

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

**April 19, 2018**

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

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

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

---

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

**VIOLATIONS:**

**81 Mount Vernon Street (VIO.BH.116) (18.098 BH):** Install two light fixtures flanking front entrance.

*Representative: Maria Tamvakologos*

The applicant presented photographs of the existing violation, samples of the proposed lighting, and samples of the previous color of the entryway. Staff noted that there may have once been side lights and a transom but it has been removed prior to the applicant's purchase of the building. The applicant explained that she would be happy to repaint the door and frame to its original condition and would be open to restoring the previous entryway configuration as well. The Commission all agreed that the entryway should be painted all black. The Commission found the proposed light fixtures more appealing than the current but noted that historically there was typically only one light where the door opened.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, MR, DS, KT).**
  - **Paint entryway all black.**
  - **Install one new light fixture on the side that the door opens.**

**DESIGN REVIEW:**

**81 Mount Vernon Street (18.1070 BH):** Paint front door and surround; install 16 storm windows on front elevation; install landscaping in front yard.

*Representatives: Maria Tamvakologos; Sean Cryts; Josh Oldfield*

The applicant presented photographs of the existing conditions, drawings of the proposed storm windows, drawings of the proposed landscaping, and images of the flowers to be used in the new landscaping set up. The Commission noted that putting flat storm windows on curved windows goes against the guidelines, and they suggested that the applicant explore re-glazing the windows or installing storms on the interior. The Commission asked if there was a historic precedent for the proposed garden and also

suggested that the applicant remove the proposed Japanese maple. In addition they suggested that the plantings align with the bow of the windows and they take design cues from the architecture in order not to detract from the building.

Public testimony was called for and the BHCA representative, Drew Wilcons, said that the association would prefer storm windows on the interior. As a private citizen he said he would love to see the windows restored, but that there are some storm windows on the street in front of historic curved windows.

- **In conclusion the application was in part denied and in part granted a continuance. M. Rosales initiated the motion and D. Santos seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, MR, DS, KT).**
  - **Deny storm windows;**
  - **Continue landscape plan to subsequent hearing per comments.**

**112 Myrtle Street (18.972 BH ):** Repair front door, transom and trim to match existing; install new roof deck; clad existing headhouse with standing seam copper; replace existing bubble skylight with low profile skylight.

*Representatives: Adam Gilmore, Meyer and Meyer Architects*

The applicant presented photographs of the existing entryway, renderings of the proposed decking, and sightline studies of the deck. The Commission confirmed that no changes were being made to the side lights of the door. The Commission also asked if this door would be locked, and if not, suggested that the doorbell be installed inside the building. The Commission also asked if any design changes had been made to the strobe light, and the applicant said that it was being removed from consideration until they could discuss other options with the fire department. The Commission discussed the visibility of the proposed roof deck and the existing bubble skylight. The Commission suggested that the roof deck be relocated to the other side of the roof so that it would not be visible from any public way.

- **In conclusion the application was in part approved and in part denied without prejudice. P. Donnelly initiated the motion and M. Rosales seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, MR, DS KT).**
  - **The repairing of front door, trim and transom approved.**
  - **Recladding of existing headhouse with standing seam copper and replacing the skylight at headhouse with lower profile, flat skylight approved.**
  - **Doorbell to be removed from plans.**
  - **Roof deck was denied without prejudice as it would be highly visible from Louisburg Square, consider shifting deck forward.**

**92B Pinckney Street (18.1096 BH):** Install projecting sign on Charles Street elevation.

*Representative: Diana Coldren*

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 the existing sign would be removed and in place there would be a blade sign. She also explained that although typically there is a one blade sign per building limit, the distance between the two

blade signs on this one building would be greater than that of the blade sign and the next adjacent building. The Commission then discussed the material and colors of the proposed sign.

Public testimony was called for and the BHCA voiced their concern with the proliferation of blade signs on these buildings and there would be two signs on one building. To which the applicant clarified that there is a 17 foot distance between the two signs.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, MR, DS, KT).**
  - **That the bracket matches that seen at “Beacon Hill Chocolates” at 91 Charles Street in design and height.**

**11 Irving Street (18.872 BH):** Replace three non-original windows on third story front elevation with SDL, double hung, 6/1 wood windows.

