

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

Brookline Preservation Commission
MINUTES OF THE April 12, 2022 MEETING
Held Virtually using Zoom Online Software

Commissioners Present:

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

Commissioners Absent:

Peter Kleiner
John Spiers, Alternate
Alex Villanueva, Alternate

Staff: Tina McCarthy, Jake Collins

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

Ms. Armstrong agreed to vote for Mr. Kleiner.

Approval of Minutes

3/8/2022

Mr. Elperin- line 257, my intention was the tradition of change for this home *could* be continued.

Ms. Armstrong- Line 94, 133, 178, 202, 246 & 267, use moved instead of motioned. Line 50, no caps on HE. Line 82, PT should be spelled out. Pressure Treated. 144 West no caps, 166 spell out PR, preservation restriction.

Mr. Jack- Line 87, strike “shadow” and substitute “outline” of original rail. Line 88 strike “behind” for “above”.

Mr. King- Line 238 should read “expressed an aversion”. Line 241 should read “Mr. Batchelor agreed with removing the new proposed dormer”.

Mr. Elperin- Clarified that in line 241, he was not advocating to remove existing dormers.

Mr. Elperin moved to approve the minutes of 3/8/22 with the noted corrections. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

David King – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor- Yes, Elton Elperin – yes; Wendy Ecker- Yes

3/22/22

Ms. Armstrong noted that she did not see this set and did not review.

Mr. Elperin- line 238, requested that the statement be rephrased to read “pleased that it had been relocated, but wish it had been relocated further”.

46 Mr. King- Line 225, asked to add his statement that there were attached 3 car garages in the plan,
47 which are contrary to our guidelines. He clarified that rotating the building was not as important as his
48 overall reservations about design. He was Ok with rotating the building. (line 226)
49

50 Mr. Elperin- Moved to accept the minutes of 3/22/22 as amended. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.
51

52 David King – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – abstain, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim
53 Batchelor- Yes, Elton Elperin – yes; Wendy Ecker- Yes
54
55
56

57 **Public Comment:**
58

59 Mary Dewart spoke on behalf of the steering committee of the Brookline/Boston coalition to save Larz
60 Anderson Park. She explained that the Ice Rink Taskforce accepted a revised feasibility study focusing
61 on 50 million project with 2 full size rinks with parking at Larz Anderson Park. The revised version of
62 the study includes a proposal to construct only one rink. Voted to pass the study to the Parks &
63 Recreation Commission for approval. They will prepare a presentation and collaborate across
64 departments. They will prepare a Preservation Plan. Tonight, it is presented to the Parks Commission,
65 as a summary, no vote yet. Would you write a letter to the Parks Commission about this proposal?
66

67 Mr. Elperin- this sounds like a reasonable request. Asked for more details about the plan. The
68 Commission would like to review the materials and discuss at the next Preservation Hearing.
69

70 Peter Senopoulos- Explained that he is a Boston resident, across the street from the park. Current rink
71 is broken and requires repairs every year. The proposed year-round rink is the size of a Home Depot.
72 Cannot imagine a facility of that size in Larz Anderson Park. Process started last summer; report came
73 out at Christmas time with comments due on Christmas Eve. All the 50 comments were negative.
74

75 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**
76

77 **12 Worthington Road (Cottage Farm LHD)** –Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to
78 remove the existing central chimney and rebuild it with a single layer brick veneer and structural
79 support on the interior; remove the chimney on the west elevation and rebuild it with a cavity wall
80 and single layer brick veneer; replace the existing slate roof with a new slate roof with larger tiles;
81 fully reconstruct the brick wall of the home as needed (Zero Energy Design, applicant). **Precinct 1**
82

83 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.
84

85 Matt Genaze (architect) explained that the special permit for the addition was unanimously
86 approved at the Planning Board, and they thanked the Preservation Commission for their work on
87 the design. Replacement brick has been recommended for the rebuild. The contractor will produce
88 mockups for your review, of brick and mortar. The maroon color on the elevation drawings shows
89 full wall rebuild areas. He added that the redrawn elevations did reflect the size change for the
90 proposed slate.
91

