

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

*Brookline Preservation Commission*  
**MINUTES OF THE August 25, 2021 MEETING**  
**Held Virtually using Zoom Online Software**

**Commissioners Present:**

Elton Elperin, Chair  
David King  
Wendy Ecker  
Elizabeth Armstrong, Alternate  
Richard Panciera, Vice Chair  
John Spiers, Alternate  
Alex Villanueva, Alternate

**Commissioners Absent:**

David Jack  
Peter Kleiner  
Jim Batchelor

**Staff:** Tina McCarthy

---

There were no minutes to approve and no public comment.

Mr. Elperin appointed Ms. Armstrong to vote for Mr. Batchelor and Mr. Spiers to vote for Mr. Jack.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

**237 Saint Paul Street** – Application to replace the existing asphalt roof with a slate roof (William Jardus, applicant). **Precinct 1**

No public comment  
No applicant present

Mr. King – improvement and in line with what we want to see

Mr. Elperin – the color is odd, but good match to asphalt, no problem

Mr. Panciera – unusual request. Good, probably was slate before. Proposed slate looks nice. Don't need to match current roof.

Mr. Elperin – problems with random width.

John Spiers, Mr. Panciera – no concerns.

Mr. Panciera – make sure it can bear the weight structurally  
Motion – accept as submitted. Mr. Elperin second.

Mr. Kleiner – yes, Mr. Elperin – yes, Ms. Armstrong – yes, Ms. Ecker – yes, Mr. Panciera – yes, Mr. Spiers – yes, Mr. Villanueva – yes

47  
48 Mr. Elperin – venting at ridge? If needed, staff review.  
49  
50 Ms. Armstrong – is Alex Villanueva voting for Peter Kleiner?  
51  
52 Mr. Elperin –yes.  
53  
54  
55 **57 Upland Road** – Application to construct a rear addition and install a bay window (Law Office of  
56 Robert L. Allen, Jr., applicant). **Precinct 5**  
57  
58 Mr. Allen represents case. Family has lived here for 12 years.  
59  
60 John Day, architect – trim is mahogany. Goes over plans want to add mudroom, new entrance  
61 and more windows. True divided lites, steel and mahogany. LePage will make TDL, no SDL.  
62 Detail is incorrect in slide. Can be below 7/8”.  
63  
64 Mr. Allen – immediate abutter supports, no one objected.  
65  
66 No Public Comment.  
67  
68 Mr. Elperin – handsome design, functional. Not very visible. Similar to Prescott Street.  
69  
70 Mr. Panciera – no questions. Support, nice design. Well articulated.  
71  
72 Mr. King – agree. Objects to bay window having insulated glass. Does not like Pond Street  
73 Precedent.  
74  
75 Mr. Villanueva – bay window does not seem like an addition.  
76  
77 Mr. Panciera – not sure, may be okay.  
78  
79 Mr. Spiers – why is the glass ratio different and from the other addition? Why is it white? Seems  
80 boxy.  
81  
82 John Day – please go to elevation, rendering distorts. Does not stick out quite so far.  
83  
84 Mr. King – can you treat it like black windows?  
85  
86 John Day – could review that, we did make it black at one point. Using MDO for paneling, fiber  
87 board.  
88  
89 Mr. Elperin – motion to accept, Mr. Panciera seconded. All in favor.  
90  
91 Peter Kleiner joins the meeting and will begin voting. (Mr. Villanueva not voting.)  
92