**This application was withdrawn prior to the hearing and was not reviewed by the Commission.**

**95 Mount Vernon Street (18.1062 BH):** Install two surveillance cameras and paint to match wall.

*Representatives: Grace Oltarzewski*

The applicant presented existing condition photographs, background information for the proposal, renderings of the proposed wall camera, and product examples of the proposed light fixture camera. The Commission opposed the camera installation on the side entrance because it would require cutting into the brick and altering the historic fabric. The Commission suggested finding a way to install it in the corner of the door jamb so that it was less visible and would be less likely to cause damage. The Commission noted that the style of the proposed entrance lamp is wrong for the style of the building. They suggested finding a fixture that is more in keeping with the architectural style. They also suggested that the applicant research installing pendant lighting in the ceiling. Overall they requested that the applicant do more research to find an appropriate solution.

Public testimony was called for and the BHCA noted that there was a more appropriate style for the building provided by the same company that the applicant could use. Additionally they suggested installing a camera in the call box instead of in the entrance lighting. The applicant should come back to the Commission with updated specifications.

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

**80 West Cedar Street (18.1067 BH):** Remove existing rooftop deck and install new deck in existing footprint.

*Representatives: Marisol Ortegon*

The applicant presented existing condition photographs and drawings of the proposed decking. The Commission discussed the visibility of the decking and asked whether it had been previously approved. Staff noted that properties 80 and 80A were lumped together in the roof deck approvals and it remains unclear. The Commission noted that there is a lot of space to reconfigure the decking to make it not visible. They noted that if the applicant can make the decking not visible, that they would not have to come back for review.

Public testimony was called for and the BHCA asked if the framing requirements of the decking were higher. The applicant confirmed that they were lower.

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

**84 Chestnut Street (18.1089 BH):** Install 70"x15" wall-mounted sign above storefront.  
*Representatives: Peter Wheeler*

The applicant presented photographs of the existing conditions, drawings of the proposed signage, and a rendering of the new sign. The Commission discussed the details of the previous signage, and the applicant noted that their sign would be smaller. The Commission felt that the lettering of the signage was too compressed and that the coloring seems out of place. The applicant noted that this is the brand logo that they have used at all of their stores and that they are not unable to make changes. The Commission suggested adding some spacing between the lettering and considering the colors of the building in order to make it not seem out of place.

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

**Commissioner Rosales left the hearing.**

**37 Brimmer Street (18.1085 BH):** Replace two 4/4 windows on fourth floor to match existing.  
*Representative: Jeff Karpowich*

The applicant presented photographs of the existing windows, and photographs of the windows to be installed. The Commission asked if the windows were original and if they were intending to paint them black. The applicant explained that they will do what the Commission asks of them to be in conformance, and they would just like them replaced because they are in bad condition. Staff recommended that the Commission approve the application with the proviso that the windows be 2/2 to conform with the other buildings on the street, so that over time the entire building will conform to the 2/2 windows. Commissioner Taylor noted that he likes the idiosyncratic approach because it shows the variety of what is possible in the district, despite the fact that it is less attractive in comparison to other buildings. Commissioner Santos said that changing the windows to 2/2 would be more conforming and attractive, but with multiple owners, it may also get complicated to get the entire building back into conformance. The Commission noted that if they approve the 4/4 configuration, the windows would have to be true divided lite.

Public testimony was called for and the BHCA asked whether the proposed windows would be true divided lites. They also noted that they did not believe these 4/4 windows were original as it would be an odd configuration for the building. They suggested making the windows 2/2 because making the windows all uniform on the same building is not always the most appropriate choice.