92 No public comment.
93

94 Commission Comments:
95 Mr. Elperin asked if the walls were brick bearing or veneer for the house. Mr. Genaze responded
96 that they were mass masonry bearing walls. The walls have bearing construction as well. The walls
97 will be replicated as full bearing walls. The chimneys are the only single layer area. Mr. Elperin
98 asked why the bricks can't be reused. Mr. Genaze explained that there was extreme cost associated
99 with cleaning the bricks for reuse. Risk of interior bricks getting mixed up and used in the exterior
100 wythe.

101
102 Ms. Ecker expressed surprise at the size of the sample tiles. Mr. Genaze explained that the
103 proposed size was the only in-stock size available. Custom order is possible, but it is a 53% cost
104 increase, both material and labor. Mr. King stated that Vermont slate is standard 12" wide. Mr.
105 Elperin clarified that the tiles would be increased from 8x11 to 12x18 inches. Mr. Genaze
106 confirmed, adding that the proposed reveal increases from 4.5", to 7.5". Mr. Elperin agreed with
107 previous comments, the reveal is too large. Stephanie Horowitz (architect) offered to check with
108 different suppliers, but stated that two roofers have identified the proposed slate as the best match.
109

110 Mr. Elperin returned the discussion to the issue of reusing the brick, and stated that the cost of
111 cleaning the brick depends on the mortar. The described mortar should be easier to clean. He
112 suggested that the masons hired to do the work should have enough experience to sort interior from
113 exterior brick, regardless of the age of the bricks. He doubted that the associated costs would
114 outweigh the cost of purchasing entirely new brick. Mr. Panciera expressed concern about the
115 appearance of the brick, emphasizing the importance of a good match.
116

117 Mr. Elperin asked about chimney rebuilds. Mr. Genaze responded that the side chimney may be
118 rebuilt in kind and mentioned that they had taken staff's advice that the veneer must be at least one
119 full brick width. Mr. Elperin asked if they would reuse the stone elements. Mr. Genaze confirmed
120 the intention to replicate the stone cap with a monolith stone cap, no holes for pipes. The other
121 stones could be reused or replaced in-kind as needed.
122

123 Mr. Elperin noted the lack of visible cracks on the exterior brick walls. Ms. Horowitz explained
124 that the mortar had completely washed out. The client would rather not rebuild the wall; 2
125 consultants have recommended this.
126

127 Mr. Kleiner joined the meeting.
128

129 Mr. Batchelor asked if the wall area without the maroon color was staying the same? Mr. Genaze
130 replied that it was. Mr. Batchelor stated that the rebuilt brick must match well, to integrate with the
131 existing. He shared his experience of difficulty getting a new brick to match the look and texture
132 of a weathered brick.
133

134 Mr. King stated that this project is a real labor of love, and if the Commission can help in any way
135 they should. There are not a lot of other options. He expressed support for a subcommittee to
136 work with the architects to try to solve this.
137

138 Mr. Kleiner asked if the current central chimney had been previously rebuilt and spoke about the
139 brick type. Mr. Ganaze explained that the General Contractor had sourced bricks from the same
140 foundry that these bricks were made from.
141