93  
94 **179 Babcock Street** – Application to replace wood windows with vinyl windows to address an  
95 existing violation and restore the front door (Pamela Bardhi, applicant). **Precinct 8**  
96  
97 Pamela Bardhi – previous building owner wanted me to rehab the building. Carpenters were not  
98 suppose to remove windows, they were not familiar with historic district. Need to replace due  
99 to rot. Apologizes for mistake. I plan to live on the first floor.  
100  
101 Public Comment  
102  
103 Cindy Lee, 191 Babcock Street – glad door will be restored. Prefer to maintain wood windows.  
104 Vinyl windows will not match the block. Goes against guidelines.  
105  
106 Melissa Trevet, 177 Babcock Street – like the architectural details of this building. Like the  
107 transom, key feature tying building together. They are intact elsewhere in building.  
108  
109 Paul Johnson, 187 Babcock Street – support restoring front entry. Proposed windows are nothing  
110 like original. Guidelines encourage matching the pattern.  
111  
112 Mr. Panciera – disappointing, the windows in person lack detail even of what is in spec sheet.  
113 No brick mold, no muntins. Fenestration is consistent in block. Retained transom 3/3 storm  
114 windows over sash. Hard to look the other way. A detriment to building.  
115  
116 Mr. Elperin – all windows have old frames left intact. Stops removed. The replacements are  
117 inset in frames. New wood sash could be installed.  
118  
119 Need to assess, but may be could be restored. Some windows have been replaced, some have  
120 wood replacement sash. 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor.  
121  
122 Mr. Panciera – some originals on upper floors but in bad shape.  
123  
124 Mr. Elperin – No evidence that insulated glass was ever on façade.  
125  
126 Mr. King – wood windows, to match original, that is the best solution.  
127  
128 Ms. Armstrong – guidelines say repair first then replace.  
129  
130 Mr. Villanueva – replacement should be wood under guidelines.  
131  
132 Mr. King – think frames are not rotted out.  
133  
134 Mr. Panciera – most are ok. Could be reused.  
135  
136 Ms. Armstrong – unusual case because of all the other windows in the back, to preserve  
137 consistency on the front. More demanding because it is not just one house. Think we should  
138 stick to guidelines.

139  
140 Mr. Villanueva – agree with Ms. Armstrong. As windows are updated, we want them to be  
141 consistent.  
142  
143 Mr. Panciera – 189 Babcock Street just came to us, vinyl that got replaced with SDL.  
144  
145 Mr. Elperin – need subcommittee, site visit.  
146  
147 Pamela Bardhi – would like the subcommittee.  
148  
149 Ms. Armstrong – repair or replace.  
150  
151 Mr. King – you can’t repair – they are gone. New sash or new replacement, subcommittee could  
152 decide best approach.  
153  
154 John Spiers – need subcommittee to do a clear window by window assessment.  
155  
156 Mr. Elperin – empowered subcommittee.  
157  
158 Mr. King – motion to refer to subcommittee with intention of replacing with single pane wood  
159 windows with 3/3 sash.  
160  
161 Pamela Bardhi – will continue to subcommittee. Mr. Panciera second.  
162  
163 Mr. Panciera and Mr. Spiers to be on subcommittee, will conduct a site visit.  
164  
165  
166 **OTHER BUSINESS**  
167  
168 **Proposed Olmsted-Richardson LHD-** Vote to submit Warrant Article to Fall 2021 Town Meeting  
169  
170 Public comment  
171  
172 Carissa Demore, Historic New England – strong support WA  
173  
174 Harriet Rosenstein – thanks committee, TMM Pct. 9, these homes are of immense importance.  
175 Anything but preservation is egregious.  
176  
177 Ms. Ecker – was the report amended?  
178  
179 Ms. Armstrong – explains process.  
180  
181 Mr. King – motion to accept the Warrant Article. Mr. Spiers seconded. All voted in favor.  
182  
183

184 **25 Cottage Street & 222 Warren Street** – Advisory review of plans to renovate and restore the two  
185 buildings, currently under demolition delay (Jeff Birnbaum, applicant). **Precinct 14**

186  
187 Administrative Review

188  
189 Mr. Allen – introduced case, gave overview. Want to see if the board will allow the move of 25  
190 Cottage Street. Plan B is to do 4 lots, leave 25 where it is and not renovate it until the money  
191 from the other 3 lots comes in to fund.

192  
193 Troy Sober – architect. 39’s lot is difficult; combining 25 & 39 allows optimal location for new  
194 house. Want to attract owners that will maintain and invest in these homes. Covid forces us to  
195 build pools. Redevelopment of 222 depends on 25 moving. Want to understand if these options  
196 are ok.

197  
198 Mr. Elperin – why is the front yard setback facing Cottage?

