

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 June 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020 MEETING**  
**Hearing held online via Webex Events**

**Commissioners Present:**

Elton Elperin, Chair  
Richard Panciera  
Jim Batchelor  
Wendy Ecker  
David Jack  
Peter Kleiner  
David King  
Elizabeth Armstrong, Alternate

**Commissioners Absent:**

**Staff:** Valerie Birmingham, Tina McCarthy

---

Mr. Elperin called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

**Approval of Minutes**

No minutes to approve.

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

No public comment.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

**96 Crafts Road (Chestnut Hill North LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish rear deck and construct a larger rear deck, and replace the solid stucco knee wall railings on the second floor rear balcony with an open balustrade with a design similar to the proposed rear deck. (Out of the Woods Construction, applicant).

Ms. Birmingham presented the case report. Greg Antinoli, contractor, was present to speak on behalf of the case. He stated that the balcony was in need of repair, that it collects water. He explained that the proposed changes had functional as well as aesthetic purpose.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Panciera opened the discussion, stating that he believed the deck was fine. He questioned the removal of the stucco half wall but also stated that it was not necessary to the design. He also expressed a preference for the vocabulary of the railing to be the same as on the deck. Mr. Elperin

47 and Mr. King agreed that the stucco half wall was not an essential element. Mr. Kleiner stated that  
48 he did not object to the proposal but would prefer a simpler plan.

49  
50 Mr. Panciera motioned to accept the application as submitted. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.  
51 All voted in favor.

52  
53 **107 Upland Road (Pill Hill LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove  
54 existing driveway gates and install a 4’ high picket fence at the rear of the driveway with a gate  
55 (Richard Chapman, applicant).

56  
57 Ms. McCarthy presented the case report. Richard Chapman, owner, explained that the new fence  
58 would be in keeping with existing fences on the property and that he would also repair damaged  
59 fences as a part of the proposal.

60  
61 There was no public comment.

62  
63 Mr. Elperin agreed that the rustic fence was in keeping with the existing fences. Mr. Panciera  
64 agreed and added that it was set back from the street. Mr. King also agreed.

65  
66 Mr. Elperin motioned to accept the application as submitted. Mr. Kleiner seconded the motion.  
67 All voted in favor.

68  
69  
70 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**

71  
72 **10-18 Pleasant Street – The Durgin Garage** – Application for the demolition of the garage (CHR  
73 Pleasant LLC, applicant).

74  
75 Ms. Birmingham presented the case report.

76  
77 There was no public comment.

78  
79 Mr. King stated that the building is significant and asked what will happen next. Ms. Birmingham  
80 responded that she was not expecting the applicants to request a lift but that a DAT would be  
81 formed and the Commission would probably have a member on it. Ms. Ecker asked how long the  
82 delay would be. Ms. Birmingham answered that it would be 18 months.

83  
84 Mr. Elperin motioned to uphold the staff determination of significance. Mr. Jack seconded the  
85 motion. All voted in favor.

86  
87 **207 Dean Road** – Application for the partial demolition of the house (John Mulliken & Arianne  
88 Chernock, applicant).

89  
90 Ms. McCarthy presented the case. Jennifer Gilbert was in attendance representing the applicants  
91 and stated that she was available to answer any questions.

92  
93 There was no public comment.

94

95 Ms. Ecker noted that this was one of the pre-war stucco houses in town and that it should be  
96 preserved. Mr. King agreed and added that he enjoyed hearing the story of the original owner.  
97

98 Mr. King motioned to find the house significant. Mr. Jack seconded the motion. All voted in  
99 favor.

100  
101 **540 Chestnut Hill Avenue** – Application for the partial demolition of the house (Nicholas Brown,  
102 applicant).  
103

104 Ms. McCarthy presented the case. Jennifer Birnstiel, architect, was present representing the  
105 applicants. She explained that this home had been in a historic district since 2017, she had  
106 completed the dining room addition in 2015 which was not reviewed.  
107

108 There was no public comment.  
109

110 Ms. Ecker stated that she was familiar with the house; she looked at it when it was for sale in 1961  
111 and in 2013 and thought it was a charming home. Mr. King added that the home had been altered a  
112 lot but that he still felt it was significant.  
113

114 Mr. King motioned to uphold the determination of significance. Mr. Panciera seconded the  
115 motion. All voted in favor.  
116

117 **111 Jordan Road** – Request to lift the stay of demolition of the house (Charles Silbert, applicant).  
118

119 Ms. Birmingham presented the case. Charles Silbert, applicant, spoke about the garage, stating that  
120 it seemed to be a different brick than the rest of the house and that it was an aesthetically  
121 unpleasant addition. He described his intention to match the brick of the house when making  
122 repairs, indicating that he may use bricks salvaged from the garage.  
123

124 There was no public comment.  
125

126 Mr. Elperin asked if Mr. Silbert would restore the gable timbering. Mr. Silbert replied that he  
127 would replicate what is there. Mr. Elperin noted that the original had a slight hand-hewn look. Mr.  
128 Silbert stated that it was 5/4 stock and did not recall it having a texture. Mr. Elperin explained that  
129 the replaced boards looked different but the original have wood pegs and a rough texture. He  
130 asked if all of the timbering would be replaced. Mr. Silbert stated that he would only replace what  
131 was rotten.  
132

133 Mr. Panciera recounted observations from his visit to the site. He expressed concern about the  
134 amount of brick that will be replaced and noted that the varied brick would be hard to match. He  
135 agreed that the garage is in poor shape. He recommended that the applicant use soft mortar with  
136 the brick.  
137

138 Mr. Kleiner stated that he was less concerned about the brick and more concerned about the future  
139 subdivision of the lot. He explained that the demolition of the garage would enable the  
140 subdivision. He noted that this concern is beyond the purview of the Commission but would be an  
141 outcome of the decision. Mr. Batchelor asked if the subdivision was already shown in the  
142 assessor's map (from the presentation) and Ms. Birmingham confirmed that it was. Mr. Silbert

143 explained that the lot was a double and it could be divided. Mr. Batchelor expressed his preference  
144 to have the second lot undeveloped but noted that this was not a reason to deny the demolition of  
145 the garage. He agreed with Mr. Panciera's concern about matching the brick but indicated that it  
146 should be allowed. Mr. King agreed, adding that the building is not in a Local Historic District.  
147 Mr. Elperin expressed support for allowing the change and asked that the specifications for brick  
148 and restoration of the timber work be provided. Mr. Silbert stated that he wanted the brick to  
149 match and would reuse the garage bricks.

150  
151 Mr. Elperin made a motion to accept the application with the details of the brick, mortar and timber  
152 to be reviewed by staff. Mr. King seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

153  
154 The meeting adjourned at 8:08

155  
156  
157  
158 **NEW BUSINESS AND UPDATES**

159  
160  
161

DRAFT