

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

Brookline Preservation Commission
MINUTES OF THE JULY 09, 2019 MEETING
Brookline Town Hall, 5th Floor Hearing Room, 333 Washington Street

6 **Commissioners Present**

7 David King, Chair
8 Elton Elperin, Vice Chair
9 Jim Batchelor
10 David Jack
11 Richard Panciera
12 Wendy Ecker

Commissioners Absent:

Elizabeth Armstrong
Peter Kleiner

14 **Staff:** Valerie Birmingham, Lara Kritzer, Tina McCarthy

15 **Members of the Public:** See list

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

19
20 **Approval of Minutes**

21
22 Mr. King introduced minutes to be approved, beginning the discussion with April 23rd.

23
24 Mr. Elperin questioned line 141, asked if it should read lense or light and suggests that line 309
25 be changed to “that they are visible”.

26
27 Mr. Elperin moved to accept with change.

28
29 Ms. Ecker seconded the motion.

30
31 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

32
33 Mr. King introduced minutes from May 14th.

34
35 Mr. Elperin requested line 114 be changed to “Mr. Elperin”.

36
37 Mr. Elperin moved to accept with change.

38
39 Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

40
41 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

42
43 Mr King introduced minutes from May 22nd. Stated that the writing is confusing, particularly
44 for the 11 Copley case.

46 Mr. Elperin stated that on line 315 he did not mean to say opposed to lighting other than the
47 trees. Clarified that it should read opposed to lighting the trees.

48
49 Ms. Eckert notes that line 220 does not fully express her discussion about differences between
50 Chestnut Hill and Cottage Farm.

51
52 Mr. King noted that in line 385, Mr. Elperin's comment is extreme.

53
54 Mr. Elperin stated that he will stand by it.

55
56 Mr. King moved to accept the minutes with changes.

57
58 Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.

59
60 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

61
62 **Public Comment** (for items not on the agenda)

63
64 There was no public comment at this time.

65
66

67 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

68
69 **20 Adams Street (Crowninshield LHD) – Application for a Retroactive Certificate of**
70 **Appropriateness to install a new 4'-6' cedar fence along the left side property line which**
71 **connects to the left side of the house. (Derek Wallace, applicant).**

72
73 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.

74
75 Mr. Wallace apologized for the company installing the fence without permission, stated that it
76 will not happen again. Explains that the fence is unpainted cedar.

77
78 Mr. Elperin noted that the fence is 6" higher than the 42" limit, which he feels is unfortunate
79 but not worth the cost of reducing the height.

80
81 Mr. King asked about openness requirements.

82
83 Ms. Birmingham clarified that this requirement is only in the front yard, which staff interpreted
84 as forward of the house.

85
86 Mr. Jack asked if the original fence to screen the AC condensers will remain.

87
88 Mr. Batchelor stated that they should stay screened, suggested that the motion clarify this.

89
90 Mr. Wallace states that the fences match and there are no plans to remove the one around the
91 AC.

92 Mr. Batchelor moved to accept the fence, with the clarification that this does not authorize the
93 removal of the fence around the AC.

94
95 Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

96
97 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

98
99 **61 Spooner Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD)–Application for a Certificate of**
100 **Appropriateness to construct an outdoor kitchen area in the rear yard including a grill,**
101 **soapstone water feature, fire pit and spa surrounded by a 48” high wood cedar fence**
102 **(Spooner Road Realty Trust, applicant).**

103
104 Ms. Jennifer Depazo Gilbert (lawyer) introduced herself, Lauren Bubela (architect) and Dr.
105 Jane Fogg (owner).

106
107 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.

108
109 Mr. Batchelor asked if the horizontal tape in the photo indicates the location and height in plan.

110
111 Ms. Birmingham responded that it did, showed on map where the view was from.

112
113 Mr. Batchelor asked if the adjacent vacant lot is buildable.

114
115 Ms. Depazo Gilbert explained that history of arson and litigation over this lot, and stated that
116 this is not a buildable lot in her opinion.

117
118 Ms. Depazo Gilbert stated that all the requests of the subcommittee were met. Showed the
119 Commission a sample of the proposed stone.

120
121 Mr. Elperin asked if this is for the backsplash.

