

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

*Brookline Preservation Commission*  
**MINUTES OF THE August 13, 2019 MEETING**  
**Brookline Town Hall, Room 103, 333 Washington Street**

6 **Commissioners Present**

7 David King, Chair  
8 Elton Elperin, Vice Chair  
9 Jim Batchelor  
10 Wendy Ecker  
11 Peter Kleiner  
12 Richard Panciera  
13 Elizabeth Armstrong

**Commissioners Absent:**

David Jack

15 **Staff:** Valerie Birmingham, Lara Kritzer, and Tina McCarthy

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

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

20  
21 **EXECUTIVE SESSION – Question as to whether the Preservation Commission shall**  
22 **enter into Executive Session and move to Room 310 for discussion of the ongoing**  
23 **litigation of the 17 Hawthorn Road decision if the chair declares that an open meeting**  
24 **may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the public body.**

25  
26 Mr. King made a motion for the Commission to enter into Executive Session. Mr. Elperin  
27 seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

28  
29 The Commissioners entered Executive Session in Room 310 of Town Hall.

30  
31 The Commissioners returned to Room 103 of Town Hall.

32  
33 Mr. King made a motion to reconvene open session. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion. All  
34 voted in favor.

35  
36 Mr. Kleiner entered the hearing.

37  
38 **Public Comment** (for items not on the agenda)

39  
40 No public comment.

41  
42 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**

43  
44 **98 Chestnut Street** – Request to lift the stay of partial demolition of the house (Kronick  
45 Fatigue LLC, applicant).

47 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.  
48  
49 Shayna Galinat, esquire, Law Office of Robert L. Allen, Jr. LLP, introduced the applicants.  
50 Ms. Galinat explained that the project had completed the zoning relief process and had  
51 received approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals.  
52  
53 Polly Welch, direct abutter at 96 Chestnut Street, asked about the landscape plan. Philip  
54 Kramer, architect for the project, replied that they were planning to retain several trees and  
55 replace smaller trees.  
56  
57 Mr. Elperin asked about the existing cantilevered design on the rear façade. Mr. Kramer stated  
58 that they had no intentions of altering that design.  
59  
60 Mr. Elperin asked about the proposed dormers, particularly the fenestration on the east  
61 elevation dormer; further, Mr. Elperin suggested that traditional windows be used on the  
62 dormer to help them blend in.  
63  
64 Ms. Ecker asked where the door to the proposed third unit was located. Mr. Kramer described  
65 that it was located on the interior.  
66  
67 Ms. Armstrong asked about the parking spaces. Mr. Kramer replied that the project had  
68 received zoning relief for the number of parking spaces.  
69  
70 Mr. Elperin asked if the plan was for the design to be modernized as suggested by the  
71 rendering. Mr. Kramer remarked that it was not, and that the plan was to bring back the  
72 house's historic detailing.  
73  
74 Mr. Kleiner asked if the door on the second floor on the east elevation could be centered over  
75 the window, and if the balcony could be pulled back from the corner board on the same  
76 elevation. Mr. Kramer replied that the request could be done.  
77  
78 Mr. Elperin made a motion to lift the stay of demolition based upon the submitted design with  
79 the exception that the front doors reflect those in the elevation not the rendering, additional  
80 fenestration will be added to the dormer on the east elevation, and that the balcony will be set  
81 further back from the front wall plane on the west elevation; and with final details to be  
82 reviewed and approved by staff. Mr. Kleiner seconded the motion.  
83  
84 The Commission VOTED: 7-0-0  
85 7 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting.  
86  
87 **290 Tappan Street** – Application for the partial demolition of the house (290-292 Tappan  
88 Street LLC, applicant). **The case was not heard as the applicant requested that the case be**  
89 **continued to the September 10, 2019 public hearing.**  
90  
91 **25 White Place** – Application for the partial demolition of the house (Alan Rawizza,  
92 applicant).

