

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

*Brookline Preservation Commission*  
**MINUTES OF THE June 26, 2019 MEETING**  
**Brookline Town Hall, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Hearing Room, 333 Washington Street**

6 **Commissioners Present**

7 David King, Chair  
8 Elton Elperin, Vice Chair  
9 David Jack  
10 Richard Panciera

**Commissioners Absent:**

Peter Kleiner  
Jim Batchelor  
Wendy Ecker  
Elizabeth Armstrong

11  
12 **Staff:** Valerie Birmingham, Lara Kritzer  
13 **Members of the Public:** See list  
14

---

15  
16 Mr. King called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.  
17

18 **Approval of Minutes**

19  
20 The Commission did not have minutes to review.  
21

22 **Public Comment** (for items not on the agenda)

23  
24 No public comment.  
25

26 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

27  
28 **60 Glen Road (Pill Hill LHD) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install**  
29 **brick infill on wall openings beside either side of the front entrance and attach new limestone**  
30 **benches over ventilation grates (Olmsted Park Condominiums, applicant).**

31  
32 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.  
33

34 Braxton Bass, Bass Restoration & Waterproofing, Inc. discussed the overall project that is  
35 underway at 60 Glen Road, as well as the need for the current proposal to help with site drainage  
36 issues.  
37

38 Mr. Panciera asked if the proposal included both sides of the entrance. Mr. Bass answered that it  
39 would only be on the left side where the louvers are. Mr. Bass further explained that the hatch  
40 opens into an 8x8 vault.  
41

42 Mr. King asked if there were any drawn elevations. Mr. Bass replied that he did not have  
43 elevations, and that he only had the plans, photographs and aerial views to explain the proposal.  
44 Mr. Elperin stated that it was difficult to understand the proposal without elevations. Mr. Bass  
45 explained that the proposed limestone bench would be cut to match the building, and would be  
46 anchored into the building as much as necessary. Mr. Elperin remarked that it was a clever solution  
47 but that he would still like to have a visual.

48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95

Mr. King asked if there was a ventilation requirement. The Commissioners and Mr. Bass discussed the existing transformer, vault and vents.

Mr. Bass stated that there was another bench option which would include granite with three legs. This option would not require the building infill nor would it be anchored to the building as it would be set slightly further from the building. Mr. Bass further explained that the louvers are intended to be hidden below the bench. The Commissioners discussed the two options. Mr. Panciera suggested adding a wrought iron grate over the louvers.

Mr. Elperin stated that he felt the asymmetry of it not being on both sides of the entrance would look odd. Mr. Bass agreed but stated that they had hoped using limestone for material to blend would help. Mr. King remarked that the proposal had no relation to the façade.

Mr. Jack asked about the second option. Mr. Bass further explained the proposal. Mr. King asked about the existing and proposed drainage. Mr. Bass answered that there was a sump pump that pulls out into a catch basin. Mr. Panciera asked about the existing openings. Mr. Bass replied that it was NSTAR's vault.

Mr. Panciera remarked that it would be better if the portion of the building was not infilled with brick, and that he preferred the alternate option. Additionally, Mr. Panciera stated that if the stone would be penetrated that the applicant should organize it so that the fastener goes into the mortar joint.

Mr. Elperin stated that there should be an elevation provided that encompasses the entire area. Mr. King further remarked that the elevation should show the relation to all of the elements on the building.

Mr. Elperin made a motion to continue the application to an empowered subcommittee, and that the applicant would provide the subcommittee an elevation of the entire front façade noting all of the elements. The subcommittee would consist of Mr. Elperin and Mr. Panciera.

The Commission VOTED: 4-0-0  
4 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting

**32 Allerton Street (Pill Hill LHD) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish an existing shed, replacing it with a new shed relocated to the rear yard, and construct a patio at grade in the side yard, removing the existing fence at the entrance to the side yard and replacing it with a 45” fence to match existing, but extending to meet the fence at the west property line (Charles Ring, applicant).**

Ms. Kritzer presented the case.

