

1  
2 **Brookline Preservation Commission**  
3 **MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 25<sup>TH</sup>, 2020 MEETING**  
4 **Held remotely via Zoom Webinar**

5  
6 **Commissioners Present:**

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

**Commissioners Absent:**

David King

14  
15 **Staff:** Valerie Birmingham, Tina McCarthy  
16

---

17  
18 Mr. Elperin called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM. Mr. Elperin noted that Mr. King would not  
19 be able to attend and invited Ms. Armstrong to vote in his place.  
20

21 **Approval of Minutes**

22  
23 Members reviewed and made edits to the draft minutes for the May 13<sup>th</sup> meeting at this time.  
24 Mr. Elperin moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Ms. Ecker seconded the motion and  
25 all voted in favor.  
26

27 Members reviewed the draft minutes for the May 27<sup>th</sup> meeting at this time. Mr. Panciera  
28 moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion and all voted in  
29 favor.  
30

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

32  
33 No public comment.  
34

35 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

36  
37  
38 **16 Manchester Road (Crowninshield LHD)** – Application for a Retroactive Certificate of  
39 Appropriateness to remove wood gutters and install fiberglass gutters (Adam Weiner, applicant).  
40

41 Ms. McCarthy presents the case.  
42

43 Mr. Wiener explained that his father owns the home and that he himself had grown up there. He  
44 clarified that he had not measured the fascia but intended to replace it in-kind. Temporary boards  
45 had been tacked on to prevent animals from entering the home.  
46

47 Mr. Elperin asked if there was any public comment on the case. There was none.

48

49 Mr. Batchelor stated that he felt the Fiberglass gutter proposed was reasonable and recommended that  
50 staff review the details of the dimensions. Mr. Elperin added that he wanted the review to include  
51 installation locations and dimensions on either elevation drawings or a roof plan. Mr. Weiner  
52 agreed that he could provide this information.

53

54 Mr. Batchelor motioned to accept the fiberglass gutter proposal with staff approval of plan with  
55 locations and sizes of gutters and aluminum downspouts. Mr. Panciera seconded the motion. All  
56 voted in favor.

57

58 **228 Pleasant Street (Crowninshield LHD)** - Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to  
59 modify the existing side porch to allow access from the yard and to the second floor; replace a door  
60 on the rear elevation; replace asphalt shingles on rear with tile to match roof; replace 6 basement  
61 windows and demolish the interior portion of the existing chimney, structurally supporting the  
62 exterior portion which will remain in place. (Chadi Kawkabani, applicant)

63

64 Ms. McCarthy presents the case.

65

66 Mr. Kawkabani had no comment on the staff report.

67

68 Mr. Jack suggested starting the discussion with the replacement of a window with a door and asked  
69 if the width of the existing opening would be changed. Mr. Kawkabani said that it would stay the  
70 same.

71

72 Mr. Elperin asked for the definition of a “façade” as the LHD guidelines state that openings on a  
73 façade should not be changed. Ms. McCarthy explained that all street facing elevations are  
74 considered facades, though this is clearly secondary to the main façade on Pleasant Street. Mr.  
75 Jack agreed with this definition but noted the change was the only way to make the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor porch  
76 useable.

77

78 Mr. Kleiner stated that he did not object to the idea. Ms. Ecker agreed, noting that the difference  
79 would not be very visible from the street. Mr. Elperin and Mr. Panciera agreed as well.

80

81 Mr. Elperin asked about the muntins and noted that they are SDL. Mr. Kawkabani explained that  
82 he would be matching the muntin sizes of the window and painting the door black. Ms. Armstrong  
83 clarified that the construction is single pane but not true divided light, noting that this is unusual for  
84 an LHD and not the quality the Commission usually expects. Mr. Elperin stated that usually SDLs  
85 are double pane, which creates the “fun house” reflections due to the vacuum. The proposed  
86 construction will not have this due to a single pane of thick glass. Mr. Panciera and Mr. Kleiner  
87 agreed, noting that the difference would not be noticeable. Mr. Batchelor stated that he was  
88 unfamiliar with this product but that it seemed ok.