93  
94 Ms. Kritzer presented the case.  
95  
96 Robert Cornetta, attorney, Cornetta Babine LLC, stated that they were before the Commission  
97 for a determination as their proposed project had triggered partial demolition. Mr. King stated  
98 that the Commission could not discuss the proposed plans at this hearing, and that the  
99 Commission could only look at the existing house. Tom Rose, homeowner, stated that he was  
100 a new owner, and that he intended to restore the house.  
101  
102 Rebecca Moore, rear abutter at 24 Davis Avenue, stated that she believed the property is  
103 deeply significant, and that she disagreed with the proposed plan; additionally, Ms. Moore  
104 remarked that she hoped the property would be preserved.  
105  
106 Mr. Kleiner made a motion to uphold staff’s initial determination of significance. Mr. Elperin  
107 seconded the motion.  
108  
109 The Commission VOTED: 7-0-0  
110 7 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting.  
111  
112 An eighteen month stay of demolition was placed on the house at 25 White Place, which would  
113 expire on February 13, 2021.  
114  
115 **49 Kensington Circle** – Application for the partial demolition of the house (John and Kristen  
116 O’Brien, applicants).  
117  
118 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.  
119  
120 Shayna Galinat, esquire, Law Office of Robert L. Allen, Jr. LLP, introduced the applicants.  
121 Ms. Galinat stated that she did not believe the case would be before the Commission if it was  
122 not part of the Arlington, Beresford, Kensington Circle, an area that is eligible for listing on the  
123 National Register of Historic Places. Additionally, Ms. Galinat went over research conducted  
124 on the area, and stated that while her clients had designed the project to not need zoning relief,  
125 it could not be designed to not trigger partial demolition. Ms. Armstrong asked about the  
126 researched conducted by Ms. Galinat. Ms. Galinat further explained.  
127  
128 Ms. Ecker asked if the building always had vinyl siding. Ms. McCarthy answered that she  
129 could not confirm, but that she had not found a building permit for the installation of vinyl  
130 siding.  
131  
132 Mr. Batchelor asked about the significance of the area and noted that the other parcels were  
133 larger than this particular one. Ms. McCarthy remarked that she had mainly focused her  
134 research on the individual property, but that she does believe the address is an outlier in the  
135 area.  
136  
137 Mr. Elperin remarked that at first glance he had not thought the house was significant, but that  
138 on site it perhaps was. Mr. Elperin further commented that the area was charming and included

139 a great variety of housing designs; additionally, Mr. Elperin stated that he did not feel the  
140 house was an outlier of the neighborhood and that the rooflines of the houses relate nicely, and  
141 that all the different scales, setbacks, heights makes it feel like a very integrated neighborhood.  
142 Lastly, Mr. Elperin commented that he thinks the building could be significant under Criteria  
143 D, as part of a group of buildings.

144  
145 Mr. King agreed with Mr. Elperin that it was a nice area, but that he did not think the house  
146 was significant on its own account and that most houses were part of a larger group of houses.

147  
148 Mr. Kleiner commented that if the Commission deemed the house to be significant and the  
149 project came back for design review, he would struggle to determine what he was trying to  
150 preserve. Additionally, Mr. Kleiner stated that this house did not portray a high level of craft or  
151 material. Ms. Ecker agreed.

152  
153 Mr. Panciera commented that he agreed with Mr. Kleiner and Mr. King, and that the house was  
154 fairly modest and that the nice features that do exist on this house also exist on many other  
155 houses.

156  
157 Mr. King made a motion to not uphold staff's initial determination of significance. Mr. Kleiner  
158 seconded the motion.

159  
160 The Commission VOTED: 6-1-0  
161 6 in favor, 1 against and 0 abstained from voting

162  
163 **56 Thorndike Street** – Application for the demolition of the house (56 Thorndike Street LLC,  
164 applicant).

165  
166 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.

167  
168 Aurel Garban, representative for the property owner, commented that the house had had vinyl  
169 siding and windows installed.

170  
171 Stephanie Long, 60 Thorndike Street, stated that she strongly disagreed with the proposed full  
172 demolition of the house because of its historic nature, as well as what could come next;  
173 additionally, Ms. Long commented that she was worried about the entire nature of Thorndike  
174 Street and that the feel of the neighborhood was one of the reasons she had purchased her  
175 home. Further, Ms. Long commented that instead of full demolition, the owner should consider  
176 a gut and remodel.

177  
178 Judith Vanderkay, 16 Columbia Street, remarked that 56 Thorndike Street is a good strong  
179 house, and that the previous owners had worked to keep the structure safe and in good repair.  
180 Additionally, Ms. Vanderkay stated that the house did not deserve to be demolished and that it  
181 would make a good renovation.

182  
183 Ben Haley commented that Thorndike Street is a nice example of a very cohesive 20<sup>th</sup> century  
184 streetscape, and that the demolition would be detrimental to the streetscape.

