

**Beacon Hill Architectural Commission**  
**Public Hearing Minutes**  
Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room  
Boston, MA, 02201

**November 15, 2018**

**Commissioners Present:** Paul Donnelly, Joel Pierce, Miguel Rosales, Kenneth Taylor

**Commissioners Not Present:** Thomas Hopkins, P. T. Vineburgh, Danielle Santos

**Staff Present:** Joe Cornish, Gabriela Amore

---

**5:03 PM** K. Taylor called the public hearing to order.

### Design Review

**20 Chestnut Street (19.243 BH):** At front façade install new storm windows at first-story windows.  
*Representative: Monika Pauli*

The applicant presented photos of existing conditions and plans of the proposed project. She explained that they will be installing storm windows on the first story only. The applicant also provided images of what the proposed storm windows would look like when they are installed.

The Commission discussed the color of the proposed storm windows. They confirmed with the applicant that all the proposed work should match in color and size of the existing storm windows at the second story.

There was no public comment.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with provisos. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (KT, PD, MR, JP).**
  - **The color and sizes of the windows must match the color, material and size of the existing second story storm windows.**

**71 Chestnut Street (19.525 BH):** At front façade re-point masonry; replace all sills and lintels with cast stone; remove existing iron grate over door and iron gate at door alcove; clean rust off existing steel beam and re-paint; replace existing wood panels in transom over double doors with new glass panes; repair all doors; replace deteriorated sections of wood trim in-kind; Replace first-story sixteen-light wood window in-kind; and re-paint all exterior wood elements.  
*Representatives: Jennifer Mello*

Jennifer Mello presented photos of existing conditions and plans for the proposed project. She explained that the hardware and light fixture on the building will be retained. She added that they also plan on matching the mortar, and will mainly repoint around the windows, and anywhere else on the building that it seems necessary. The windows will not be replaced.

The Commission discussed what aspects of the building are original and what aspects are not, and clarified small details of the work. The Commission stated that the drawings provided were not accurate, and that a better proposal should be created. The plywood above the door raised concern from The Commission, and more details were requested for aspects such as the length of the lintels, and the current condition of the panels under the larger windows.

Public comment was opened and Richelle Gewertz from the Beacon Hill Civic Association (BHCA) suggested that the color scheme should remain as is and not the neighboring building. Staff also received 6 letters of support for the proposed work.

- **In conclusion the application was motioned to continue. J. Pierce initiated the motion and P. Donnelley seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (KT, PD, MR, JP).**

**36 Joy Street (18.1423 BH):** Replace existing 6'-0" cedar stockade fencing alongside yard; attach five panels of treated lattice fencing for ivy wall; install single lattice panel at wall and ally end for ivy wall.

*Representative: Lawrence O'Connor, Isabelle Slotine and Ken Crisafulli.*

The applicant reviewed the changes that have been made to the proposal since the last time they presented the application to The Commission. Ms. Slotine shared that her abutters would prefer the lighter of the two stains presented to The Commission, but she would rather use no stain at all. She also shared that she would prefer installing a square trellis onto her fence, but is open to doing a diagonal oriented one if that is preferred.

The Commission confirmed the proposed materials that would be used, determining the fence would be cedar.

Public comment was opened and Richelle Gewertz from BHCA stated that she liked the project, and suggested not painting the fence and letting it weather.

- **In conclusion the application was motioned to be approved as submitted with no stain on the fence, and with a stain on the shed trellis allowed. K. Taylor initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (KT, PD, MR, JP).**

**12 Otis Place (19.370 BH):** Replace existing fence with wood fence and gate.

*Representative: Anastasia Contos*

The representative presented photos of existing conditions and plans for the proposed work. She stated that she wants to match her neighbor's fence. She also stated that she was rushed into submitting the application because of the timeline between a car running through her fence, and the application deadline.

The Commission pointed out that the drawings provided are not to scale, and more details must be provided to confirm that the new fence will match the neighbor's fence. They stated that they conceptually were fine with the application, but need drawings with proper scale and dimensions.

- **In conclusion the application was motioned to be approved with the proviso that the applicant provide a detail drawing to staff confirming that the fence will match the neighbor's fence in-kind. M. Rosales initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (KT, PD, JP, MR).**

**12 Walnut Street (19.338 BH)**: At sidewalk eliminate failed coal chute and install brick pavers.  
*Representatives:*

Did not appear

**86 Chestnut Street (19.377 BH)**: At front façade alter first-story entry and storefront by replacing fanlight at entry with raised paneling; replace one entry door in-kind and replace one entry door with paneled wall; remove carpet from entry steps and repair steps; remove handrail at steps; replace wood mouldings in-kind; replace transom windows in-kind; remove window grates and plate glass windows; install six-light wood casement windows; remove lower level windows; and install gray granite at former lower level window locations (see also Administrative Review/Approval below).

*Representatives: Dustin Nolin*

The applicant presented photos of existing conditions and plans for the proposed work. He explained that both existing doors will be retained, but that the left door will be fixed in place while the right one is still functioning. He also explained that while they would like to keep as much glass at the former storefront as possible, they would like to include a sense of privacy since the property will be residential.

The Commission inquired on details of the building, such as materials and change of use. The Commission discussed the appropriateness of the existing fanlight, and felt that the bottom section of the former storefront should be either all granite or wood.

Public comment was opened, and John Corey suggested integrating a wood sill with the wooden steps, so the whole first floor is wood. Richelle Gewertz from BHCA shared that she felt the windows should be preserved, as well as the paint color.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the provisos that the upper part of the proposal was approved, except the change of color, and the rest of the application be continued. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (KT, PD, MR, JP).**

**20 Pinckney Street (19.361 BH)**: Remove lower window security grate (see also Administrative Review/Approval below).

*Representative: John Corey*

Commissioner M. Rosales recuses himself.