Corrine and Charlie Ring, homeowners, explained that they had put a lot of thought into the proposal, and wanted it to fit in with the neighborhood. Additionally, Mr. and Ms. Ring commented that the proposed new shed would not be visible from a public right of way.

Mr. Panciera asked if there was a cupola. Mr. Ring stated that there was not.

96  
97 Mr. King asked about the fence. Mr. Ring stated that the fence would be replaced in kind.  
98

99 Mr. Elperin made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.  
100

101 The Commission VOTED: 4-0-0  
102 4 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting.  
103

104 **16 Prescott Street (Cottage Farm LHD – continued hearing) – Application for a Certificate of**  
105 **Appropriateness to remove an existing mid-twentieth century addition to the house, construct**  
106 **a new addition to the rear façade, construct a new addition and side entrance in place of the**  
107 **existing entrance porch on the left façade, replace existing steel windows, install new windows**  
108 **and window openings in the existing masonry, and remove existing skylights and a corner**  
109 **chimney (Miquel and Laura de Icaza, applicant).**  
110

111 Ms. Kritzer read the case report.  
112

113 Kyle Sheffield, LDA Architects, remarked that they were not proposing railings at this time for  
114 new basement access on the right side elevation. Mr. Elperin asked if that met building code. Mr.  
115 Sheffield answered that with proper vegetation it was.  
116

117 Mr. Sheffield stated that they have tentatively selected Hopes windows, and went over the reasons  
118 for the selection. Mr. Sheffield explained to the Commission how the team was proceeding with the  
119 windows. Further, Mr. Sheffield stated that his team was working on the proposed slate roof and  
120 copper downspout collector boxes replacements.  
121

122 Mr. Elperin stated that the subcommittee was pleased with the fenestration changes from the first  
123 proposal. Mr. Sheffield further explained the interior changes made to alter the proposed rear  
124 fenestration to be more aligned with the Commission's comments.  
125

126 Mr. Sheffield stated that the preservation of the limestone is paramount, and that sections will need  
127 to be replaced as part of the window removal process due to the detrimental effect that the windows  
128 have had on the stone themselves.  
129

130 There was no public comment.  
131

132 Mr. Sheffield stated that he had gotten in contact with a representative from Crittall Windows, and  
133 been told that Crittall Windows are not thermally broken; further, Mr. Sheffield stated that he had  
134 reached out to an additional company but found the detailing of the windows to be not appropriate.  
135 Mr. Sheffield commented that a thermally broken and insulated glaze window that maintains the  
136 same site lines is critical. Further, Mr. Sheffield commented that it is difficult to have a storm  
137 window with a casement window as it needs to be on the exterior; additionally, Mr. Sheffield stated  
138 it was important not to create a double shadow line through the glazing with the insulated glass and  
139 lead coming. Mr. Sheffield showed the Commission a sample of the lead coming from Hopes  
140 Windows and described that the width of the coming had been reduced to match the existing;  
141 further that the sample showed the puddle soldered where two pieces of coming overlap, and the  
142 spacer bars matching the lead coming color as best as possible. Additionally, Mr. Sheffield  
143 described that Hopes Windows is able to fasten to the wood structure on the interior instead of the

144 limestone and wet glaze the window to the limestone opening. Further, Mr. Sheffield explained the  
145 intensity of the work to the stone surround mullions.

146  
147 Mr. King asked if the house was going to be insulated. Mr. Sheffield replied that it was and  
148 explained the plan.

149  
150 Mr. Elperin commented that to simulate the look of lead it might be best not to have the spacer  
151 bars. Further, Mr. Elperin stated that the Commission was seeing a large amount of distortion with  
152 the sample glass, and that it was a problem.

153  
154 Mr. Panciera stated that the Commission should be careful as to not set a precedent for future  
155 projects, and that this topic has created a struggle for Historic Preservationists.

156  
157 Mr. Sheffield remarked about the issues experienced at 26 Chilton Street.

