

**Beacon Hill Architectural Commission  
Public Hearing Minutes**

Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room  
Boston, MA, 02201

**February 15, 2018**

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

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

**Staff Present:** Eric Hill, Preservation Planner; Kristian Boschetto, Preservation Assistant

---

**5:00 PM** K. Taylor called the public hearing to order.

**DESIGN REVIEW:**

**67 Mount Vernon Street (18.582 BH)** : Paint previously painted lintels, sills and door surround.

*Representatives: Paula Stooki, Owner*

The applicant presented photographs of the existing conditions. The Commission did not approve of the grey color that the applicant had proposed, and said that they would prefer a color in between that of the houses next door. They suggested a light terra cotta/taupe color.

Public testimony was called for and neighborhood representative Jim Rosenfeld stated that he agreed with the Commission.

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

**112 Revere Street (Continued from 12-2017 hearing) (18.588 BH)**: Construct two enclosures on roof of main structure to house mechanical equipment and antennas.

*Representatives: Chris Swiniarski*

The applicant presented aerial view maps with labels, photos of the existing conditions, drawings, and maps of the cellular coverage within the area. The Commission discussed the location of the antenna and asked if it could be moved to a less visible area. The applicant explained that they had explored all options and locations, and that the antenna could not be moved back further from view without compromising the quality of the reception. The Commission asked if the size of the enclosure could be reduce and the applicant explained that they could shave off a few inches, but that ultimately they would have to move it closer to the edge of the parapet for acceptable transmission. The Commission then discussed the size and visibility of the structure, and asked if it were possible to either not house the antenna or put it within a cylindrical structure that resembles a chimney. Some of the Commissioners felt that this structure should be denied and the applicant explained that denial of the project would go against federal law pertaining to telecommunication rights.

Public testimony was called for and Diana Ambrose, a resident of the area, expressed great concern with the antenna the frequencies that it may give off. She was concerned that the radio transmissions could be a health hazard. Additionally she was concerned that this structure would lower property value because it may be an eyesore. Jim Rosenfeld of the Beacon Hill Civic Association expressed his concerned for the visibility of the structure, and said that it is quite visible from the main areas of Charles Street. Ron Shu, a resident of the neighborhood, noted that this company is typically good at enclosing the antennas and suggested that they make a structure to look like brick.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. K. Taylor initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-1 (Aye: PD, JP, KT; Nay: MR).**
  - **Housing structure should be no taller than 11 feet and be cylindrical;**
  - **Structure should be painted grey to resemble the sky;**
  - **Structure shall not be ostentatious;**
  - **Staff must revisit site to research visibility;**
  - **If the rear antenna structure is visible from Charles Street the applicant must return to the Commission for further review.**

**83 Chestnut Street (Continued from 01-2018 hearing) (18.769 BH):** Construct headhouse and roof deck; replace three ganged single-pane windows on front elevation with multi-lite windows; install granite lintel on front façade; replace paired entry doors with single door option with pilaster door surround; replace fan-light transom and install insulated glass; repair front gate and install new hardware; install flush-mounted intercom in brick jam at entrance; replace pendant light; replace the coal chute on front elevation and replace spigot.

*Representative: Mark Schmitt; Damon May; Henry Ladd*

The applicant presented existing condition photographs, maps, drawings, renderings, and examples of the proposed lamps and door hardware to be used. The Commission discussed the material of the panel on the front lower opening and the applicant confirmed that plywood would be replaced in kind. The Commission discussed the details of the entryway including whether or not the gate would be locked and how the new intercom and doorbell would be installed. The Commission felt that the removal of the double doors and replacement with a wider single door was inappropriate for this location. They also felt that the proposed lantern at the entryway was not in keeping with the style of the building and that the existing should be retained. They also discussed the new window configuration, asking the applicant to detail how many brick courses would be removed and the material of the lintel.

Public testimony was called for and Jim Rosenfeld of the BHCA concurred with the Commission that the double doors should remain. He also asked the applicant to clarify that the fan lite will be replaced as true divided lite and will not be insulated glass.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following proviso. M. Rosales initiated the motion and K. Taylor seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT).**
  - **Retain existing light fixture;**
  - **Door fixtures must be bronze;**

- **True divided lite transom;**
- **Retain existing door;**
- **Make proposed intercom black;**
- **Approve plywood panel and lanterns on terrace.**

**91 Beacon Street (18.851 BH):** Replace existing non-wood six-panel door on side elevation with fiberglass door in same design and paint black.

*Representatives: Rick Merilani*

The applicant presented photographs of the existing door and drawings of the proposed door. The Commission asked why the applicant is not replacing it with a solid wood door and the representative explained that the owner felt it was a maintenance issue. The Commission said that the proposed door is not appropriate and would not be approved.

- **In conclusion the application was denied without prejudice. M. Rosales initiated the motion and K. Taylor seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT).**

**34 Beacon Street (18.713 BH):** Replace front door to match existing and reinstall existing hardware; replace intercom system in same location as existing; replace glass panes in front door sidelites with laminated glass; install four security cameras on building; replace existing wood side door with metal door to match existing detailing, dimensions and color.

*Representatives: Mona Bonnot*

The applicant presented current photographs with the proposed locations clearly marked, and images of the proposed intercom and cameras to be used. The Commission asked if it were possible to find a smaller intercom-camera system, but the applicant explained that this was the only one they could find with a finish that matched the door hardware. The Commission discussed the color and visibility of the camera at the front door, and the applicant explained that it will be colored to match the trim and that it will be partially screened by the pillar. The Commission asked about the details of the front door replacement and the Commission confirmed that it will all be replaced in kind with true divide lite windows and retention of the original door hardware. The Commission was concerned with the replacement of the door and asked that the applicant explore the option of repairing it so that they can save the original. The Commission then discussed the details of the door replacement and camera at the lower side entryway. The Commission asked that the applicant install the camera into the cement framing so that they do not damage the granite. The Commission felt that the rear and side alley cameras were excessive and unsightly and they asked if it were possible to disguise them more. They suggested potentially recessing the side alley camera in the ceiling so it would be less obtrusive. Overall the Commission felt that the applicant needed to look for better camera options and to revisit the camera locations. They also suggested that the applicant look into repairing the door instead of replacing it.

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

**42 Chestnut Street (18.866 BH):** Convert existing pedestrian door on rear elevation to garage door; alter curb cuts on Branch Street.

*Representatives: Rob Ferree; Monika Pauli*

The applicant presented existing condition photographs and drawings. The Commission advised the applicant to clearly review the guidelines because typically new openings are not allowed. They suggested that the applicant do more research as to whether there may have been an opening here previously and to come back to the Commission with any evidence they have found.

- **In conclusion the application was denied without prejudice. J. Pierce initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT).**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS**

**18.873 BH**     **4 Charles River Square:** Repair and replace existing roof flashing and gutters to match existing; repoint chimney to match existing.

**18.837 BH**     **9 Lime Street:** Replace 7 non-original windows on structure with wood, true divided lite windows in existing lite configuration.

**18.848 BH**     **10 Otis Place:** Replace 13 sash sets on windows using existing frames in kind; replace two casement windows in kind.

**In conclusion the applications were approved as submitted. P. Donnelly initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT).**

**Ratification of the January 18, 2018 Public Hearing Minutes**  
**The minutes were continued to a subsequent hearing for review.**

**9:21 P.M.:** K. Taylor adjourned the public hearing.