185  
186 Ms. Birmingham read an email from Bill Powell opposing the demolition.  
187  
188 Mr. Kleiner remarked that it was a nice house on a great street.  
189  
190 Mr. Elperin asked about the detached garage. Ms. Birmingham answered that staff had made  
191 an initial determination of non-significance for the detached garage after conducting research.  
192  
193 Mr. Kleiner further stated that the house presented the owner with a nice opportunity to do  
194 renovations, and would be happy if it were preserved.  
195  
196 Mr. Kleiner made a motion to uphold staff’s initial determination of significance. Mr. Elperin  
197 seconded the motion.  
198  
199 The Commission VOTED: 7-0-0  
200 7 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting  
201  
202 A twelve month stay of demolition was placed on the house at 56 Thorndike Street, which  
203 would expire on August 13, 2020.  
204  
205 **143 Laurel Road** – Application for the partial demolition of the house (Joshua and Hannah  
206 Ganjei, applicants).  
207  
208 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.  
209  
210 Tom Saltsman and Bond Worthington, architects for the project, stated that they did not intend  
211 to do anything on the front, and they were not proposing any alterations to the house’s historic  
212 nature.  
213  
214 Mr. Elperin commented that it was a very nice house.  
215  
216 Ms. Ecker stated that it was very typical for that neighborhood.  
217  
218 Ms. Armstrong made a motion to uphold staff’s initial determination of significance. Mr.  
219 Kleiner seconded the motion.  
220  
221 The Commission VOTED: 7-0-0  
222 7 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting  
223  
224 An eighteen month stay of demolition was placed on the house at 143 Laurel Road, which  
225 would expire on February 13, 2021.  
226  
227 Ms. Armstrong and Mr. Panciera left the hearing.  
228  
229  
230 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

231  
232 **22 Dunster Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of  
233 Appropriateness to replace the existing stone foundation with a new full height foundation,  
234 enlarge the existing garage and connect it to the house with a new mudroom addition, replace  
235 the existing windows, enlarge the center windows in the bays on the front façade, enlarge the  
236 second floor dormer on the right side of the front façade, and center the front entrance (Leo  
237 Power III, applicant).  
238  
239 Ms. McCarthy presented the case.  
240  
241 Brian Alim, architect for the project, stated that they wanted to maintain the historic charm of  
242 the house; additionally, that the design maintained the most significant chimney, clarified that  
243 the secondary chimney would be rebuilt using a full dimensional brick, and that the third utility  
244 chimney would be demolished as part of the proposal.  
245  
246 Mr. King asked about visibility. Ms. McCarthy explained what was visible from a public way.  
247  
248 Mr. Elperin asked about the relationship of the shed dormer to the hip roof, and commented  
249 that a 3D drawing of the intersection was needed. Mr. Kleiner commented that he had no  
250 objection to the principles of the design, but that the details needed work. The Commissioners  
251 discussed the proposed shed dormer.  
252  
253 Mr. Elperin stated he had a problem with the proposed removal of the foundation. Mr. Alim  
254 stated that there was a problem with water and mold in the basement. Mr. Alim went over the  
255 proposed foundation veneer. Mr. Elperin commented that the veneer would not look the same  
256 as the original. Mr. Kleiner agreed, and stated that it would not have the same depth and would  
257 read like tiles. Mr. Kleiner further commented that the applicant would need 6-8” depth and  
258 might be able to salvage some of the existing stone from the rear. Mr. Elperin asked if  
259 excavating, repairing, and waterproofing could be an option instead of full replacement. Mr.  
260 Alim stated that the foundation was on ledge and there were cracks. Mr. King commented that  
261 the project should be sent to a subcommittee.  
262  
263 Mr. King stated that the Commission would not approve the windows as they go against the  
264 Design Guidelines for Local Historic Districts. Leo Power, homeowner, commented that all of  
265 his neighbors have Pella windows.  
266  
267 Mr. King commented that he was unsure about the enlarging of the window openings. Mr.  
268 Elperin stated that the windows looked right the way they are in the bay, and commented that  
269 the moving of the front door made sense.  
270  
271 Mr. Alim asked about keeping the front of the foundation only. The Commissioners discussed  
272 the proposal of the foundation.  
273  
274 Mr. Alim asked if moving the dormer in 6” would help with the issues. Mr. Elperin answered  
275 that he thought it would.  
276

277 Mr. Elperin made a motion to deny the request to replace the existing windows with Pella  
278 aluminum clad windows, deny the request to demolish the front and left sides of the field stone  
279 foundation, permit repairs to the right side of the foundation using stones salvaged from the  
280 reconstruction of the rear foundation wall, approve the relocation of the front door to center it  
281 in the entrance portico, approve the removal of the rear utility chimney and the reconstruction  
282 with full dimensional brick of the chimney on the left side of the roof; additionally, to approve  
283 the rear mudroom and garage additions as well as the removal of the existing rear entrance as  
284 none of these are visible from a public way; lastly to create an empowered subcommittee of  
285 one Commissioner to review with staff details of the dormer and consider the appropriateness  
286 of widening the window openings on the front façade. Mr. Kleiner would be the Commissioner  
287 on the subcommittee. Mr. King seconded the motion.

288  
289 The Commission VOTED: 5-0-0  
290 5 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting

291  
292 **18 Spooner Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD)** – Application to amend the Certificate of  
293 Appropriateness for the new addition to the rear façade by relocating the air conditioning  
294 condensers to an areaway on the right (north) façade of the new addition (Gray and William  
295 Hughes, applicants).

296  
297 Ms. Kritzer presented the case.