142 The Commission held further discussion of the slate.
143
144 Ms. Horowitz expressed intention to work with the subcommittee but requested an empowered
145 subcommittee and asked for a final decision on the slate. Mr. King stated that he was ok with the
146 slate. Ms. Ecker thought it would change the character of the house.
147
148 Mr. Elperin moved to approve the proposed slate. Mr.King seconded the motion.
149
150 David King – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – no, Jim Batchelor-
151 Yes, Elton Elperin – yes; Wendy Ecker- No. The motion passed.
152
153 Mr. Elperin moved to form an empowered subcommittee to complete the brick review for the walls
154 and chimneys. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.
155
156 David King – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim
157 Batchelor- Yes, Elton Elperin – yes; Wendy Ecker- Yes
158
159 Mr. Panciera and Mr. Kleiner agreed to serve on the subcommittee.
160
161 Ms. Horowitz asked for clarity on the chimney reconstruction decisions.
162
163 Mr. Jack moved to accept proposal to rebuild the chimneys with single layer brick veneer,
164 including the reuse of the stone on the side if possible. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.
165
166 David King – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim
167 Batchelor- Yes, Elton Elperin – yes; Wendy Ecker- Yes
168
169
170 **59 Crowninshield Road (Crowninshield LHD)** –Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness
171 to install a granite step on the front porch and install exterior lighting (Kristin Ruano, applicant).
172 **Precinct 2**
173
174 Mr. Collins presented the case.
175
176 Kristen Ruano, landscape designer, explained the reasons for the lighting request. The bullet lights
177 will be installed at a 20-degree angle, so lighting 3.5’ up on the house. She stated that the concrete
178 step is in disrepair and the client prefers granite.
179
180 No public comment.
181
182 Commission Comments:
183
184 Mr. Jack asked for more information on the granite step. Ms. Ruano explained that it would be a
185 solid, smooth finish slab with sand finish.
186
187 Mr. King stated that he supported the proposal except for the up-lights. Mr. Elperin agreed. Mr.
188 Kleiner asked for more information about the case history of lighting regulation but had no
189 objection to the stair proposal.

190
191 Mr. King moved to accept the application with the exception of the up-lights, which were denied.
192 Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.
193 Mr. King- yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes,
194 Elton Elperin – yes, Peter Kleiner- yes.

195
196
197
198
199 **26 Circuit Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD)** –Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to
200 install aluminum downspouts (Carla Benka & Richard Benka, applicants). **Precinct 14**

201
202 Mr. Colins presented the case.
203
204 Richard Benka, owner, spoke about reasons for the replacement. Judy Selwin confirmed the
205 difficulty of painting galvanized steel. The white paint of the aluminum is applied in
206 manufacturing and will not peel.

207
208 No public comment.

209
210 Mr. Panciera stated that the reasoning for this proposal seemed similar to allowing fiberglass
211 gutters. The reasons are practical, but he recalled that the Commission had denied aluminum
212 downspouts in the past. He thought perhaps an exception could be made in this case due to the
213 proposed matching the profile of the existing downspouts. Mr. Jack supported the idea of an
214 exception.

215
216 Mr. Elperin stated that most homes in the neighborhood do use copper downspouts and they are not
217 painted. Mr. Benka expressed concern about using copper given the style and light color of his
218 house. He had no evidence to support the idea that copper had ever been installed on this house.

219
220 Mr. Batchelor agreed that it is difficult to paint galvanized but suggested that galvanized unpainted
221 was a good match for the house. He objected to allowing the downspouts for the reason that they
222 are a high quality aluminum downspout. Mr. Elperin agreed with this objection.

223
224 Mr. Benka stated that the proposed is a perfect profile match to what exists, which would not be the
225 case if you had copper or any other kind. They will be indistinguishable except they will hold
226 paint.

227
228 Mr. King noted that the Benkas originally presented the first test case for fiberglass gutters. Now
229 the Commission accepts them; this change to our guidelines was an improvement. He expressed
230 concern that allowing these aluminum downspouts would allow many others to put up aluminum.
231 You could put up copper, which we allow.

232
233 Public Comment:

234
235 Judy Selwyn- Suggested that classifying materials as good and bad is problematic. At the turn of
236 the century zinc, galvanized or tin metals were used, not copper. Rain leaders are prone to wearing
237 out and are worth making exceptions for.