89

90 Mr. Elperin asked about the glass guard around the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor deck and why it is set back so far. Mr.  
91 Kawkabani explained that this would make it easier to clean. He added that the glass is low-iron  
92 glass with brackets powder coated black to minimize visibility, intended to be installed on top of  
93 the decking. Mr. Elperin requested the brackets be installed on the side of the decking to minimize  
94 visibility. He also mentioned that he thought the existing rail could potentially be raised. Mr.

95 Panciera and Mr. Jack expressed concern about the proportions if the rail was raised. Mr.  
96 Batchelor agreed, adding that he preferred the proposed approach. Mr. Kleiner stated that he had  
97 no objection to either option.  
98

99 Mr. Elperin asked the Commissioners how they felt about the side porch stairs. Ms. Eckert felt  
100 they were reasonable. Mr. Batchelor suggested making the stairs 2/3rds the width of the porch,  
101 leaving a portion of the existing rail in place. Mr. Elperin mentioned that the rail was not drawn  
102 correctly on the plans and requested that the newel post be on the bottom step. The Commissioners  
103 discussed interpretation of building code. Mr. Elperin and Panciera had no objection to full width  
104 steps.  
105

106 Mr. Elperin asked the Commission for their thoughts on installing the clay roof tiles on the low  
107 roofs. Mr. Jack questioned whether the pitch of these roofs was sufficient and if they would fit  
108 below the existing window sill. Mr. Kawkabani stated that the tile roofers had assessed the  
109 proposal and the pitch is appropriate. He added that the roofs would be reinforced structurally to  
110 accommodate the added weight. Mr. Elperin asked if a gutter would be added. Mr. Kawkabani  
111 replied that there is no existing gutter and he would only add one if it was necessary. He added that  
112 copper was the other alternative he had considered but that he prefers the tile. Mr. Elperin  
113 suggested that metal or asphalt would be better. Mr. Jack agreed, noting that the tile was visually  
114 heavy for the small lower roofs.  
115

116 Mr. Elperin moves the discussion to the basement windows. Mr. Jack asked for the existing  
117 conditions. Mr. Kawkabani explained that the window restoration contractor had recommended  
118 replacement. Mr. Elperin asked if the existing windows were operable. Mr. Kawkabani replied  
119 that they were not. Mr. Elperin suggested that the frames looked good and Mr. Panciera added that  
120 Brosco makes replacement sash. Mr. Jack noted that the existing muntins are smaller than the  
121 proposed. Mr. Panciera asked if they could be smaller to match. Mr. Kawkabani said he would  
122 look into it. Mr. Batchelor stated that he preferred operable windows, as the proposed were. He  
123 suggested that Brosco true divided light would be appropriate with the narrowest possible muntins.  
124 Mr. Elperin expressed support for a wood awning replacement window with muntins 5/8".  
125

126 Mr. Elperin summarized the remaining changes to the rear, noting that the door was the same as the  
127 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and that the wood rail looked good. Mr. Jack stated that he had no objections. Mr.  
128 Elperin thanked the applicant for providing engineer's drawings for the structural support of the  
129 chimney and expressed support for the proposal. All agreed.  
130

131 Mr. Panciera made a motion to accept the door on the second floor porch as submitted. Mr.  
132 Kleiner seconded the motion All voted in favor.  
133

134 Mr. Elperin made a motion to accept the installation of the glass rail with mounting brackets  
135 installed on the side of the deck. Mr. Jack seconded the motion; all voted in favor.  
136

137 Mr. Elperin made a motion to accept the full width steps with the wood rail extended to the end of  
138 the stair, newel post to be installed on the bottom step. Mr. Jack seconded the motion; all voted in  
139 favor.  
140

141 The Commissioners briefly debated the appropriateness of the clay tile roofs at the rear. Mr.  
142 Panciera made a motion to accept the roofs as submitted. Mr. Jack seconded the motion; all voted  
143 in favor.

144  
145 Mr. Elperin made a motion to accept the replacement of the basement windows as submitted,  
146 provided that the muntins are ½” wide. Mr. Panciera seconded the motion; all voted in favor.