122
123 Ms. Bubela (architect) clarified that it is and the bluestone cap has been removed.

124
125 Mr. King asked if the green lights on the lighting plan would be visible at the street.

126
127 Ms. Bubela stated that they will not, they are small and illuminate the ground.

128
129 Mr. Panciera asked about the placement of the spa lights.

130
131 Ms. Bubela clarified that they are located on the inside of the fence, for safety lighting.

132
133 Mr. Elperin asked about the placement of the lights on the cooker.

134
135 Ms. Bubela explained that they are on the interior of the kitchen, built into the stone
136 backsplash.

137

138 Ms. Eckert asks for an explanation of the circular pavement.
139
140 Ms. Bubela explained that this is a brick paver detail leading from the driveway to the side
141 entrance.
142
143 Mr. Elperin expressed appreciation for the removal of the bluestone cap. Stated that the
144 distance makes the counter visibility irrelevant. Reviewed heights of the water feature and the
145 counters. Expressed his preference for the option without the wood storage niches.
146
147 Ms. Depazo Gilbert stated that she does not believe these are visible.
148
149 Ms. Fogg expressed her desire to keep the fireplace area tidy, without a woodpile.
150
151 Mr. Batchelor states that the design is generally good, and that the wood niches should be
152 allowed as they are not visible and have a functional purpose.
153
154 Mr. King agreed with Mr. Batchelor.
155
156 Mr. Elperin stated that the applicant's response is what the subcommittee asked for and moved
157 to accept the designs as submitted.
158
159 Mr. Jack seconded the motion.
160
161 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.
162
163 **157 Ivy Road (Elvira Lang, applicant)—Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness**
164 **to replace the front entrance steps, install new cast iron railings and install new lighting**
165 **fixtures on either side of the front entrance.**
166
167 Elvira Lang (owner) introduces herself and the designer Elizabeth Cooke-King.
168
169 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.
170
171 Ms. Cooke-King explained that the stair risers will still be brick, salvaged from the original
172 stairs as much as possible.
173
174 Mr. Elperin expressed appreciation of the design. He asked for clarification on the detailing of
175 the railings.
176
177 Ms. Cooke-King provided additional railing specifications.
178
179 Mr. Elperin asked about the durability of brick at the interface with the sidewalk and suggested
180 that the stone might wear better.
181
182 Ms. Cooke-King explained her intention to keep the reference to the original brick, as it was so
183 important to the original design.

184 Mr. Elperin asks if the brick on the steps is cut into a rounded pattern as shown.
185
186 Ms. Cooke-King confirms this is correct.(57.25)
187
188 Mr. Elperin states that the lanterns are ok.
189
190 Mr. King points out the unusual choice of sandstone for the steps and walk.
191
192 Ms. Cooke-King explains that this particular type of sandstone is much harder than usual and a
193 warmer tone to match the keystones on the building, which was requested by the owner.
194
195 Mr. King moved to accept the application as submitted.
196
197 Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.
198
199 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.
200
201 **3 Spooner Road (Wolfram Goessling and Helle Sachse, applicants)—Application for a**
202 **Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate existing windows; install new windows,**
203 **skylights and doors; extend the dormers on north and south facades; and extend roof**
204 **overhang on east façade.**
205
206 Mr. Isamu Kanda introduces himself as the architect for the application.
207
208 Ms. Kritzer presented the case.
209
210 Mr. Jack asked if the gable end of the addition would be visible from the public way.
211
212 Ms. Kritzer clarified that it is partly visible, from a distance through vegetation.
213
214 Mr. Elperin asked if the AC units should be screened.
215
216 Ms. Kritzer reviews the site plan and AC visibility. States that it is unlikely to be visible, as it
217 is situated between the garage and a stone wall.
218
219 Mr. Elperin expresses concern over the east elevation design (rear ell).
220
221 Mr. King shared Mr. Elperin’s concern with the window placement and dimensions.
222
223 Mr. Kanda explained the restrictions on the interior, which were the reasons for the current
224 design.
225
226 Mr. Batchelor suggested that if the windows could be larger that would help, Mr. Panciera
227 agreed.
228
229 Mr. Kanda stated that the windows on the second floor could be widened.