238
239 Mr. Jack moved to accept the proposal as submitted. Mr. Panciera seconded the motion.
240
241
242 Mr. King- no, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes,
243 Elton Elperin – no, Mr. Kleiner- yes
244
245 Motion passed.
246
247 **135 Crafts Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD)** –Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to
248 construct an addition to the rear and replace all windows and doors on the rear elevation; modify the
249 side and front entrances; reposition the fence and trellis on the left side of the house; replace the
250 garage doors with a single door and new canopy (Anabelle Skalleberg, applicant). **Precinct 13**
251
252 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.
253
254 Atle Skalleberg, owner, explained the reasoning for the application. Previous owners had a child in
255 a wheelchair, and they modified the house at the front and rear. The elevator is at the rear with no
256 stairs to the basement. They installed a circular drive at the front. The new rear addition allows
257 stair access to the basement. Just want to invest in the home and make it more livable. Revised the
258 garage door as requested.
259
260 John Chapman, architect, explained the intention to replace windows in-kind, many of the existing
261 are Pella. The window in the front can be restored. The current windows at the rear are Pella clad
262 windows.
263
264 No public comment.
265
266 Discussion of windows:
267
268 Mr. Elperin explained that when he visited the site he could only see the 2nd floor from the rear,
269 partially visible. Ms. McCarthy confirmed that no permit was found for the rear replacement
270 windows, either in the LHD or building files.
271
272 Mr. Elperin thought that the main issue was the right elevation, the directly visible windows.
273 Mr. Kleiner noted that the muntin pattern was also changing.
274
275 Mr. Batchelor recalled a recent subcommittee that discussed windows in depth. This subcommittee
276 concluded that front and side facades that are directly visible from the street should meet the
277 standards of the Guidelines, keeping the original materials and arrangement. For minimally visible
278 areas, such as the rear, the subcommittee was considerably more flexible. He felt that similar logic
279 should be followed in this case. He stated that the front 2nd floor window on the right elevation
280 should be kept. Mr. Panciera agreed with this suggestion.
281
282 Mr. Elperin thought that the addition could have wood, insulated glass. Mr. King agreed that
283 approach was appropriate in an addition, not the main body of the house. Commissioners
284 discussed the proposed rearrangement of the windows on the right elevation. Mr. Elperin found the
285 changes to be acceptable. Mr. Panciera agreed that it was not damaging to historic appearance.

286 Mr. Batchelor stated that he was comfortable with the proposal, as the addition itself blocked
287 visibility. Mr. Kliener asked about the muntin arrangements. He observed that the existing
288 condition was 8/8 and the proposed 6 or 4 over 1 changed the character. Mr. Elperin felt muntins
289 on the lower sash were not necessary. Mr. Kleiner explained that the primary elevations of the
290 home should make sense and for consistency should maintain the lights on the bottom sash. He
291 added that this was not important at the rear or on the addition portions. Mr. Panceria agreed.
292

293 Mr. Chapman pointed out that the existing right side of the house was an addition, as well as the
294 existing porch.
295

296 Mr. Elperin moved to accept proposal regarding windows with the exception of the front and right
297 elevation windows. These were approved with the following revisions: front windows and the top
298 left window on the right elevation are to be preserved. Two new windows on the 2nd floor on the
299 right elevation together with the first floor windows on this elevation would be wood thermal
300 glazed. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.
301

302 David King- yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Elton Elperin – yes,
303 Peter Kleiner- yes.
304

305 Wendy Ecker left the meeting.
306

307 Discussion of new front entry:
308

309 Mr. Elperin stated that generally we don't allow this. Should keep the historic entry. Mr. Kleiner
310 agreed. Mr. Chapman requested to keep the new front step, to be rebuilt like the original due to
311 relocation of driveway & regrading of the yard.
312

313 Mr. Kleiner moved to deny the proposed modifications to the entrance portico but allow the stoop
314 to be restored to the prior condition. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.
315

315 Ms. Armstrong agreed to vote for Ms. Ecker.
316

317 Mr. King- yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong –
318 yes, Elton Elperin – yes, Peter Kleiner- yes.
319

