

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

Brookline Preservation Commission
MINUTES OF THE September 29, 2021 MEETING
Held Virtually using Zoom Online Software

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

Commissioners Present:

Richard Panciera, Vice Chair
David King
John Spiers
Elizabeth Armstrong
Jim Batchelor

Commissioners Absent:

Elton Elperin, Chair
David Jack
Peter Kleiner
Wendy Ecker
Alex Villanueva

Staff: Tina McCarthy, Jacob Collins

Mr. Panciera opens at the meeting at 6:28 pm.

Mr. Panciera— Elizabeth Armstrong vote for Elton Elperin— Yes
John Spiers vote for David Jack — Yes

Mr. Panciera— Motion to enter into Executive Session under Purpose 1 of the Open Meeting law to discuss an Open Meeting law complaint dated August 2, 2021.

Mr. Spiers— Second.

Ms. Armstrong—Yes, Mr. King— Yes, Mr. Spiers— Yes, Mr. Panciera— Yes

Ms. McCarthy asks the public to voluntarily exit the room and return at 7:20, when the executive session is scheduled to end. After multiple attempts to contact her, Brenda Levy is removed by staff from the webinar.

The Commission reenters open session at 7:27pm.

Public comment opened and closed without any participants.

Richard Panciera makes a motion to appoint David King Acting Chair in his absence.

Elizabeth Armstrong— Yes, Jim Batchelor—Yes, David King—Yes, John Spiers—Yes, Richard Panciera—Yes

Mr. Panciera exits the meeting, and Mr. King is promoted to Acting Chair.

John Spiers— Move to approve the minutes from the July 13th Brookline Preservation Commission meeting.

David King— Second.

47
48 John Spiers–Yes, Jim Batchelor–Yes, Elizabeth Armstrong– Yes, David King–Yes
49
50 John Spiers– Move to approve the minutes from the July 21st Brookline Preservation Commission
51 meeting.
52
53 David King– Second.
54
55 David King–Yes, John Spiers–Yes, Jim Batchelor–Yes, Elizabeth Armstrong– Yes
56
57 David King– Move to approve the minutes from the July 13th Brookline Preservation Commission
58 meeting.
59
60 John Spiers–Second.
61
62 John Spiers–Yes, Jim Batchelor–Yes, Elizabeth Armstrong– Yes, David King–Yes
63
64 **PUBLIC HEARINGS – DEMOLITION**
65
66 **92 Sewall Avenue** – Application for the full demolition of the house (Sewall Holdings LLC,
67 applicant). **Precinct 3**
68
69 Attorney Robert Allen present to represent the applicant.
70
71 Ms. McCarthy presents the application.
72
73 Mr. Allen– not here to argue against historic or architectural significance.
74
75 Public comment opened.
76
77 Lauren Elias – listened to the previous hearing on the property and agreed with conclusions at that
78 time.
79
80 Roger Goldstein – Neighbor at 70 Sewall Street, resided in the neighborhood for over thirty years.
81 Building is unusual style for the neighborhood and anchors the corner. In favor of incorporating the
82 existing building in any new construction
83
84 Jane Gilman- Town Meeting Member Precinct 3, Sewall Inn acts as gateway to neighborhood. Two
85 houses on the corner set the tone for the neighborhood. Concerned that the removal of the gardens
86 and new construction on the site may contribute to heat island effect.
87
88 Carol Taylor – Marshall Street resident. Building is a gem that maintains unique character.
89 Determination of significance should be upheld.
90
91 Elissa Tonkin– Sewall Street resident. Agrees with comments of others who appreciate the building
92 and notes that demolition affects the entire neighborhood.
93

