

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

March 15, 2018

Commissioners Present: Paul Donnelly, Joel Pierce, Miguel Rosales, Kenneth Taylor, P.T. Vineburgh.

Commissioners Not Present: Thomas Hopkins, Danielle Santos.

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

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

VIOLATIONS:

86 Beacon Street (18.964 BH): Install security camera at side rear entry; install security panel at side rear entry.

Representative: Bill Kasner

The applicant presented a photograph of the existing violation and samples of the products used. The applicant explained that the security panel and camera were essential and necessary for the safety of their tenants. He also explained that the management plaque is necessary by the city, but that they may be able to relocate it on top of the panel. The Commission discussed that the panel was not attractive and should be placed inside a brass enclosure. Additionally they said that the camera was inappropriate, so the applicant said that the camera may be able to be placed inside the panel through a small pinhole.

- **In conclusion the application was granted a continuance to a subsequent hearing pending the applicant makes note of the Commissioner comments.**

DESIGN REVIEW:

16 Pinckney Street (18.959 BH): Replace front entry doors, jambs, transom side panels and ceiling panel in main entry in kind; install new hardware at entry.

Representatives: Dustin Nolin

The applicant presented photographs of the existing conditions, drawings of the proposed door, and product examples of the hardware to be used. The Commission asked what the material of the replacement door would be and whether the treads and risers would be replaced as well. The Commission noted that the existing door was in poor shape and that they approved of its replacement.

Public testimony was called for and BHCA representative Josh Lefler stated that they posed no objections to the work.

- **In conclusion the application was approved as submitted. P. Donnelly initiated the motion and P. T. Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**

66 Beacon Street (18.970 BH): Mount 4'-0"x 3'-0" display cabinet in recessed entry.
Representatives: Susan Collins; Brad Rowell

The applicant presented photographs of the existing entryway, renderings of the proposed signage, and examples of other signage in Beacon Hill. The Commission discuss the details and specifications of the display cabinet and concluded that installing this sign board would cause irreparable damage to this iconic façade. They suggested that the applicant use temporary signs on stands instead so that it would not cause damage and would not need to be reviewed by the Commission.

Public testimony was called for and the BHCA agreed with the concerns of the Commission.

- **In conclusion the application was denied without prejudice. M. Rosales initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**

92B Pinckney Street (18.945 BH): Install 3'-0" x 2'-0" sign on Pinckney Street elevation.
Representative: Francisco Medrano

The applicant presented existing condition photographs and a drawing of the proposed sign. The Commission explained that they typically only allow one blade sign on Charles Street and that they would be opposed to having an additional sign on the residential Pinckney Street. The applicant explained that he would prefer a blade sign on Charles rather than the existing flat sign. The Commission said that the applicant would have to match the size and placement of the other existing bracket signs and that the flat sign would need to be removed. They suggested that the applicant reapply with a bracket sign to be formally reviewed.

Public testimony was called for and the BHCA recommended denial as there was already an existing sign.

- **In conclusion the application was denied without prejudice. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**

At 5:56PM Commissioner K. Taylor turned the meeting over to J. Pierce and left the meeting.

70 Revere Street (18.968 BH): Install fire escape in courtyard from ground floor to rooftop as required by code; recess and replace secondary door at Myrtle Street elevation.
Representatives: Leslie Kerr

The applicant presented photographs of the existing conditions, drawings of the elevations and railings, product examples, and a prior approval letter from Staff. Staff noted that building code requires fire balconies in the courtyard and that these balconies cannot be seen except from the top of the building. The Commission asked

what type of railing was being used and the applicant explained that it is a metal railing called "Beacon Hill railing". The Commission then discussed the plans for the recess door and felt that the drawings did not accurately represent the work to be done. Thus they requested that additional drawings that reflect the curved lintel be submitted to staff for review.

Public testimony was called for and the BHAC asked that another method of egress be explored instead of the rear balconies. Additionally they disapproved of the recessed door because it would create a dark space.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. P. T. Vineburgh initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, PTV).**
 - **Drawings must be corrected to reflect curved lintel;**
 - **Create drawing of door return;**
 - **Submit new drawings to staff;**
 - **Paint door black.**

38 Irving Street (18.962 BH): Replace 13 aluminum windows on front elevation with 6/6 wood true divided-lite windows in existing dimensions; replace existing sills and lintels with concrete; replace non-original secondary door to match existing; replace existing gutters and downspouts with copper to match existing; re-clad dormer with slate shingles (**see also Administrative Review/Approval work below**).

Representatives: Garrett Hattman; Paul Rovinelli; Dave Denkins

The applicant presented existing condition photographs, drawings of the elevations, product examples of the proposed hardware, and detailed descriptions of the work. The Commission said that they felt that the slate was too busy with the overall design of the building and windows, and suggested that the dormer windows be reduced to a one-over-one configuration to eliminate the problem. The Commission advised that the secondary door on the below grade level be colored red to match the entry door, and the applicant said they would change it at their request but would prefer a dark color. The Commission felt that the lower level windows should also be switched to either one-over-one or two-over-two so that the façade would not be so busy.