The representative presented photos of existing conditions and plans for proposed work, and explained that he wants to remove the iron work that is in front of one window on the property.

The Commission clarified the extent of the proposed scope of work to be limited to removal of the security grate and the work outlined under the Administrative Review/Approval section of the agenda.

**In conclusion the application was approved. P. Donnelly initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (KT, PD, JP).**

**Pinckney Street at Charles Street (19.374 BH):** Remove existing street light and install new street light with small cell node.

*Representative: Joseph Shannon, Crown Castle*

The applicant presented photos of existing conditions and plans for proposed work. He explained that the proposed light fixtures contain LED lights, and the rest of their cell node lights that already exist in Boston will be upgraded to contain the same lights.

The Commission expressed concern for introducing more light pollution into the Beacon Hill district. They felt the proposed structure was too large, and was not compatible with the district. There was also concern over a potential safety risk, since the boxes take up such a large amount of space.

During public comment John Corey asked if there were any scale drawings or plans from the sidewalk, because the boxes seem too large. Richelle Gewertz from BHCA suggested denial without prejudice because the fixtures are inappropriate for the district but may fit well on Storrow Drive. Nina Lytton questioned the possibility of finding other locations to install the fixtures to improve wireless service.

- **In conclusion there was a motion to deny this application. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (KT, PD, MR, JP).**

**Mount Vernon Street at Charles Street (19.375 BH):** Remove existing street light and install new street light with small cell node.

*Representative: Joseph Shannon, Crown Castle*

The applicant presented this application with Application 19.374 BH above.

- **In conclusion there was a motion to deny this application without prejudice. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (KT, PD, MR, JP)**

**Revere Street at Charles Street (19.376 BH):** Remove existing street light and install new street light with small cell node.

*Representative: Joseph Shannon, Crown Castle*

The applicant presented this application with Application 19.374 BH above.

- **In conclusion there was a motion to deny this application without prejudice. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (KT, PD, MR, JP).**

**37-41 Bowdoin Street (19.207 BH):** Install two antenna enclosures at rooftop.

*Representatives: Sarah Gaulty and Michael Fox*

The applicant presented photos of existing conditions and plans for proposed work.

The Commission discussed the visibility of the enclosure, and suggested lowering the profile and asked if locations across the street outside of the district were explored.

- **In conclusion there was a motion to deny without prejudice. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (KT, PD, MR, JP).**

**22 West Cedar Street (19.251 BH):** At rear elevation remove metal cladding at bay window and parapet and install copper cladding in details to match existing cladding; remove faux cement fiber black slate at second-story bay and upper Mansard roof and install black slate; install roof deck on top of existing rear two-story addition; and replace non-historic six-over-six wood window with eight-light wood door.

*Representative: John Day*

The applicant presented photos of existing conditions and plans for proposed work. He explained that the existing fire escape would remain.

The Commission clarified small details of the proposed work, such as determining visibility. They asked the representative for the history of the bay, but he was unsure of it. They felt that there was most likely a parapet in the proposed location, but there was concern about setting a precedent by approving it without more documentation. The Commission suggested not adding a new profile to the skyline, and to move the deck back to reduce visibility.

During public comment Sandy Steele stated that this proposed work has been challenged before, and there is not suitable proof to claim there was ever a parapet at the location being claimed. John Cory questioned how the window will be turned into a door, and pointed out that a parapet could interfere with that work. He also questioned how a roof deck will be supported. Nina Lytton claimed she, an abutter, was never notified of this proposed work. Staff J. Cornish stated that a letter from 20 West Cedar was sent in opposition of this project.

- **In conclusion there was a motion to approve with the following provisos. The slate and copper replacement in-kind would be approved, but the parapet addition was denied.**

M. Rosales initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (KT, PD, MR, JP).

#### ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

- 19.346 BH 60 Beacon Street: At front façade repair and re-paint cornice in-kind.
- 19.352 BH 5 Brimmer Street: At front façade re-point masonry.
- 19.357 BH 37 Brimmer Street: At rear elevation replace first-story six-over-nine and four-over-six non-historic wood windows in-kind; and replace ten-light non-historic door in-kind.
- 19.377 BH 86 Chestnut Street: At front façade replace wood and slate siding at dormer in-kind; replace slate roof in-kind; replace copper gutter and downspout in-kind; repoint masonry; repair brownstone; and re-paint doors and shutters black (***see also Design Review above***).
- 19.379 BH 17 Louisburg Square: At front façade replace copper cladding and gutter at fifth-story in-kind.
- 19.316 BH 104 Mount Vernon Street: At roof rebuild top portion of chimney in-kind.
- 19.361 BH 20 Pinckney Street: At front façade re-paint entry door to match existing color; replace downspout with copper downspout; and re-paint entry steps and risers black (***see also Design Review above***).
- 19.348 BH 20 Pinckney Street: At front façade replace nine six-over-six non historic wood windows in-kind.
- 19.349 BH 86 Pinckney Street: At front façade replace: fourteen six-over-six non-historic wood windows in-kind; two three-over-three non-historic wood windows in-kind; and one nine-over-nine non-historic wood windows in-kind.
- 19.347 BH 46 West Cedar Street: At front façade repair and re-paint door black.

In conclusion the applications above were approved. M. Rosales initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (KT, PD, MR, JP).

#### Ratification of the October 18 Public Hearing Minutes

- Staff informed The Commission that the draft of the minutes from last month's hearing was not ready.

**8:18 PM** K. Taylor adjourned the public hearing.