

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Brookline Preservation Commission
MINUTES OF THE January 11th, 2022 MEETING
Held Virtually using Zoom Online Software

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
47

Commissioners Present:

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

Commissioners Absent:

Alex Villanueva, Alternate

Staff: Tina McCarthy

Mr. Elperin called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM & asks Ms. Armstrong to vote for Mr. Kleiner.

Approval of Minutes

5/11/2021

Ms. Ecker asked for corrections to the language on line 170. Mr Spiers asked that the line read “asks if the applicant can move it”. Mr. Elperin asked that line 186 read “requires fire protection”; that “squish” be changed to “crush”; line 201 read “dry lay as much as possible”.

Mr. Elperin motioned to accept with revisions; Mr. Spiers seconded.

David King – yes, Elizabeth Armstrong – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin – yes, Jim Batchelor- yes

Mr. Kleiner joins the meeting; Ms. Armstrong no longer voting.

5/18/2021

Mr. Elperin asked for clarification on line 69. Mr. Spiers replied “the neighborhood”. Mr. Elperin asked that line 127 read “use a conventional roof”.

Mr. Elperin motioned to accept with revisions; Mr. Panciera seconded the motion.

David King – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes, Elton Elperin – yes, Jim Batchelor- yes

12/14/2021

48 Ms. Ecker asked to insert “of the” in line 112. Mr. Elperin clarified that in line 137, about the roof
49 deck, “you cannot see it from the street” and asked that line 197 be omitted.

50 Mr Elperin motioned to accept with revisions; Mr. King seconded the motion.

51
52 David King – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes,
53 Elton Elperin – yes, Jim Batchelor- yes

54
55

56 **Public Comment:**

57

58 Mary Dewart- Spoke about her concerns for the future of Larz Anderson Park. She outlined the
59 proposal for the skating complex, noting that the park is on the National Register and is a public park;
60 the proposal would be an intense change of use. She asked the Commission to follow the developments
61 with the project.

62

63 Commissioners asked staff for further updates on the Larz Anderson skating rink proposal. Ms.
64 McCarthy provided updates from the staff meetings held on the topic.

65

66 Peter Senopoulos- Resident of Hawkins Road across from Larz Anderson Park. Shared his concern
67 with the proposed development and hoped that revisions would be made to the current plans. He
68 objected to the demolition of the existing rink and noted that the narrative for the project began in 1950
69 and did not include any history of the park.

70

71 Mr. Elperin states that the Commission will follow developments with the project. Ms. McCarthy
72 agrees to update the Chairs as needed.

73

74

75

76 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

77

78 **11 Copley Street (Crowninshield LHD)** –Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace
79 the existing front door with a replacement in a similar design with simulated divided lites (Doug Agule,
80 applicant). **Precinct 8**

81

82 Ms. McCarthy presents the case.

83

84 Paul Dickey, contractor, stated that he was unaware of the Local Historic District and had already
85 ordered the door. He accepted responsibility for the oversight. Explained that the owner wanted a
86 more energy efficient door, and wanted to make the entry way warmer.

87

88 Carol Wingaurd, owner, explained that the existing door does not lock and cannot be repaired.

89

90 No public comment.

91

92 Commission comments:

93

94 Mr. Jack noted that the sidelights in the entry are important and thanks the applicant for clarifying
95 that they will not be replaced. He added that replacing the door with insulated glass would
96 eventually lead to the replacement of the sidelights as well.
97

98 Mr. Elperin noted that the current door is single glazed with an energy panel and that the entry was
99 not designed to be a heated space. The proposed door violates the Design Guidelines; it should be
100 replaced in kind. Mr. King, Mr. Batchelor & Ms. Armstrong agreed. Ms. Armstrong added that
101 front doors are the type of feature the Design Guidelines are intended to protect.
102

103 Mr. Dickey states that he was not able to order a single glazed door from Marvin. Ms. McCarthy
104 agreed to send a list of potential manufacturers Ms. Wingaurd.
105

106 Mr. Batchelor made a motion to require that the door meet the design guidelines, denying the
107 proposed insulated glass door. Mr. Elperin seconded the motion.
108