230
231 Mr. Batchelor mentioned that the attic window on the north façade is very small.
232
233 Mr. Elperin pointed out that in the elevation drawings, the bottom windows appear larger and
234 look better.
235
236 Mr. King asked about the reason for the skylights.
237
238 Mr. Kanda explained that the interior is lined with bookshelves and there is a lack of light.
239
240 Mr. King expressed a preference for two windows.
241
242 Mr. Elperin stated that he has less aversion to skylights.
243
244 Mr. Batchelor states that in general the Commission discourages skylights as they change the
245 character of the home, but they are not as problematic on this building.
246
247 Ms. Eckert noted that the area became an LHD to prevent things like skylights.
248
249 Mr. King confirmed that the skylights are not visible from the front.
250
251 Mr. King opened discussion about the doors.
252
253 Mr. Elperin stated that the preference is for single glazed windows and asked about the plan for
254 energy panels on the casement windows.
255
256 Mr. Jack suggested interior storms.
257
258 Mr. Kanda agreed that they could be, but that the details would be worked out according to the
259 Commission's decision. He explained that the option presented is for casements with no
260 muntins, to minimize the appearance of the insulated glass.
261
262 Mr. Elperin states that he believes insulated glass should be allowed if there are no muntins, as
263 there is very little visible difference between double and single pane glass in that case (as they
264 are not in the front).
265
266 Mr. King stated that he does not agree and asked why these windows are casements.
267
268 Mr. Kanda explained that this side of the building was not that visible and wanted the design to
269 be as simple as possible.
270
271 Mr. Batchelor stated that the Commission rarely approves double glazed windows.
272
273 Mr. Elperin recalled that the Commission did approve them in Crowninshield, which he
274 opposed.
275

276 Mr. Batchelor expressed the need for consistency in decisions.

277

278 Mr. King noted that the approved windows were case specific.

279

280 Ms. Birmingham asked which address the Commissioners were referring to. No one present is
281 able to recall the address.

282

283 Mr. Batchelor suggested that double hung windows and storms is the best solution in this case,
284 that thermal pane casements is the wrong direction.

285

286 Mr. King reviewed the elements of the case and asked the Commissioners to give their
287 positions and any final comments.

288

289 Mr. Elperin moved to approve the application as submitted with the exception of the east
290 elevation windows, which should be changed from insulated glass casements to double hung,
291 single glazed windows.

292

293 Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

294

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

296

297 Ms. Kritzer asked if the Commission intended staff to review and approve the changes.

298

299 Mr. Elperin confirmed.

300

301

302 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**

303

304 **57 Toxteth Street – Request to lift the stay of partial demolition of the house (Frederick** 305 **Choumert, applicant).**

306

307 Ms. Birmingham reviewed the case. At its October 9, 2018 public hearing, the Brookline
308 Preservation Commission imposed an eighteen month demolition stay on the house and garage
309 at 57 Toxteth Street.

310

311 The applicant has requested that the Commission consider lifting the stay of demolition based
312 upon its review of the proposed plans for the property. Proposed alterations include the full
313 demolition of the garage and addition of an attached rear garage. In order to accommodate the
314 proposed attached garage, the applicant is proposing to lower the grade in the rear of the
315 property. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to either remove or alter the chimneys, as
316 well as changes to the windows.

317

318 Contractor Jeremiah Foster spoke on behalf of his clients, who were unable to make the
319 meeting. He explained that they do not want to change the architecture of their home, only
320 make it more livable. The neighbors support the project and the clients are attempting to
321 maintain the integrity of the interior in the renovations.

322
323 Architect Tim Burke explained that the renovations will make the space functional for a family
324 with four children. He noted that the existing roof shapes will be kept and there will be limited
325 visibility of the addition from Toxeth Street.

326
327 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment.

328
329 Mr. Louis Zand of 61 Toxeth Street expressed his support for the project, encouraging the
330 expansion to include a young family in the neighborhood.

331
332 Ms. Anne Turner, a neighbor on Toxeth Street, attested that the kitchen is tight and in need of
333 renovation and that the rear of the home could use some cleaning up. She expressed support
334 for the project.