94 Julie Leitman – Had rehearsal dinner guests stay at the Bertram Inn. Foreign guests enjoy staying
95 here and appreciate the architecture.
96
97 Susan Berger – Neighbor at 165 Sewall, Hopes that the Commission will find the building
98 significant.
99
100 Public comment closed.
101
102 Mr. Spiers– Building has a great deal of presence and plays an important role in defining the
103 neighborhood. Notes how unusual it is to find a century old commercial building in Brookline.
104
105 Mr. King – Found comments insightful, careful, and balanced. Motions to uphold stay.
106
107 Mr. Spiers– Second.
108
109 Mr. Batchelor – Yes, Mr. Spiers – Yes, Ms. Armstrong – Yes, Mr. King – Yes
110
111
112 **57 Chatham Street**– Request to lift the demolition stay, based on plan review (LJEFF LLC,
113 applicant). **Precinct 1**
114
115 Attorney Robert Allen present to represent the applicant.
116
117 Ms. McCarthy– the Determination of Significance for the property was upheld at the July 21, 2021
118 meeting and the applicants are requesting a lift of stay. The applicants are proposing a second story
119 addition.
120
121 Mr. Allen– The applicant intends to preserve the intent of Stanley Myers design. Applicant had a
122 personal connection to the Myers family. Origin of the addition was plans drawn by Myers in 1998
123 but never executed. House is a catalogue house that was modified for the client. Designed as a
124 doctor’s house.
125
126 Gary Hendren– Architect. Notes that some distortion occurred in Myers’s hand drawn rendering of
127 the addition. The current plans follow the structure and match Myers’s intent. Ordering custom
128 windows that copy the detail in the original plans.
129
130 Ellen Golde– Owner. Lives on street. Knew Mrs. Coltran, a previous owner of the property. Many
131 neighbors want the second story built. This is not one of Myers’s best home, but she wants it to fit
132 into the neighborhood.
133
134 Public comment opened.
135
136 Roger Goldstein– 70 Sewall Ave. Applauds the owner for the proposal. House is recessive, and the
137 second story addition will improve its appearance.
138
139 Public comment closed.
140
141 Mr. Spiers– asks for rationale behind building the chimney narrower.

142
143 Mr. Hendren– The chimney will match existing dimensions but be built taller.
144
145 Mr. King– Questions if the original rendering has wrong dimensions.
146
147 Mr. Hendren– Yes. Believe our rendering is accurate. Windows will be replicated in details but
148 with insulated glass in wood.
149
150 Mr. King – Motion to grant lift of stay.

151
152 Mr. Spiers– Second.

153
154 Mr. Batchelor – Yes, Mr. Spiers – Yes, Ms. Armstrong – Yes, Mr. King – Yes

155
156 **PUBLIC HEARINGS- LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS**

157
158 **242 Walnut St (Pill Hill LHD)** – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a
159 larger deck with accessibility walkway at the location of an existing deck, the replacement of an
160 existing door and window on the first story with an accessible door, and the relocation of basement
161 access steps. (Thomas Jonak, applicant). **Precinct 5**

162
163 Applicant Thomas Jonak,AIA is present along with homeowner Leila Jalinous.

164
165 Mr. Collins presents the application.

166
167 Mr. Jonak– Oakland Road did not exist when this home was built. Doors are similar in scale to
168 windows. Door will be constructed of wood. Proposed walkway is not a ramp, but a level
169 connection to grade.

170
171 Ms. Jalinous– Best option for accessibility.

172
173 Public comment opened and closed without any participants.

174
175 Mr. Spiers– Questions the material choices and notes that the precedent on the site is wrought
176 iron. There is no precedent for a deck.

177
178 Mr. Jonak– Doors are inspired by windows. Want more accessibility. Cable rail system is less
179 obtrusive.

180
181 Mr. Spiers– Compare proposed door opening to existing. Losing puddingstone.

182
183 Mr. Jonak– This side is brick. Cutting out area between window and door. Door that exists is not
184 wide enough.

185
186 Mr. King– Believes materials and designs are reasonable but the cable rail makes him
187 uncomfortable. Would prefer an iron rail.

