

Aberdeen Architectural Conservation District Commission

Public Hearing Minutes

Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room

Boston, MA, 02201

May 10, 2018

Commissioners Present: Kirsten Hoffman, Sharon Cayley, Helen Pillsbury

Commissioners Not Present: Lisa Keegan Parcell

Staff Present: Eric Hill, Preservation Planner

4:02 PM H. Pillsbury called the public hearing to order.

DESIGN REVIEW

1616 Commonwealth Avenue (18.1186 AB): Install panel sign above storefront.

Representatives: Ricky Zeng, New CC Sign Inc.

The Applicant presented the conditions for the proposed scope of work, including photographs and drawings. The Commission discussed the change in material and how they were much more comfortable approving signage that is a natural material such as wood as opposed to a synthetic flooring material. Staff asked the applicant if a clear sealant or stain would be applied to the wood and the applicant noted that the sign would be sealed with a clear sealant to protect it from weathering.

In conclusion, the application approved. H. Pillsbury initiated the motion and S. Cayley seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (SC, KH, HP).

354A Chestnut Hill Avenue (18.1150 AB): Install channel-lit signage above storefront; install flat panel sign on side elevation.

Representatives: Ricky Zeng, New CC Sign Inc.

The Applicant presented the conditions for the proposed scope of work, including photographs and drawings. The Commission asked if the sign was channel-lit and the applicant noted that it was, much like others recently approved in the district. It was also discussed that all of the white sections are the channel-lit signage and the black sections are the solid aluminum backing of the sign.

The Commission asked the reason for the secondary sign as it did not seem appropriate to have a secondary sign of the side elevation with a gooseneck light above. The applicant noted that there was already an opening for lighting which was there before and they wanted to go back with what was there. Staff noted that the light was installed before it was a historic district and since it was later removed, it lost its "grandfathered in" status.

In conclusion, the application was approved with the following provisos:

- **The applicant submits the updated signage plan without the secondary sign and gooseneck lighting.**

H. Pillsbury initiated the motion and S. Cayley seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (SC, KH, HP).

12-14 Chiswick Road (18.1195 AB): Enlarge third-story window on side elevation for egress; install new window on third-story side elevation; replace aluminum siding under front porch and replace with lattice to match side porch; install faux downspout to conceal A/C lines for new HVAC system; move electrical meters to rear elevation.

Representatives: Steve Rosen; Ari Vainio

The Applicant presented the photos of the existing conditions along with the drawings of the proposed work. The commission began by asking questions about the windows on the side elevation and why the applicant was requesting a new window as well as the enlarged existing window. The applicant noted that while not required at this point, they would like to enlarge the existing small window for better egress onto the existing fire escape. The secondary window is another bedroom which would be able to escape on the fire escape if in emergency. The commission asked if the downspout would match the others on the structure and the applicant noted that it would.

When addressing the electrical meters, the commission as well as staff had concerns with installing a large panel to the rear elevation (visible) and that drilling into the historic stone foundation is not recommended. The applicant noted that they could construct a board to install them to and rest it against the building or have it free standing as to not disturb the building. If they could not do this, they would come back to the commission. They also wanted to see plantings installed to screen the meters.

In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos:

- **The window was approved to be enlarged per the specifications;**
- **The new window is to be symmetrical to the existing on the side gable;**
- **The electrical meters are to be attached to a free-standing panel and screened by shrubbery to be approved by staff.**

S. Cayley initiated the motion and K. Hoffman seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (KH, SC, HP).

1962 Beacon Street (18.1165 AB): Alter existing storefront and install new openings; remove separate handicap entrance and incorporate into main entrance; Install channel-lit sign above storefront.

Representatives: Beth McDougal; Jim Janus; Bill Blanchette

The Applicant presented the photos of the existing conditions along with the drawings of the proposed work. The commission began by asking questions about the historic store front and what remained from the original commercial storefront. The applicant noted that it was all demolished when the post-war renovation and stuccoing took place. The Commission also noted that the existing storefront does not fit with the architectural qualities of the building or district as a whole. It was noted by a couple commissioners that the proposed signage was very large and “blocky” and is not necessarily appropriate. The applicant noted that the commercial

structure across the street has the same lettering. It was noted by a commissioner that the signage across the street was installed before the conservation district was formed. Also, the commission noted that a base should be installed on the storefront as well as some vertical elements to better resemble the historic storefronts in the district.

The Commission asked for public comment where Eva Webster, a resident wanted more information on the existing condition of the historic storefront and proof as to what is under the stucco storefront. She mentioned that we should check the conditions to verify that there is indeed no historic fabric remaining. Ms. Webster also asked that the storefront should be restored based on the photographic evidence; staff noted that there is no date on the photo as well as the fact that the photo is blurry and far off and the reconstruction of the storefront would be mostly guesswork and taking away from permitted square footage of the store.

In conclusion the application was continued with the following comments:

- **Staff should meet the applicant on site to verify what remains of the original storefront;**
- **That updated plans showing the stucco to match the limestone gray should be incorporated;**
- **That the updated plans should feature a stucco base under the fixed glass windows to match those seen on the block for continuity and the application should look into vertical lintels between paired windows;**
- **And the applicant should look into scaling the lettering of the sign down to a more appropriate size.**

K. Hoffman initiated the motion and S. Cayley seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (KH, SC, HP).

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

18.1192 AB 149-153 Chiswick Road: Repoint brick and reset brick on sections of structure; reset flashing at parapet. (Approved by staff, emergency repairs)

- **In conclusion the application was approved as submitted. H. Pillsbury initiated the motion and S. Cayley seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (KH, SC, HP).**

Ratification of the April 12, 2018 Public Hearing Minutes

ADVISORY REVIEW

18.1193 AB

40 Mount Hood Road: Demolish existing post-war hotel structure; construct multi-family, mixed use development ranging from five to seven stories; install landscaping and hardscaping.

Representatives: James Gray, Stantec Architecture; Ian Ramey; Hannah Shumor; Yu Yi.

The Applicant presented the conditions for the proposed scope of work, including the photographs, sightline studies, drawings and proposed landscaping. The Commission discussed the existing 2-story motel structure and that they did not necessarily think it was significant to the

district nor on its own merit and its demolition would not adversely impact the conservation district. After, the Commission noted how on Egremont Street, there were concerns about the height and massing of the building as well as the overall design concepts including: window configuration, materials, front entrance steps; colors; and the 5th floor material. The Commission noted that the applicant should look at multi-lite windows and modern apartment buildings in the district for inspiration, much like 1650 Commonwealth Avenue did.

Alexa Pinard of the BPDA spoke and mentioned that it would be a good idea for the applicant to show shadow analysis as well as cross sections of the height of the proposal in conjunction with other nearby buildings for context.

The Commission opened the floor for public comment and Eva Webster mentioned that she had concerns about the height, how the change in topography would impact the historic context of the neighborhood, the brick patterns should be analyzed for detail; and that the windows should be analyzed. Steve Rosen also spoke out against the proposed development siting concerns about the height of the development

7:15 PM H. Pillsbury adjourned the public hearing.