335
336 Ms. Lyn Holden stated that the plans are good and that she supports them. She added that this
337 area is not a Local Historic District, it is a Neighborhood Conservation District and so
338 reasonable changes should be permitted.

339
340 Mr. Foster explained that the rear bump-outs are later additions which have been modified over
341 time.

342
343 Mr. Jack stated that the proposed addition complies with the NCD, and expressed appreciation
344 of the design.

345
346 Mr. Batchelor motioned to approve the application as submitted.

347
348 Mr. Jack seconded the motion.

349
350 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

351
352 **15 Toxeth Street – Request to lift the stay of partial demolition of the house (Walter and**
353 **Velvizhi Heine, applicants)**

354
355 Attorney Jennifer Gilbert introduced herself, Walter Heine and architect Paul Worthington.

356
357 Ms. Kritzer reviewed the case. On May 14, 2019, the Preservation Commission voted to
358 uphold staff's initial determination of significance and imposed a twelve month delay on the
359 partial demolition application. The Applicants have submitted a letter requesting that the
360 Commission lift the stay of demolition based on the plans submitted to install two new shed
361 dormers on the existing gable-end roof. The proposed plans include a 24' wide shed dormer on
362 the east façade facing Bowker Street which extends from the ridge to the wall plane of the
363 second floor. On the west façade, a 4' wide shed dormer, also extending from the roof ridge to
364 the wall plane, is proposed to provide space for a staircase.

365
366 Mr. Worthington stated that he had nothing to add and that the project is small.

367

368 Ms. Gilbert noted a letter of support written by neighbor Kathleen Rush.
369
370 Mr. Worthington explained that he was unable to get a lot of pitch on the dormer, the current
371 design is the only option short of taking the whole roof off.
372
373 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment. There were no comments at this time.
374
375 Mr. Worthington expressed his opinion that a 24' dormer is not a big deal.
376
377 Mr. Elperin and Ms. Kritzer provided clarification about why this project triggers partial
378 demolition.
379
380 Mr. Worthington explained that the interior configuration guided the design. He had
381 considered revising the design so that it would not trigger review but had found that those
382 revisions` would make the bedroom too small.
383
384 Mr. King mentioned the stairs, asking if they could be adjusted.
385
386 Mr. Worthington states that they cannot.
387
388 Mr. Elperin asked if the wall could be brought in to make the addition read as a dormer.
389
390 Ms. Gilbert states that making it smaller doesn't make sense for the owner's intentions and if
391 that was the decision they would just wait out the delay.
392
393 Mr. Batchelor stated his inclination to see the project as acceptable since it is set back from the
394 street.
395
396 Mr. Batchelor motioned to accept the application as submitted.
397
398 Mr. Jack seconded the motion.
399
400 The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. The motion passed.
401
402

403 **1762 Beacon Street – Request to lift the stay of partial demolition of the house and full**
404 **demolition of the garage (Rony Shapiro, applicant)**
405

406 Ms. McCarthy reviewed the case. In their hearing on May 22, 2019, the Commission imposed
407 an 18 month demolition delay on the property at 1762 Beacon Street. On June 12th, 2019, the
408 applicant requested a lift of the stay of demolition based on submitted plans to demolish the
409 existing garage, construct an addition to the side and rear of house, expand the third floor under
410 a mansard roof and add a roof deck on the rear half of the roof. With the exception of the
411 stained glass windows on the first floor, windows will be either new or replaced with Pella
412 Architectural Series, a wood SDL sash. Other alterations include filling in one of the open
413 porch window bays to match the arch to its left and relocating the front entry door.

