this proposal. She stated  
380 there are not a lot of mansard roofs or gambrels. She stated also the mansard roof does not mitigate  
381 the scale. It still results in demolitions. She didn't feel they reflect the context or are sensitive to  
382 neighboring structures. She reiterated this results in 3 full stories without adding new housing. She  
383 did not think the mansard is the solution.

384  
385 Mr. Collins that the mansards they were seeing on new developments are not proportional, historical,  
386 not to scale, and don't follow historic precedent. They just expand the building and allow the  
387 developer to maximize or over maximize the space.

388  
389 Discussion ensued over mansard roofs and their appropriateness.

390  
391 Mr. Elperin asked if this warrant article encourages the development of 2 families in existing  
392 structures.

393  
394 Ms. Morelli said it does not interfere with this. She stated the median lot size in these 20 streets is  
395 over 5,700 sf. She has some examples of lots on 8,000 sf. The max allowed FAR for this district is  
396 one. She reiterated the median lot size is 5,700 sf so they are larger lots and that is what was  
397 precipitating the demolition.

398  
399 Ms. Morelli stated homeowners can still do conversions and additions. She stated they did a sampling  
400 of 600 properties to understand what the existing building depths are. She stated they didn't want to  
401 touch FAR, but as long as people could convert their attics and basements and as long as they put  
402 additions on they would be conserving those structures.

403  
404 Mr. Elperin stated asked about the setbacks. He stated he needed more time to think about the  
405 warrant article. He was concerned over the roof types.

406  
407 Ms. Morelli addressed Mr. Dumas' concerns over procedures. She did not believe it was the case the  
408 building department was overlooking design review. She stated with design review you need legally  
409 enforceable standards that have to be as objective as possible. If more is left to interpretation amongst  
410 the various boards, it will be hard for developers for plan their projects and make changes. She stated  
411 the problem is that there will be different interpretation amongst each board. She stated it would be  
412 better if there was more specificity and detail on the geometry of the form. If those standards are  
413 measurable, it will be easier to communicate to developers and the public to have a base standard for  
414 the boards that are going to be reviewing those projects. She reiterated design review but it needs  
415 objective standards in the by-law to lead to successful outcomes.

416  
417 She stated these are additional dimensional requirements to guide and compliment design review.  
418 She defined form-based zoning as an approach that relies more on the geometry.

419  
420 Mr. Jack and Mr. Panciera believed this warrant article was necessary, but they are also interested in  
421 the process and defining a lot of important details to understand what the Commission is being asked

422 to approve. Mr. Jack stated he supports what is being proposed, but that the Commission should look  
423 at previous case studies.

424

425 Ms. McCarthy stated the combined reports are due on May 4<sup>th</sup>. She stated it is possible to get in an  
426 update after that but it will not be printed.

427

428 Ms. Armstrong asked Ms. Morelli how she defined the area.

429 Ms. Morelli stated the T.5 has been experiencing the most demolitions, because it has an FAR of 1.

430 This is a high FAR, and most of the properties within this district are far below this FAR. This high

431 ceiling is tempting to a developer to demolish the property because of the existing metric with the

432 FAR. It was a combination of the amount of demolitions and the FAR being so high.

433

434 Ms. Morelli stated she will pick out exemplary properties that can serve as a blueprint for the zoning.

435 She will provide examples they used as a basis for the math. She reminded the Commission the

436 standards of the dormer sizes and the spaces of the gable, she picked up from the preservation

437 Commission's guidelines on partial demolition.

438

439 Mr. Elperin suggested looking at a couple of developer buildings in the T5 that triggered this

440 proposal so they could see how different would the design be if they had conformed to this proposal.

441 He hoped from this they would agree completely with warrant article 16 or have minor suggestions.

442

443 Ms. Morelli stated she could not go into an in-depth study of Osborne. She stated it would be helpful

444 to look at existing lots, and think about if there will be demolition, what type of dormers would you

445 see, what kind of roof would you see? She will look at exemplary properties.