158  
159 Mr. Elperin remarked about his concerns about the sample provided and how the glass was bowed  
160 out. Mr. Sheffield replied that it could be an error with the sample. The Commissioners discussed  
161 the option of the removal of the spacer bars as well as the possibility on an option with the  
162 installation of a grid on the backside of the outside portion; further Mr. Panciera commented that  
163 the longevity of that option was unknown at this time. Mr. Panciera further described an example  
164 of window done in that manner and the pros and cons to it. The Commission and Mr. Sheffield  
165 further discussed the proposed windows and different approaches. Mr. Panciera remarked that the  
166 Commission should consider if new steel windows should be allowed to be used at all, as it goes  
167 against the Design Guidelines for Local Historic Districts. Mr. Sheffield stated that the existing  
168 windows were covered in asbestos. Further, Mr. Sheffield commented that the issue in regards to  
169 the repair and replacement of historic steel windows is one that many Commissions will face, and  
170 that they do now want to be a guinea pig; additionally, Mr. Sheffield remarked that from the  
171 beginning of the project their team has attempted to maintain transparency with the Commission  
172 while dealing with the issues at hand with the windows.

173  
174 Mr. King asked how the subcommittee felt about the rest of the project. Mr. Elperin remarked that  
175 the subcommittee was pleased with all of the work aside from the issue of the windows. Mr.  
176 Elperin continued to state that he was sympathetic to the current window issue and that a  
177 tremendous effort has been made to preserve the architecture. The Commissioners further  
178 discussed the issue of the windows and how to proceed.

179  
180 Mr. King made a motion to approve the application as submitted except for the windows; the  
181 windows were to be discussed by an empowered subcommittee and requested that the applicant  
182 provide the subcommittee with samples, photographs and addresses that could be visited. The  
183 subcommittee would consist of Mr. Elperin, Mr. Panciera, and Ms. Ecker. Mr. Elperin seconded  
184 the motion.

185  
186 The Commission VOTED: 4-0-0  
187 4 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting.

188  
189

190 **14 Allerton Street (Pill Hill LHD) – Application for a Retroactive Certificate of**  
191 **Appropriateness to install a cupola and copper weathervane on top of the detached shed**  
192 **(Christopher Wilmott, applicant).**  
193

194 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.

195  
196 Christopher Wilmott, homeowner, stated that he had told the Commissioners about the proposed  
197 cupola at a previous hearing. Mr. Wilmott asked if he could keep the cupola and remove the  
198 weathervane as a compromise, and stated that there would be a large statement tree planted in the  
199 front yard.  
200

201 Mr. Elperin stated that he preferred the shed without the cupola and the weathervane. Further, Mr.  
202 Elperin remarked that he felt less was more as the house is highly decorative and should not be  
203 competing with accessory buildings. Mr. Panciera and Mr. King agreed.  
204

205 Mr. King made a motion to deny the retroactive application. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.  
206

207 The Commission VOTED: 4-0-0  
208 4 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting.  
209

210 Mr. Wilmott asked if applications were typically heard without the applicant present. Mr. King  
211 stated that a previous application could not be discussed as it was not on the agenda. Mr. Wilmott  
212 asked if the vent on the side of the garage could remain temporarily until he had a different plan to  
213 present to the Commission. Mr. King restated that they could not comment on an item not on the  
214 agenda.  
215

216 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**  
217

218 **St. Paul Gardens (50-54 Alton Place, 70-72, 74, 76-78, 80-82, 84-86 St. Paul Street) –**  
219 **Application for the partial demolition of the apartment buildings (Chestnut Hill Realty,**  
220 **applicant).**  
221

222 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.  
223

224 Susan Cohen, an abutter, remarked that she had concerns about future development.  
225

226 Mr. Elperin commented that there was no reason to contradict the Commission’s previous  
227 determination of significance.  
228

229 Mr. Elperin made a motion to uphold the staff determination of significance for St. Paul  
230 Gardens (50-54 Alton Place, 70-72, 74, 76-78, 80-82, 84-86 St. Paul Street) and issue an eighteen  
231 month stay of demolition through December 26, 2020. Mr. Jack seconded the motion.  
232

233 The Commission VOTED: 4-0-0  
234 4 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting  
235

236 The meeting adjourned.