414
415 Revised plans are passed out to Commission members by the applicant.
416
417 Architect Alan Garfield explained the intention of the application, to restore the building and
418 create four condo units with parking spaces at the rear.
419
420 The Chair opened the discussion to public comment.
421
422 Ms. Phoebe Compton, owner of attached 1760 Beacon Street spoke in favor of the application,
423 which is consistent with her half of the building.
424
425 A resident of Unit 9, 9 Corey Road, which overlooks the garage expressed concerns about the
426 extension of 1762's three story side wall into this space. She recalled the loss of tree canopy
427 over the last 15 years, and expressed disappointment that more would be lost. Losing the
428 garage and tree would be a precedent changing the feel of the back alley.
429
430 Ms. Sharon Slodky, a resident of 1768 Beacon Street, 4th floor rear, asked how the views and
431 light would be impacted for people on the east side of 1762. She suggested a neighborhood
432 meeting to address these concerns.
433
434 Ms. Lisa Nowinski, of 1768 Beacon Street echoed Sharon's concern about extending the
435 building closer to the property line and the potential light and view impacts for neighboring
436 properties.
437
438 Ms. Lisa Shrier of 17 Corey Road stated that the garage is an eyesore, but expressed a lack of
439 understanding of what will replace it. She also expressed concern about increased parking and
440 traffic in the alley and how this will impact the neighbor's use of this space. She stated that
441 snow and trash removal as well as access for construction crews and vehicles is already
442 difficult in the alley and would like to see a plan to address these concerns.
443
444 Mr. King asked the Commissioners for their initial thoughts.
445
446 Mr. King asked staff if the chimneys are coming out.
447
448 Ms. McCarthy responded that they are not.
449
450 Mr. Elperin stated that there is potential for improvement in the redesign of the garage area, but
451 the lack of detail in the plans leaves him unconvinced. He also expressed doubt that four cars
452 could fit in the space as proposed.
453
454 Mr. King stated that this is a historic garage, in good condition and consistent with the existing
455 alleyway pattern.
456
457 Ms. Eckert agreed with Mr. Elperin's concern about the space being too tight for four parking
458 spaces.
459

460 Mr. Batchelor stated that it would be nice to save the garage but that there are other solutions.
461
462 Mr. King asked the applicant if two means of egress are provided for the four units.
463
464 Mr. Garfield responded that there are not because the building would be fully sprinklered.
465
466 Mr. King suggested the applicant provide a 3-D model to study the shadow impact on
467 neighboring buildings.
468
469 Mr. Batchelor emphasized the importance of including to-scale drawings of neighboring
470 buildings in the plans.
471
472 Mr. Elperin agreed that a shadow study would be helpful in answering neighbor's concerns.
473
474 Mr. Elperin mentioned the strange transition from a plumb wall to a mansard in the rear.
475
476 Mr. Garfield replied that it matched the mansard to the left.
477
478 Mr. Elperin expressed concern that the rear wall has too few windows in contrast with the west
479 elevation, which is well designed.
480
481 Mr. Garfield stated that he was working with the existing windows at the rear but a different
482 rhythm could be created.
483
484 Mr. King mentioned the infilling of the open arch on the front porch and stated that it seemed
485 like a loss to the building.
486
487 Mr. Elperin agreed, adding that replication of the existing stained glass window would be
488 difficult and that the open porch is the most important character defining feature of the
489 building.
490
491 Mr. Batchelor agreed that the arch would be difficult to replicate and questioned whether it was
492 a good idea.
493
494 Mr. Garfield stated that he had considered glazing the whole opening.
495
496 Mr. Elperin expressed his preference for that option.
497
498 Mr. Panciera suggested that the glass line be brought in to protect the brick of the existing arch.
499
500 Mr. King suggested that the applicant redesign the entry to protect the open archway feature.
501
502 Ms. Eckert recommended a subcommittee to deal with the issues.
503
504 Mr. Elperin agreed with Mr. King that the applicant should redesign the entry.
505