147  
148 Mr. Jack made a motion to accept the rear basement door and rear porch rail as submitted. Mr.  
149 Elperin seconded the motion; all voted in favor.

150  
151 Mr. Elperin made a motion to accept the structural support of the chimney as submitted. Mr. Jack  
152 seconded the motion; all voted in favor.

153

154

### 155 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**

156

157 **116 Colchester Street** – Application for the full demolition of the building & **295 Kent Street** –  
158 Application for the full demolition of the building and accessory detached garage building  
159 (Longwood Ventures, LLC, applicant).

160

161 Ms. Birmingham presented the cases.

162

163 Robert Allen Jr., Law Office of Robert L. Allen Jr., LLP, represented the applications and stated  
164 that he would not contest the initial determinations of significance made by staff. Mr. Allen  
165 remarked that he understood there was a lot of interest in the applications, and that there would be  
166 necessary steps made to obtain public input; Mr. Allen continued to state that there were no plans  
167 at that time.

168

169 Mr. Elperin commented that the Commission had received many public comments regarding the  
170 applications, and that the Commission could only discuss the structures as they exist. Further Mr.  
171 Elperin remarked that in terms of Preservation the only long term way to halt the demolition would  
172 be the creation of a local historic district.

173

174 Robert Volk, Linden Street, spoke to the importance of the building at 295 Kent Street as one of  
175 the few stone buildings in the Town; further Mr. Volk stated that both buildings contributed to the  
176 streetscape and asked that the 18 month stay of demolition be imposed.

177

178 Mae Tupa, Francis Street, commented that she had lived in her house for over 40 years, which she  
179 had restored, and that she walked by the properties numerous times and loved them; further Ms.  
180 Tupa remarked that she wanted to keep the properties alive and well, and not see it turned into a  
181 huge complex.

182

183 Kate Silbaugh, Amory Street, remarked that there had been a lot of interest in these locations, and  
184 that she like so many has passed by the buildings on foot every day, and that 295 Kent Street is the  
185 most iconic building on the walk; Ms. Silbaugh continued that as a Town Meeting Member she had  
186 received a lot of inquiries about the applications and urged that the level of concern be taken  
187 seriously.

188

189 Sean Lynn Jones, 53 Monmouth Street, stated that every Town Meeting Member of Precinct One  
190 has signed a letter asking the Commission grant an 18 month stay of demolition; further Mr. Lynn  
191 Jones stated that he has heard about the importance of the buildings, and how many people see  
192 them, and that he personally sees that the buildings stand out as contributing to the area as they  
193 were designed with care. Mr. Lynn Jones commented that he strongly hoped the Preservation  
194 Commission would impose the 18 month stay of demolition, and that the developer will listen to  
195 the public's concerns.

196  
197 Heather Wiley, 101 Colchester Street, commented that she could see the properties from her home.  
198 Ms. Wiley asked about what would happen next and when information would be provided as it was  
199 difficult to discuss without plans. Mr. Elperin explained what would happen following public  
200 comment. Ms. Wiley asked the Commission impose the 18 month stay of demolition on the  
201 properties.

202  
203 Lore Kantrowitz, 287 Kent Street, commented that he could see both properties from his window  
204 and that they add so much to the character of the neighborhood; and stated that the 18 month stay  
205 of demolition should be imposed.

206  
207 Michael Slater, 20 Chapel Street, supported the previous public comment, and stated that the  
208 developer had begun landscaping work and the removal of trees and wanted assurance that no other  
209 trees would be removed; further he commented that he supported an 18 month stay of demolition.  
210 Mr. Elperin commented that the Preservation Commission does not have purview over  
211 landscaping, and the stays of demolition would only be imposed on the structures.

212  
213 Hugh Coffman, 103 Colchester Street, remarked that lived across the street, and that while staff  
214 had commented that 295 Kent Street is handsome, that 116 Colchester Street had historical  
215 significance and spoke to the importance of the buildings; further he remarked that it was difficult  
216 to discuss without knowing the plans.

217  
218 Catlin Rollins, 287 Kent Street, stated that the properties were historic, and that it should be  
219 considered that many people in the area are away at the moment; additionally she commented that  
220 the developer had done a poor job of landscaping and his behavior should not be rewarded.

