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

Approval of Minutes

There were no minutes for the Commission to review.

Public Comment (for items not on the agenda)

No public comment.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS

261 Walnut Street (Pill Hill LHD) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install vents, sprinklers and fire beacons. (Patrick Mcdevitt, applicant).

Ms. McCarthy presented the case report.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Elperin asked for clarification about the specifications and dimensions of the proposal. Ben Atlas, Gable Studio, remarked that they were only doing what was required by code and that they had tried to minimize required exterior changes.

Ms. Ecker inquired about the sprinklers on the balcony. Mr. Atlas stated that the sprinklers would protect the balcony, and that they were required by code. Mr. Panciera asked if the piping for the sprinkler head could be painted. Mr. Atlas remarked that was possible.
Mr. Jack thanked the applicant for working with staff, and looking for compromises. Mr. Jack asked if the roof vents would be painted. Mr. Atlas stated that they could do that. Jaime McDevitt, owner, remarked that they could paint the vents to match the color of the roof.

Mr. Elperin moved to approve the application as submitted with the requirement that the piping and vents be painted. Mr. Jack seconded the motion. The Commission voted all in favor.

92 High Street (Pill Hill LHD) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a 48” high fence around rear property perimeter to serve as a dog enclosure. (Rebecca Locke, applicant).

Ms. McCarthy presented the case report.

There was no public comment.

Rebecca Locke, owner, remarked that the photograph presented was not as polished as what was actually proposed, and that the goal of the photograph was to show how invisible the fence is. Ms. Locke continued to explain that the proposed fence is more refined and ornate.

Ms. Ecker asked if the fence would accomplish the owner’s goal of keeping in the owner’s dog. Ms. Locke answered that it would.

Mr. King asked how the mesh would be attached to the post. Dominic Sousa, contractor for the proposal, answered how he intended to accomplish the proposal.

Mr. King remarked that it was an unorthodox fence in a local historic district, and that the idea of the fence could be nice but he wanted to see it more developed.

The Commission discussed the posts and if a subcommittee should be set up to review details. Mr. Elperin asked that the posts be somewhat more formal than the 4’x4’s shown; and suggested that they could be wood, shaped with some minimal design, or even steel. Mr. Jack remarked that more developed drawings were needed and commented on the design of the posts.

Ms. Locke commented that her family adored the house, and that the idea of the fence was to have it be invisible so that it did not compete with the house. Ms. Locke continued to state that her neighbors also wanted the fence to appear invisible.

Mr. Kleiner commented that he was reluctant to overthink the design of the fence, and that he would not characterize the proposal as a modern fence.

Mr. King moved to continue the application to an empowered subcommittee. Mr. Jack seconded the motion. The empowered subcommittee would consist of Mr. Jack and Mr. Panciera. The Commission voted, six in favor and one abstention.

62 Circuit Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the front steps (Jonathan Cluett, applicant).

Ms. Birmingham presented the case report.
There was no public comment.

Mr. Elperin asked about the bottom piece. Jonathan Cluett, owner, remarked that it would be stone to match the walkway. Mr. Elperin commented that the proposal seemed appropriate, but asked if more detailed drawings were necessary.

Mr. King remarked that he had no objection to the proposal and a more detailed drawing could be reviewed by staff if the Commission agreed.

Mr. Panciera moved to approve the application with a final drawing to be submitted and reviewed by staff. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion. The Commission voted all in favor.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION

111 Jordan Road – Application for the partial demolition of the house (Charles Silbert, applicant).

Ms. Birmingham presented the case report.

There was no public comment.

Charles Silbert, owner, remarked that he did not consider the structure to be a significant example of the Tudor Revival style. Mr. Silbert commented on the architecture and details of the house and garage.

Mr. King remarked that the design was a little Disney, but what was significant was that the street is comprised of brick houses of a similar scale. Mr. Jack agreed, and remarked that he thought the house was significant because of its context. Mr. Elperin also agreed, but stated that he sympathized with the owner. Mr. Kleiner remarked that as a resident of Jordan Road, the house was characteristic of many on the street which have been maintained.

Mr. Kleiner moved to uphold staff’s initial determination of significance and implement a one year stay of demolition which would expire on May 13, 2021. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion. The Commission voted all in favor.

31 Stetson Street – Application for the partial demolition of the house (Chadi Kawkabani, applicant).

Ms. McCarthy presented the case report.

There was no public comment.

Barath Sankaran, owner, remarked that he and his wife love the neighborhood and that their goal was to remain in their home and create a more livable space. Mr. Elperin commented that the Commission could not discuss the proposal at this time.

Ms. Ecker stated that she was familiar with the street, and that the house blended in nicely.
Mr. Jack remarked that he agreed, and that the structure was constructed as a group of middle class housing; further Mr. Jack stated he could understand why the owner loved the structure.

Chadi Kawkabani, stated that he lives on Stetson Street and commented there are structures on the street that are multistory and multi-unit, and that not all are single and two family structures.

Mr. Jack stated that the street was fragile, and that poorly done renovations had been constructed in the past and he would like to make sure that future changes are sensitive to the street. Mr. Sankaran remarked that he was as vested as possible to ensure the proposal would be done as quickly and best as possible.

Mr. King moved to uphold staff’s initial determination of significance and implement a one year stay of demolition which would expire on May 13, 2020. Mr. Jack seconded the motion. The Commission voted all in favor.

NEW BUSINESS AND UPDATES

There was no new business at this time.

The meeting was adjourned.