506 Mr. King summarized the Commission's recommendations to create a 3D shadow study to
507 assess the impact of the addition on the neighbors; to redesign the front entry to keep the open
508 porch which is a significant architectural feature; the garage is significant but there are options
509 for replacement if the design is improved.
510
511 Mr. Garfield mentioned that the plan uses interlocking pervious pavement tiles, not asphalt in
512 the parking area.
513
514 Ms. Eckert asked the applicant to demonstrate a plan for snow removal.
515
516 Mr. Garfield responded that the proposed open space would help with that.
517
518 Mr. Elperin suggested that the applicant not feel restrained by the existing windows on the rear,
519 add more.
520
521 Mr. Jack mentions that the roof deck has not been discussed. He also asked if the windows on
522 the façade will be replaced or restored.
523
524 Mr. Garfield stated that the plan was to return to the original appearance of the windows,
525 taking off the aluminum storms.
526
527 Mr. King asked if the existing windows are historic.
528
529 Mr. Garfield responded that some are replacements, others are originals with storms.
530
531 Mr. Batchelor asked what the applicant was proposing as replacements.
532
533 Mr. Garfield replied, 6 over 1's.
534
535 Mr. Elperin stated that original windows should be kept.
536
537 Mr. King asked the applicant to identify the existing window on the elevations as original or
538 not.
539
540 Mr. Jack confirmed that the existing chimneys are to remain.
541
542 Mr. King asked if there is a roof deck currently, and if it would be visible.
543
544 Mr. Garfield replied that he was unsure about the visibility as they had not yet done a study of
545 the roof deck.
546
547 Mr. Batchelor mentioned that the South End has a lot of complaints about roof decks and
548 expressed concern for the neighbors.
549
550 An audience member expressed that insufficient information had been presented and asked
551 how this project sits within the larger context of the rear private way and how the massing

552 works with the existing neighborhood. She asked if the Commission supported breaking the
553 existing alley pattern. She also mentioned that school children walk in this alley.

554
555 Another member of the audience added that the alley is very narrow, and expressed concern for
556 fire truck access and trash pickup. She asks for clarification on the proposed roofline and light
557 impacts.

558
559 Mr. King and Ms. Birmingham explained how the process will be continued in subcommittee
560 which are open to the public.

561
562 Another audience member expresses concern about the roof deck, explaining the impacts on
563 privacy of the existing roof deck in the neighborhood.

564
565 Mr. King motioned to continue the application to a subcommittee, which will work out a plan
566 to bring back to the full Commission.

567
568 Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.

569
570 The Commission voted 6-0 to support the motion. The motion passed.

571
572 The subcommittee members are Mr. King, Mr. Jack and Mr. Elperin.

573
574 **57 University Road – Application for the full demolition of the house (57 University Road,**
575 **LLC, applicant).**

576
577 Ms. Kritzer presents the case.

578
579 Attorney Jennifer Gilbert introduced herself.

580
581 Mr. King reminded the audience that only the significance of the building is under
582 consideration and opened the discussion to public comment on that topic.

583
584 Mr. David Holtz of 29 University Road stated that this is the second full demolition on this
585 street this year and that losing the building would change the neighborhood. He expressed the
586 hope that something can be done.

587
588 Mr. King explained the demolition delay process, which is the extent of the Commission's
589 power.

590
591 Ms. Sara Beauvalot of 53 University Road stated that the historic character is important to the
592 neighborhood and explained that the previous owners chose the current owner to sell their
593 house to because this developer promised to preserve their home.

594
595 Mr. King stated that unfortunately he had heard similar stories before, and suggested that the
596 neighborhood form a historic district to protect the remaining homes.

597

598 Ms. Jill Kalen explained that she chose her current house because of the architectural character
599 in the neighborhood, and stated that this home is very significant and valuable.
600 Ms. Judy Myers, Town Meeting Member of Precinct 12, expressed the concern felt over this
601 home and the desire to preserve it, as well as the larger concern people in the district feel for
602 Aspinwall Hill. Expressed the hope that the developer will listen to the neighborhood and
603 work with the Commission to reuse the home instead of demolish it.
604
605 Ms. Janet Holts of 29 University Road, resident for 40 years, expressed the concern felt in the
606 neighborhood about losing historic homes and the inappropriate new construction.
607
608 Mr. David Cotney of 79 University Road expressed support for Ms. Myers' statement that
609 solutions could be found and the idea of forming a local historic district.
610
611 Ms. Kim Luzzi of 63 University Road expressed the hope that the developer hears the voices of
612 the neighborhood as well as anger at the developer for deceiving the previous owners who
613 intended their home to be preserved.
614
615 Ms. Kathy Rago of 35 University Road, resident for 25 years, expressed her love for the
616 neighborhood and concern for the changing character.
617
618 Mr. Elperin moved to uphold the staff's initial finding of significance.
619
620 Ms. Eckert seconded the motion.
621
622 The Commission voted 6-0 to support the motion. The motion passed.
623
624 The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 PM.