221  
222 Joseph and Dorothy Carey, 94 Perry Street, commented that they had submitted a petition to  
223 oppose the demolition, and that the buildings contribute to the character of the neighborhood;  
224 further the whole area is a jewel and that demolition of the buildings would set a precedent and not  
225 keeping within the character of the area.

226  
227 Harry Bohrs, Toxteth Street, commented that he passed through the area on a daily basis and  
228 quoted Vincent Skully noted that architecture is a conversation between generations, and that  
229 conversation is the most conspicuous and obvious and hardest to tune out; further he stated the  
230 buildings are gems in the shared architectural landscape of the neighborhood and if demolished,  
231 important architectural voices would be extinguished. Mr. Bohrs remarked that he recognized it is  
232 easier for developers to demolish and build and that it did nothing to enhance the neighborhood and  
233 community; further he asked the Commission to not end the conversation and impose an 18 month  
234 stay of demolition on the properties to allow time for a collaborative conservation with the  
235 neighborhood and developer.

236

237 Andrew Lowenstein, 300 Kent Street, stated that the demolition of one of the buildings on its own  
238 would be a significant loss, but the demolition of both of the buildings would truly be a  
239 conspicuous loss of beauty on the neighborhood and Town as a whole; further Mr. Lowenstein  
240 strongly asked the Commission to impose the 18 month stay of demolition on the properties.

241  
242 Dennis DeWitt, Upland Road, remarked that it was nice to be hopeful for a dialogue between the  
243 neighborhood and the developer, but that the neighborhood ought to seriously consider developing  
244 a local historic district which could possibly entail the extension of the existing Lawrence Local  
245 Historic District nearby.

246  
247 John Hermos asked for clarification of the demolition process. Mr. Elperin clarified the 18 month  
248 stay of demolition and what would occur after the public comment period.

249  
250 Ms. McCarthy commented that there had been numerous submittals in the chat function which  
251 supported the 18 month stay of demolition from the following:

- 252  
253 Lisa Thors, 310 Kent Street  
254 Bob and Toni Stressler, 287 Kent Street,  
255 Leah Bass, 20 Chapel Street  
256 Anne Turner, 97 Toxteth Street  
257 Rob and Kathleen Schoen, 10 Beech Road  
258 Lore Kantrowitz, 287 Kent Street  
259 Virginia Smith, Linden Street  
260 Alexandra and Max Metro, Beech Road  
261 Bonnie Padwa, 300 Kent Street  
262 Jane Flanagan, TMM Precinct 15  
263 Richard Nangle, TMM Precinct 15

264  
265 Mr. Allen remarked that there will be a conversation with the neighborhood and that he did not  
266 contest the significance determination.

267  
268 Mr. Jack agreed that the structures are significant.

269  
270 Mr. Elperin commented that 116 Colchester Street is a beautifully proportioned and detailed  
271 building, and that he had always noticed its portico; further that he would hate to see it go into  
272 disrepair and be overlooked.

273  
274 Ms. Armstrong stated that both buildings are beautiful; further Ms. Armstrong remarked what the  
275 hope of the intention of the 18 month stay of demolition would be, but stated that the way to  
276 protect the buildings to a higher degree would be to form a local historic district, as mentioned by  
277 Mr. DeWitt.

278  
279 Mr. Kleiner made a motion to uphold staff's initial determination of significance on the building at  
280 116 Colchester Street, and impose an 18 month stay of demolition. The stay of demolition would  
281 extend until February 25, 2022. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

282

283 Mr. Kleiner made a motion to uphold staff's initial determination of significance on the buildings  
284 at 295 Kent Street, and impose an 18 month stay of demolition. The stay of demolition would  
285 extend until February 25, 2022. Mr. Jack seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

286

287 Ms. Birmingham asked if Mr. Allen could speak to the landscaping concerns of many of the  
288 neighbors. Mr. Allen remarked that he knew that deceased trees has been removed recently, but did  
289 not know of other plans. Mr. Allen commented that he would ask his client and provide any  
290 additional information to Ms. Birmingham.

291

292 The meeting adjourned at 8:54 P.M.