298  
299 Shayna Galinat, esquire, Law Office of Robert L. Allen, Jr. LLP, introduced the applicants. Liz  
300 Cahill, architect for the project, stated that they thought the proposal might be a better way to  
301 conceal the condensers while still retaining living space.

302  
303 Mr. King asked how it might impact the neighbor. Ms. Cahill responded that it would be less  
304 visible than previously approved.

305  
306 Mr. King asked if a railing would be needed. Ms. Cahill stated that building code did not  
307 require a railing for this situation.

308  
309 Mr. Elperin asked if the wall could be sloped. Ms. Cahill remarked that she thought more of  
310 the wall would show.

311  
312 Mr. King asked about the reasoning for the width of the proposed area way. Ms. Cahill  
313 responded that it was due to the size of the condensers and space needed to service them.

314  
315 Mr. Elperin made a motion to approve the amendment as submitted. Mr. Kleiner seconded the  
316 motion.

317  
318 The Commission VOTED: 5-0-0  
319 5 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting

320  
321

322 **19 Powell Street (Cottage Farm LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to  
323 change the rear mudroom sloped roof to a flat roof with roof deck above, change the side rear  
324 extension from a sloped to a flat roof, change the second floor rear sloped roof to a flat roof  
325 with a roof deck above, convert second and third floor rear double hung windows to new  
326 inswing French doors (Laura Weinrib and David Wolraich, applicants).

327  
328 Ms. Birmingham presented the case.

329  
330 David Boronkay, architect for the project, stated that they were attempting to bring a sense of  
331 order and antiquity to the house

332  
333 Ms. Birmingham stated that a letter of support had been received from the direct rear abutter.

334  
335 Mr. King asked about the cornice on top of the bathroom roof. Mr. Boronkay stated that it  
336 would line up with the cornice of the main house. Mr. Elperin asked about the flat roof under  
337 the soffit of the gambrel. Mr. Boronkay explained how that detail would work to the  
338 Commissioners.

339  
340 Mr. Boronkay further explained the two proposals of the upper roof deck. Mr. King remarked  
341 that he liked the version with the balusters stepped back from the roof edge. Mr. Batchelor  
342 remarked that the first option was too large.

343  
344 Mr. Batchelor made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the condition that  
345 the roof deck be constructed as shown in option 2. Mr. King seconded the motion.

346  
347 The Commission VOTED: 5-0-0  
348 5 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting

349  
350  
351 **21 Mason Street (Cottage Farm LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to  
352 install new wood and metal fencing, brick piers, stone stairs with wrought iron handrails, spa,  
353 pergola, fire pit, stone seating and retaining walls, and brick grill surround/outdoor kitchen area  
354 (Nancy and Peter Saperstone, applicants).

355  
356 Ms. Kritzer presented the case.

357  
358 Michael Coutu, landscape architect for the project, stated that in order to meet regulations the  
359 spa needed a 5’ enclosure. Additionally, Mr. Coutu stated that the proposed grill would be  
360 enclosed with brick to blend in with the rest of the house and would be better than a  
361 freestanding grill.

362  
363 Mr. Elperin asked for clarification about the spa enclosure. Mr. Coutu went over the design  
364 with the Commissioners, and commented that they did not want multiple fences on the  
365 property.

366



367 The Commissioners and Mr. Coutu discussed the gates on the stairs next to the open porch and  
368 the proposed fencing for the spa enclosure requirement. Mr. Mr. Batchelor commented that  
369 location of the fence would be impactful to the neighborhood. Coutu commented that they had  
370 attempted to leave as much open as possible, and thought an iron fence would help with  
371 transparency. The Commissioners discussed altering the railings on the open porch as a  
372 possible solution.

373  
374 Ms. Ecker left the hearing.

375  
376 Mr. King remarked that he was not in favor of the kitchen. Mr. Coutu asked if the Commission  
377 would be OK if the kitchen was shrunk down. The Commissioners discussed the visibility of  
378 the kitchen from Cottage Farm Road. Mr. Elperin remarked that he would rather see a grill  
379 with no enclosure.

380  
381 The Commissioners discussed the proposed fencing in front of Cottage Farm Road located in  
382 front of the side enclosed porch. Mr. King stated that he preferred it to be 42” at the front, and  
383 that it be moved back from the façade to the first column.

384  
385 Mr. Elperin made a motion to approve the application with the conditions that the iron fence be  
386 installed at 42” height along the Cottage Farm Road perimeter and the return to the porch and  
387 gate, and that the applicant will work with staff in regards to alterations to the open porch and  
388 the spa requirements; lastly to deny the request to have a built in grill. Mr. King seconded the  
389 motion.

390  
391 The Commission VOTED: 4-0-0  
392 4 in favor, 0 against and 0 abstained from voting

393  
394 The meeting adjourned.

395  
396