446

447 Mr. Collins suggested they have a good case study for an ongoing project.

448

449 Ms. Morelli brought up 116 Columbia, a proposed demolition. A flat, 3 story contemporary design

450 was proposed. The planning board stated this was not appropriate. They proposed a mansard roof.

451 When warrant article 16 was submitted, the developer agreed to comply with this warrant article, and

452 wanted to comply with all dimensional requirements and zoning. They are also not going to demolish

453 the structure. She thought that was an example of letting the developer know what the town wants.

454 Approximately 65,500 sf lot.

455

456 Mr. King asked how many of these districts were preservation districts. Ms. Morelli replied that most

457 of these districts are not protected by Local Historic Districts.

458

459 The Commission discussed how the proposal will affect the LHDs. Ms. Armstrong confirmed that it

460 wouldn't be different, only that the zoning requirements would change.

461

462 Mr. Collins and Ms. Morelli will coordinate to get examples of buildings on how the massing works

463 and how the restrictions on the form is going to work, and show how many shapes will be created, so

464 the Commission can understand physically the consequences of the proposal.

465

466

467 Mr. Jack made a motion that this discussion will be continued at the April 25<sup>th</sup> hearing. Mr. Panciera

468 seconded the motion.

469

470 David Jack- yes, Elton Elperin- yes, David King- yes, Richard Panciera-yes, Elizabeth Armstrong-  
471 yes

472

473

474 **OTHER BUSINESS**

475

476 **Request for a One Year Extension of the Demolition Permit for the Durgin Garage (10-18**  
477 **Pleasant Street)**

478

479 **Applicant Comment**

480

481 Ms. Jennifer Gilbert and Andy Martineau (project representative for the owner, Chestnut Hill Realty)  
482 explained the scope of the project. The proposal is to construct a mix use project including an 8-10  
483 story hotel building with approximately 210 rooms. Adjacent would be a 14 story, 225 sf apartment  
484 building. She stated this was a two-year project before it came to town meeting. She stated it was a  
485 memorandum of agreement with various conditions. An overly district was adopted. A design  
486 advisory team was appointed. They are now going through design review with the planning board.  
487 On June 18, 2020, the Commission determined the garage was significant. The demolition stay  
488 expired December 18, 2021. They are asking for a one-year extension until June 18 2024 to line up  
489 everything that is involved with taking the buildings down. She stated it is a complex site in the  
490 dense area of Coolidge Corner. She didn't feel the current deadline was feasible with the amount of  
491 work to be done.

492

493 Mr. Andy Martineau stated the utilities have been a focus as they continue to work with the DPW,  
494 and want to make sure when they cut and cap them, there is no affect to the abutters. He stated there  
495 is an abatement contractor lined up. He stated the project has taken longer than anticipated, and they  
496 want to get everything right in terms of managing construction, demolition and utilities.

497

498 **Public Comment**

499

500 None

501

502 **Commission Comment**

503

504 Ms. Armstrong asked if they extended a demolition permit before.

505

506 Discussion ensued over the applicant needing more time.

507

508 Mr. Panciera asked if there was a hazard mitigation package, and Mr. Martineau affirmed there was.

509

510 Ms. Gilbert discussed the lack of safety of these buildings.

511

512 Mr. Collins stated at 40 Center Street the town voted to extend the demo permit for 2 years.

513

514 Mr. King made a motion to allow the extension, but that there is a good reason for allowances to  
515 expire. Therefore, they should qualify that due to the scope, complexity and covid, the commission  
516 will allow this exception for the extension of the demolition permit. Ms. Armstrong seconded the  
517 motion.

518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527

David Jack- yes, Elton Elperin- yes, David King- yes, Richard Panciera-yes, Elizabeth Armstrong-yes, John Spiers-yes

Mr. Jack concluded the meeting at 9:50 PM.