320 Discussion of additions:
321

322 Mr. Elperin spoke about the minimal visibility to the rear. He had no objections to the changes but
323 asked about the disappearing chimney on the plans. The architect explained that it was an existing
324 gas fireplace. Mr. Panciera asked about the setback of the proposed mudroom from the façade. He
325 asked if the setback could be increased and the Architect agreed that it was possible.
326

327 Mr. Panciera moved to accept the rear as proposed and right side addition with the condition that
328 the setback from the façade be a minimum of 12". Doors should be wood, glazing insulated. Mr.
329 Elperin seconded the motion.
330

331 David King- yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Elizabeth Amstrong–
332 yes, Elton Elperin – yes, Peter Kleiner- yes.
333

334 Applicant agreed to the changes and will submit revised plans to staff.

335

336 Discussion of garage:

337

338 Mr. Jack stated that the canopy was too elaborate. He asked that it be redesigned to be simpler. Mr.

339 Panciera agreed and supported the revised garage door proposal.

340 Mr. Chapman asked if the bracket were eliminated and the copper roof changed to an asphalt roof with

341 shingles would the proposal be acceptable. Mr. Batchelor asked that there be review of the new

342 design. Mr. Chapman agreed to work with a subcommittee.

343

344 Mr. Batchelor moved to accept the garage doors as submitted and the idea of a canopy with no

345 brackets; he referred the details of the materials and design to an empowered subcommittee of one.

346

347 Mr. King- yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong –

348 yes, Elton Elperin – yes, Peter Kleiner- yes.

349

350 Mr. Panciera agreed to serve as the subcommittee of one.

351

352

353

354

355 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**

356

357 **128 Clinton Street**- –Application for the partial demolition of the house (Timothy Burke, applicant).

358 **Precinct 12**

359 **please note the Commission will only be discussing the existing structures and will not be reviewing*

360 *plans at this meeting*

361

362 Mr. Collins presented the case.

363

364 Lauren Van Allen, owner, introduced themselves. Ms. Gilbert explained that the application is for

365 partial demolition and agreed that the house is significant.

366

367 No public comment.

368

369 Mr. Jack agreed with Ms. Gilbert. He moved to find the home significant. Mr. Kleiner seconded

370 the motion.

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

372 Elperin – yes, Peter Kleiner- yes.

373

374 **123 Fuller Street** –Application for the full demolition of the house (123 Fuller Street LLC,

375 applicant). **Precinct 8**

376 **please note the Commission will only be discussing the existing structures and will not be reviewing*

377 *plans at this meeting*

378

379 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.

380

381 Lev Matskevich, developer, explained the intention to convert the home to a two family and stated
382 that this made it impossible to save the existing home. Commissioners expressed support for
383 converting to a two family.
384

385 Public Comment:

386
387 Michael Sher- resident across street in one of the homes built by Charles Jones. Green house next
388 door to ours was converted from single to two family. The project was great for the neighborhood.
389 He expressed hope that a way could be found to preserve and convert the home.
390

391 Julia Rotow- Resident at 147 Fuller St. Supported conversion while preserving the existing
392 architecture.
393

394 Alisa Plazonja- Resident on Naples Street. Stated that this application was the third demo in a very
395 short period of time in the neighborhood. Same story for all, a developer looking for return on
396 investment. She expressed frustration that the Commission had spent 3 hours on excruciating
397 details of preservation for other homes while this house would be completely razed.
398

399 Mari Bentley- Spoke on behalf of the residents of 127 Fuller Street, a 3 family. The neighbors
400 would like the existing trees to be preserved.
401

402 Commission comments:

403
404 Mr. Batchelor found the home significant. He hoped the developer would consider preservation.
405 Moved to accept the staff finding of significance. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.
406

407 David King- yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Jim Batchelor – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong
408 – yes, Elton Elperin – yes, Peter Kleiner- yes.
409

410
411
412
413

414 Meeting adjourned 10:04