199  
200 Mr. King – how big are the lots

201  
202 Troy Sober – 25 is 40,000, 222 – don’t have it yet – one second.... 222 ext. 80,000, 25ext. 50,000  
203 sq ft, 39 ext 37,000 proposed 41,000 sq. ft.

204  
205 Mr. Elperin – I’m asking about setback because if it was a side yard 25 could move back.

206  
207 Mr. Allen – zoning requires it to face Cottage Street due to driveway. 50’ due to rear house  
208 behind another.

209  
210 Troy Sober – have not shown 25 in place plan.

211  
212 Mr. Elperin – we need to see in order to decide.

213  
214 Ms. Armstrong – what is the wetland setback? And grade?

215  
216 Troy Sober – explains site plan wetland buffers and restrictions. All requires “notice of intent”  
217 for changes within 150’ of wetland. Want to move the house out of wetland zone. Existing  
218 house cannot be modified to meet current expectations without cantilevering out over ravine.  
219 Current home is in front yard setback.

220  
221 Mr. Elperin – why show 3 lots if you intend 3?

222  
223 Troy Sober – providing opportunity to choose for buyer.

224  
225 Jeff Birnbaum – prefer 3, show 4 incase buyer prefers. To have ability, but 4<sup>th</sup> is very  
226 challenging.

227  
228 Public Comment

230 Arelyn Levy – all of vegetation blocking homes could be removed, which would make visible  
231 where it is. Altering historic significance of 222 Warren Street. Sticking a swimming pool at  
232 front entrance. Suppose to be prominent on Warren Street. New wing with garage is necessary  
233 but hide it. Recognize but do not agree with economics of moving 25. Close sitting to street  
234 does not work with raised grading. Integration of whole property needs to be reconsidered.

235

236 Mr. Elperin – thoughts on rotation.

237

238 Ms. Levy – I disagree with relocation and siting in all revisions.

239

240 Dennis Dewitt – should consider rotating. Entrance should look to Green Hill. This drive  
241 originally served 25. Driveways should be rethought. Easements for view sheds? Berm exists  
242 and should be preserved. Driveway doughnut is out of keeping. Wall behind Olmsted house  
243 should be treated sympathetically. Garage on 25 is subordinate. The unusual gable on garage is  
244 silly. The front bay should not be rebuilt.

245

246 Allan Galper – moving should be a last resort. Concerned that moving will damage the House.  
247 Siting of house was used in his other designs. This was important to Richardson. Tribute to  
248 coops with swimming pool. Threat to leave 25 as is concerning. The demo delay will be gone.  
249 We will lose it.

250

251 Mr. Allen – yes, not moving 25 endangers it. Talking about how to move it is constructive; not  
252 moving sets us to path B.

253

254 Mr. Elperin – no vote, but we will ask commission for opinions. We don't have an independent  
255 economic analysis. Have to just accept your word and I do accept the economic necessity of  
256 move.

257

258 Mr. King – accept developer's need to move. We can work on how. We have to live with this.

259

260 Mr. Villanueva – changing the front of 222 is more important than moving 25. First view is of  
261 garage? Jeopardizes 222 history and beauty.

262

263 Mr. King – agree, also with Dennis. Changes to 222 are not good. 3 garages? Are these  
264 considered estate house? Otherwise inappropriate.

265

266 Mr. Allen – these are open to discussion.

267

268 Mr. Spiers – Ideally don't move, but what is important, buildings, site, both? At least the left of  
269 site has both historic buildings. Could envision worse propositions. Move is reasonable.

270

271 Mr. Kleiner – move, consider refining, then acceptable. Other significant buildings have been  
272 moved. Would help public accept to give some examples.

273

274 Mr. Panciera – always thought we would be asked to move it. Best outcome we could have.  
275 Historically, house moving was very common. This solution gets people what they want.

276  
277 Ms. Armstrong – idea of moving is no longer a nonstarter. Agree that work is good but there is  
278 so much national interest in these properties. Make plans more historically appropriate. Open  
279 to it with highest level of respect for historic property in design.  
280  
281 Mr. Kleiner asked about the process of the Warrant Article while the plans for a lift of demolition  
282 stay are proceeding.  
283  
284 Tina McCarthy explained the process.  
285  
286  
287 Meeting adjourned 9:16 PM.