188

189 Mr. Panciera – Questions whether it will be a true stone lintel or backed with steel. Agrees with
190 Commissioner King on the cable rail. It is an industrial look. Questions if the posts should be black
191 and the appropriateness of insulated glass doors.
192
193 Mr. Jonak–The lintel will be backed with steel and may be in multiple pieces.
194
195 David King–It is difficult to hold doors to the same standards as windows.
196
197 Mr. Spiers– But it is a window, a substantial opening.
198
199 John Spiers– Questions the appropriateness of doors becoming windows. The proposed doors with
200 the railing come off “a little dramatic”.
201
202 Ms. Armstrong– Likes that work is distinguishable and believes the location of the proposed work
203 is appropriate. Concerned with the lintel if broken into multiple pieces.
204
205 Mr. King– Comfortable with installation of doors, in favor of looking at a different rail.
206
207 Mr. Panciera– Also in favor of a different railing.
208
209 Mr. King– Motion to accept the design with the understanding that the applicant is to work with an
210 empowered subcommittee of one to address the Commission’s concerns with the rail design.
211
212 Mr. Jonak and Ms. Jalinous agree to address the materiality of the railing with a subcommittee.
213
214 Mr. Panciera–Second.
215
216 Mr. Batchelor – Yes, Mr. Panciera– Yes, Ms. Armstrong – Yes, Mr. Spiers – Yes, Mr. King – Yes
217
218 Mr. Panciera reinstated as Chair.
219
220 **67 Crowninshield Road (Crowninshield LHD) – Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness**
221 **to construct two dormers, alter the pattern of fenestration on the rear elevation, alter an existing bay**
222 **and screened in porch, erect a new floor above the existing porch. (Kent Duckham, applicant).**
223 **Precinct 8**
224
225 Attorney Robert Allen present to represent the applicant.
226
227 Robert Allen– introduces the case and notes that window replacement is preferable due to lead.
228
229 Kent Duckham– Applicant. Notes home is in disrepair but structurally sound. Aim to restore front
230 of house but replace windows. The current access does not allow the attic to be used as living
231 space. Proposed dormer will allow for easier attic access. Existing screen porch has bad foundation
232 but they hope to enclose it and add a second story above. Proposes patching stucco to match and
233 painting stucco to get a uniform color. Window replacements will be aluminum clad to match what
234 he believe currently exists.
235
236 Public comment opened and closed without any participants.

237
238 Omar Badri– Homeowner. Appreciates the home and wants to retain its historic character.
239
240 Mr. King– Asks if any zoning relief is necessary under the current proposal.
241
242 Mr. Allen– Will require a Special permit for FAR. The property currently exceeds FAR and section
243 6 allows for increasing existing nonconformity.
244
245 Ashley Clark–Senior Planner, Law Office of Robert L. Allen Jr. Proposing a 555 square foot
246 increase to the building. The FAR is currently .69 and will rise to .78. Conforming in this area is
247 .35.
248
249 Mr. King– If window replacement is necessary, the windows should be replaced with single pane
250 wood. Against painting the stucco. Shame to lose bay. Proposed dormer compromises the rear
251 elevation. The site is already overbuilt.
252
253 Mr. Panciera– Agrees.
254
255 Mr. Batchelor– Proposes a subcommittee since resolution does not seem possible.
256
257 Mr. Spiers– The altering of the bay on the left side changes the massing. Rear is significantly
258 altered and there is a fair amount of moving and replacing. Some of the house’s uniqueness is lost
259 in the proposal.
260
261 Mr. Allen– Agrees. House was built prior to zoning and no lots in the neighborhood are
262 conforming. Massing is fine to discuss but numbers can be misleading.
263
264 Mr. King– Dormers really change massing. Not much square footage is gained by filling out the
265 bay. Retain original volume as much as possible.
266
267 Mr. Spiers– Questions dimensions of window well.
268
269 Mr. Duckham– Three feet deep.
270
271 Ms. Armstrong– Agrees with comments. Massing is important.
272
273 Mr. Panciera– Agrees. One of the few unpainted stucco houses. In favor of appointing a
274 subcommittee.
275
276 Mr. King– Motion to continue to a subcommittee and return to a full meeting.
277
278 Mr. Spiers– Second.
279
280 Ms. Armstrong– Yes, Mr. Batchelor– Yes, Mr. King– Yes, Mr. Spiers– Yes, Mr. Panciera– Yes
281
282 Mr. Spiers, Mr. Panciera, and Mr. King appointed to subcommittee.
283
284 **Public Hearing- Warrant Articles**

285
286 Ms. McCarthy asks if the Brookline Preservation Commission would like to comment on any
287 Warrant Articles for the fall 2021 Town Meeting.
288
289 There were no public comments
290
291 Mr. Spiers– Support open meeting law to allow for hybrid meetings.
292
293 Mr. King– Don’t love hybrid meetings. Prefer meetings in person.
294
295 Ms. Armstrong– Hybrid meetings are difficult. Inequality between those present in person and
296 those present virtually.
297
298 Mr. Panciera– We should make an effort for hybrid meetings.
299
300 Mr. Batchelor– Supports Mr. Panciera’s wording. Believes the technology to host virtual meetings
301 may improve.
302
303 Mr. Batchelor– Motion to draft letter. The Brookline Preservation Commission supports further
304 study and pilot testing of hybrid meetings.
305
306 Meeting adjourned at 9:49pm.
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330