109 David King – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes,
110 Elton Elperin – yes, Jim Batchelor- yes
111

112
113 **53 Powell Street (Cottage Farm LHD)** –Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace
114 windows with insulated glass sash; replace doors with wood insulated glass doors; replace wood
115 gutters with fiberglass gutters; create new basement window wells & basement entrance stair with
116 metal balustrade; install enlarged egress windows in the rear dormers; install a new skylight; construct
117 additions at the rear elevation (LDA Architects, applicant). **Precinct 1**
118

119 Ms. McCarthy presents the case.
120

121 Kyle Sheffield, architect, discussed the intention of the project, to restore the neglected house. The
122 applicant is proposing two different types of windows because the KSD windows are too expensive
123 to use on the entire house.
124

125 Public Comment:

126
127 Mike Zarren- rear abutter, supported the project.
128

129 Commission Comments:

130
131 Mr. Elperin suggested discussing the project one elevation at a time, starting with the west:
132

133 Mr. Sheffield explained that the new window well is matched to the one on the left.
134

135 Mr. Panciera stated that he felt the roof, gutters, door & window well were appropriate.

136 Mr. Elperin noted that the proposed windows have true divided lights with insulated glass. He
137 asked why the applicant could not repair the existing windows. Mr. King agreed and added that a
138 recent case at 67 Crowninshield had done a professional window restoration assessment. Mr. Spiers
139 asked what additional information (beyond the photo survey of the windows, already provided) was
140 required. Mr. King replied that the specialist must assess the windows. Mr. Elperin added that the

141 matrix provided, specifying “good, fair or poor” did not provide enough information to make an
142 informed decision. He asked for needed repairs to be specified with cost estimates.

143
144 Mr. Sheffield noted that depending on a conditions assessment, the applicant may need to replace all
145 of the stucco and the door “in kind” with an insulated glass door. They will apply for these changes
146 if necessary. Mr. Batchelor replied that an insulated glass door is not “in kind” and is not
147 acceptable.

148
149 South Elevation:

150
151 Mr. Sheffield noted a mistake on the plans, the basement windows are wood not clad.

152
153 Mr. King objected to the 3’ rail around the window well at the corner. Mr. Batchelor agreed. Mr.
154 Sheffield stated that he could remove the rail. Mr. Elperin agreed, and added that he felt the stair
155 was fine as it was set toward the rear and obscured by the chimney.

156
157 East elevation:

158
159 Commissioners discussed the visibility of the rear from Amory Street, which all agreed was
160 minimal. Mr. Batchelor stated that the skylight would be visible and objected to it. Ms. Ecker
161 agreed that it seemed inappropriate. Ms. Armstrong agreed.

162
163 North elevation:

164
165 The Commission examined the changes to the windows and also noted minimal visibility of this
166 side of the building. No objections to the landscape plan were raised.

167
168 Commissioners agree, after reviewing the plans, that the only real issue is the windows. Mr. Spiers
169 asks what the standards should be for replacement. Ms. McCarthy suggests a quote from a
170 restoration contractor with repairs itemized. Mr. Elperin suggested a subcommittee to review this
171 information when available. Discussion of visibility and enforcement of the guidelines with respect
172 to the minimally visible windows followed. The Chair supported the determination that the
173 windows at the rear and left were visible, suggested that the subcommittee decide how to enforce
174 the guidelines for these as the visibility was minimal.

175
176 Mr. Elperin made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the exception of the metal
177 window guard and window replacement. On the west and south elevations deny the proposed
178 insulated glass KSD windows due to direct visibility from Powell Street. Deny the skylight at the
179 rear due to visibility from Amory but approve the rest of the rear windows due to minimal visibility.
180 Refer the visibility of the North elevation windows and the review of window restoration to an
181 unempowered subcommittee.

182
183 Mr. King asked for an amendment requiring the visibility and restoration potential of all windows to
184 be assessed by the subcommittee. Mr. Elperin agreed to the amendment.

185
186 Mr. Batchelor seconded the motion.

187

188 David King – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes,
189 Elton Elperin – yes, Jim Batchelor- yes
190 Mr. Sheffield agreed to work with a subcommittee on the specified revisions.