Public testimony was called for and Joseph Codder, a neighbor, said that they have been wonderful neighbors and that they approve of this work. He also noted that they had the same problem with their own sills and approved of the replacement. The BHCA said that there may have been some discrepancies with what they saw and what is being submitted, but staff noted that everything was submitted correctly.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. P. Donnelly initiated the motion and P. T. Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, PTV).**
 - **Windows at dormer and base of building be 2/2;**
 - **Color secondary door black.**

112 Myrtle Street (18.972 BH): Replace front door, transom and trim to match existing; Install new pedestrian gate at alley; install strobe at front façade as required by code; install new roof deck

Representatives: Beth Newman

The applicant presented existing condition photographs, detailed drawings of the elevations and proposed decking, and sightline guides. The Commission suggested that the applicant take cues from neighboring buildings and work to hide the strobe. They suggested that it be placed in the return of the window so that it could not be seen. The Commission asked if the applicant had researched repairing the door instead of replacing it, and they had noted that it looks like repairs had been attempted at one point but that there was still an underlying problem. The Commission also noted that the proposed hardware replacement was inaccurate for the time period of the door and building and that they should do some more research on what would be appropriate. The Commission voiced their concern that the roof deck was too visible and said that the applicant should flip the configuration to reduce its visibility. The applicant said that they could use the roof deck railing to shield the headhouse and then clad the headhouse in copper. Additionally they said that they were willing to fix or remove the bubble skylight. The Commission discussed the material and color of the pedestrian gate, and found that they had no objections to the proposal.

Public testimony was called for and the BHCA found that overall the application and the work that was being proposed is a much needed improvement. They noted that the door was actually originally blue, not black. They also noted that the proposed roof deck will be highly visible, and that the headhouse should be clad in copper. Lastly they asked the Commission to discuss the repairs of the bay window with the applicant to make sure it is being done correctly.

- **In conclusion the application was partially granted a continuance to a subsequent hearing and the following items were approved. M. Rosales initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, PTV).**
 - **Approve pedestrian gate replacement and gutter replacement;**
 - **Continue all other items.**

ADVISORY REVIEW

42 Irving Street: Expand existing rooftop dormer.
Representatives: Jason Arndt, Zephyr Architects.

The applicant presented the proposal to install an enlarged dormer on the front elevation and cited that they looked at others on the block. The Commission was against the idea of expanding the dormer without historic evidence to prove that there was one in the past and noted that many of the existing enlarged dormers in the district were likely from existing conditions or evidence that there was one originally. The Commission was unsupportive of the proposal and noted that they do not recommend approval of conjectural features.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

- 18.965 BH** **36 Beacon Street:** Repair brownstone and repaint to match existing; replace copper gutter, apron and flashing to match existing; reconstruct missing sections of fascia and soffit; replace missing slate.
- 18.927 BH** **49 Beacon Street:** Repoint brick courtyard wall to match existing.

- 18.966 BH** **56 Brimmer Street:** Replace copper conductor pipe; install copper wall cap on parapet to match adjacent.
- 18.885 BH** **29A Chestnut Street:** Repair and repaint exterior wood trim at windows and entrance in kind.
- 18.969 BH** **32-34 Hancock Street:** Replace three non-original wood windows on rear elevation with 6/6 wood true divided-lite windows to match existing.
- 18.962 BH** **38 Irving Street:** Reconstruct chimney as required with brick and mortar to match existing on structure; repoint brick façade (**see also Design Review work above**).
- 18.971 BH** **73 Mount Vernon Street:** Repoint sections of front elevation with mortar to match existing.
- 18.967 BH** **140 Mount Vernon Street:** Replace five front-facing, second floor wood 9/9 sashes changing muntin bars from 1" to 1 1/8" to allow for double-pane insulated glass.
- 18.972 BH** **112 Myrtle Street:** Repair and repaint existing fire balcony; repair and repaint cornice; repair and repaint metal oriels; install new door opening at rear alley (**see also Design Review work above**).
- 18.963 BH** **3 Walnut Street:** Replace six aluminum windows on structure with wood, true-divided lite windows in existing dimensions and lite configuration.
- 18.930 BH** **3 West Cedar Street:** Repair and repaint front door and surround.
- 18.931 BH** **35 West Cedar Street:** Replace wood flower boxes on front windows and paint black.

In conclusion the applications were approved as submitted. P. Donnelly initiated the motion and P. T. Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, PTV).

RATIFICATION OF THE JANUARY 18, 2018 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

The minutes were approved with the following proviso. K. Taylor initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT)

- **Change "color options" to "color samples" for 67 Mount Vernon Street application.**

RATIFICATION OF THE FEBRUARY 15, 2018 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

The minutes were approved with the following proviso. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT).

- **Change "lite" to "light" for consistency;**

7:15 P.M.: J. Pierce adjourned the public hearing.