- A motion was made to continue the application. D. Santos initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 2-1 (Aye: DS, PD; Nay: KT).
- K. Taylor made a motion to rescind the previous motion. P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, DS, KT).
- **A motion was made to approve the application with the following proviso. K. Taylor initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 2-1 (Aye: PD, KT; Nay: DS).**
  - **Windows must be true divided lites.**

**63-69 Brimmer Street (18.1076 BH):** Construct three-story addition in existing courtyard area.

*Representative: Don Mills*

The applicant presented photographs of the existing conditions, architectural drawings and floor plans of the building and addition, colored renderings of the proposed addition, and drawings of the window configurations. The Commission discussed the visibility of the proposed addition from both the private and public ways. The Commission also discussed whether the slope of the roof would match the existing and what the material of the shingles would be. The Commission discussed the proposed windows and bays that are being relocated, and found that despite energy efficiency concerns, they would prefer true-divided-lite windows.

Public testimony was called for and the BHCA expressed their concern for the proposed simulated divided lite windows.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. K. Taylor initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, DS, KT).**
  - **Use true divided lite single or double glazed windows;**
  - **Storm windows are acceptable.**

## ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>18.1086 BH</b> | <b><u>68 Beacon Street:</u></b> Reseal 10 vertical joints on building to match existing mortar; repaint all existing windows, iron flower boxes and iron balconies black to match existing; repair window sills and seal. |
| <b>18.1088 BH</b> | <b><u>4 Charles River Square:</u></b> Restore roof deck railing; repoint sections of façade to match existing mortar; repair windows and repaint to match existing; remove storm windows from front elevation.            |
| <b>18.1095 BH</b> | <b><u>1 Chestnut Street:</u></b> Replace six wood windows on fourth floor with 6/6 wood TDL windows to match existing; install six Tru-Channel storm windows.   |
| <b>18.979 BH</b>  | <b><u>44 Chestnut Street:</u></b> Replace two non-original 1/1 wood sash sets in kind on rear elevation.  |

- 18.1050 BH**      **66 Chestnut Street, Apt. 6-8:** Replace 11 non-original wood windows on 4<sup>th</sup> floor rear addition with JB Proper Bostonian true divided lite windows.
- 18.1001 BH**      **97 Chestnut Street:** Install three Tru-Channel storm windows with half screens on dormered windows.
- 18.986 BH**        **2 Derne Street:** Replace existing asphalt shingles on roof to match existing.
- 18.985 BH**        **24 Garden Street:** Repoint sections of front façade with mortar to match existing; replace broken lintel above paired windows on front elevation to match existing in material, dimension and color; dismantle and reconstruct chimney and install low-profile chimney cap.
- 18.1092 BH**      **24 Garden Street:** Replace nine non-historic wood windows on front elevation with wood 6/6 TDL windows to match existing and paint black; replace shutters on front elevation to match existing.
- 18.1069 BH**      **17 Hancock Street:** Repair section of panel at entrance to match existing; remove water meter and reader in panel; repaint front door and entryway.
- 18.1082 BH**      **5 Joy Street:** Remove non-original brick chimney extension to match adjoined chimney at 4 Joy Street.
- 18.1101 BH**      **19 Myrtle Street:** Scrape, prime and paint wood storefronts and marquee in kind; repoint mortar on limestone to match existing color, sand content, texture and tooling; repoint loose mortar joints on brick façade and replace in kind; remove loose concrete patch near sidewalk and replace in existing dimensions, material and color.
- 18.1045 BH**      **64 Phillips Street:** Install copper parapet cap at roof with 3" expression.
- 18.978 BH**        **75 Pinckney Street:** Replace sash sets on two non-historic parlor-level wood 6/6 windows with wood, TDL double hung windows at front elevation.
- 18.1041 BH**      **1 Primus Avenue, Apt. 2:** Replace existing storm windows on front elevation, 2<sup>nd</sup> story with Harvey Tru-Channel storm windows with half screens.
- 18.974 BH**        **80-80A West Cedar Street:** Deconstruct top 30 courses of brick and relay using mortar to match existing.

**In conclusion the applications were approved as submitted. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, MR, KT).**

#### **RATIFICATION OF THE March 15, 2018 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

**The minutes were approved as submitted. P. Donnelly initiated the motion and M. Rosales seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, MR, KT).**

**Commissioner Santos arrived after the approval of previous meeting minutes and Administrative approval votes.**

**7:51 P.M.:** K. Taylor adjourned the public hearing.