191
192 Mr. Batchelor, Ms. Armstrong and Mr. Panciera are appointed to the subcommittee.
193

194
195 **67 Crowninshield Road (Crowninshield LHD)** –Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness
196 to construct two dormers; enclose a screened porch at the rear of the building and construct an
197 addition above; construction of a rear porch at the rear of the building; replace select wood windows
198 with in-kind replacements; install a fence; replace the existing garage door(Kent Duckham,
199 applicant). **Precinct 8**

200
201 Ms. McCarthy presents the case.
202

203 Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, lawyer, introduced the project team.
204

205 Kent Duckham, architect, explained the plans & noted that the dormer was required because the
206 existing ceiling height on the stair was barely 6'. He also noted that an abutter had sent a support
207 letter.
208

209 No public comment.
210

211 Commission comments:
212

213 Mr. King reviewed the work done in subcommittee, many changes made and a window restoration
214 assessment was completed as asked.
215

216 Ms. Ecker objects to the lattice on the top of the rear fence. Owner Omar Badri agrees to change the
217 fence. Mr. Elperin requested that it be solid board to the top; Ms. Ecker & Mr. Panciera agreed.
218

219 Mr. King made a motion to approve as submitted with the change of the lattice fence to a solid
220 board fence. Mr. Kliener seconded the motion.
221

222 David King – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes,
223 Elton Elperin – yes, Jim Batchelor- yes
224

225
226

227 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**

228
229 **125 Lee Street** – Application for the full demolition of the house and garage (Marie A. Folkes
230 Trust, applicant). **Precinct 14**

231
232 Ms. McCarthy presents the case.
233

234 Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, lawyer for the case, had no comment.
235

236 No public comment.
237
238 Commission Comment:
239
240 Mr. Elperin stated that the house was incredible. Ms. Ecker stated that demolition would be a loss
241 to the neighborhood. Mr. Panciera mentioned that the home is hard to see from the road and that the
242 Commission had received a letter about the home's history from a neighbor.
243
244 Mr. Panciera made a motion to find the home historically significant. Mr. Elperin seconded the
245 motion.
246
247 David King – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes,
248 Elton Elperin – yes, Jim Batchelor- yes
249
250
251 **153 Saint Paul Street-** Application for the full demolition of the house (153 St Paul Realty, LLC,
252 applicant). **Precinct 3**
253
254 Tina McCarthy presents the case. This home had been previously found significant in 2021, but
255 ownership change required a new application.
256
257 Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, lawyer for the case, had no comment.
258
259 No public comment.
260
261 Mr. King motioned to uphold the finding of significance. Mr. Panciera seconded the motion.
262
263 David King – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes,
264 Elton Elperin – yes, Jim Batchelor- yes
265
266
267 **61 Hedge Road** – Request to lift the stay of demolition on the garage (Ken Bermon & Katie
268 Pasciucco, applicants). **Precinct 5**
269
270 Ms. McCarthy presents the case.
271
272 No public comment.
273
274 Katie Pasciucco showed drawings of the existing building, submitted in addition to the plans for the
275 new garage. Mr. Elperin asked that the drawings include the rake boards.
276
277 Peter Grover, architect, reviewed plans for the new garage.
278
279 No public comment.
280
281 Commission comments:
282

283 Mr. Panciera asked what the siding materials are for the house and garage. Ms. Pasciucco stated
284 that they were composite, Everlast.
285
286 Mr. Elperin stated that the scale of the garage seemed large compared to the house. Mr. Panciera
287 suggested making the design simpler. He mentioned that the projecting bay had an arbitrary
288 relationship to the garage doors and asked if the second story could get shorter.
289
290 Mr. Grover discussed the height requirements of the first and second floors. He agreed that the
291 projecting bay could be removed.
292
293 Mr. Elperin motioned to approve the footprint and basic design with the window sizes and changes
294 to the projecting gable to be reviewed by an empowered subcommittee of one. Mr. Kleiner
295 seconded the motion.
296
297 David King – yes, Peter Kleiner – yes, Richard Panciera – yes, David Jack – yes, Wendy Ecker – yes,
298 Elton Elperin – yes, Jim Batchelor- yes
299
300 Mr. Panciera was appointed to the subcommittee.
301
302
303
304 Meeting adjourned 10:30 PM.