



BEACON HILL ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

Public Hearing Minutes

Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room

Boston, MA, 02201

December 19, 2019

Commissioners Present: Paul Donnelly, Joel Pierce, P.T. Vineburgh

Staff Present: Nicholas Armata, Senior Preservation Planner, Gabriella Amore, Preservation Assistant

5:00 p.m. Commissioner Pierce called the public hearing to order.

I. DESIGN

**APP # 20.209 BH 9 Willow Street (Continued from 10/17/2019 & 11/5/2019)
APPROVED AS SUBMITTED 3-0 (JP, PD, PV)**

Applicant: Deborah Thomas

Proposed Work: At all facades; repaint wood windows, trim, and bays in kind.

The applicant provided the timeline of events of the proposal that is with the Landmarks Commission. The application was previously remanded to a subcommittee so that different variations of the color chosen could be viewed on site. During the subcommittee, members of the public brought up a concern of a conflict of interest with one of the commissioners. Staff decided by staff that that did not make a vote due to a concern of a conflict of interest and that the application should return to the full Commission for a vote. The paint color that exists today was previously approved; the applicant was simply looking to repaint the exact same color.

The Commission saw no reason why the color could not be approved.

During the public comment, several members of the Civic Assoc. spoke in support of the work.

In conclusion, the application was approved as submitted.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, PV).



APP # 19.1150 BH 60 Chestnut Street

Applicant: John Holland; the Holland Group

Proposed Work: Remediation of condenser location, planter, and deck height

The applicant provided a short history of the project, and how the project came to be higher than what was originally approved. The staff at BHAC along with the representatives of the property met several times to come up with a correction to the issue. Their proposal involved lowering the deck, relocating the condensers and shielding them from public view. The flashing covering the top of the wall would also be altered to match a neighboring property.

During public comment several direct abutters addressed concerns over the deck being too tall, and visually unappealing. The abutters also addressed concern that the garage is illegal and should be remanded to zoning before it can be approved again by the landmarks commission.

The Commission discussed the details of the proposal; including the height, the relationship to the surrounding properties, the visibility of the HVAC equipment and the shielding

In conclusion, the application was approved with the provisos that the condenser visibility is remanded to staff to determine if they are truly not visible.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, PV).



**APP # 20.371 BH 151-153 Charles Street (Continued from 10/17/2019)
APPROVED AS SUBMITTED 3-0 (JP, PD, PV)**

Applicant: Thomas Maguire

Proposed Work: At side yard visible from Charles Street, replace wooden picket fence gate with metal fence with diamond plate screening.

The applicant was returning from the previous hearing based on some of the recommendations changes made by the commission. The new proposal contained drawings with dimensions that showed exactly how the fence would be constructed. Additionally, the drawings showed how the metal diamond plate would be affixed to the structure. The applicant also stressed the need for such a fence due to ongoing issues with trespassers. He would be modelling his fence after the fence that was recently installed across the street at the Whitney Hotel.

The commission discussed the details of the proposal and decided that the current form of the proposal was an improvement and that all of the details needed to make the decision were now available.

In conclusion the application was approved as submitted.

**Commissioner Donnelly motioned to approve the application,
Commissioner Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP,
PV).**



**APP # 20.283 BH 92 Pinckney Street (Continued from 10/17/2019)
APPROVED W. PROVISOS 3-0 (JP, PD, PV)**

Applicant: Steve Calandrella CM

Proposed Work: At north, west and south facades replace all windows (historic and replacement) with proper pane configuration to match existing.

The applicant was returning to the commission with an updated application that included the previous requests of shop drawings of the proposed windows, and photographs of the existing conditions of the windows. During the presentation, the applicant scrolled through a slideshow of the current conditions of the windows.

During the public comment period, members of the civic association expressed great concern over the loss of the historic fabric of the neighborhood, especially the original/historic windows.

The Commission discussed whether or not the windows should be replaced. BHAC staff informed the Commission that the windows were in excellent condition and, to stay consistent with the district guidelines should be repaired rather than replaced. This is with the exception of the windows on the property that were not original.

In conclusion that application was approved with the provisos that the original windows on the structure are restored, and that the non-original windows on the 4th level are replaced with the proposed replacement windows.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, PV).



APP # 20.516 BH 71 Beacon Street (Continued from 10/17/2019)

Applicant: Andrew R. Hamilton

Proposed Work: At fourth floor at front, rear and side facades, replace five, 6 over 6, wood, true divided light windows with five, 6 over 6, wood, true divided light windows.

The applicant provided the details of the application to replace the windows in the 4th floor unit. The windows being reviewed was expanded due to the visibility from a public way. The windows needed to be replaced because of the lead paint and that there would be a child in the property. The applicant mentioned that the windows could not be “dipped” because they were too old and it was thought that they would deteriorate in the process.

The Commission debated whether or not the windows should be replaced or repaired to mitigate the lead paint. After discussing the topic with staff, it was determined that there was no evidence to suggest the windows could not be repaired. Staff recommended that the details of the windows were remanded to the staff to determine if they should be replaced or repaired.

During public comment, members of the neighborhood opposed the replacement of the windows and insisted that they should be repaired.

In conclusion the application was approved with the provisos that staff is to visit on site and determine if the windows are repairable. If they are they must be restored rather than repaired.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, PV).



APP # 20.251 BH 12 Lime Street

Applicant: Dan Desrochers; Pomeroy + Company

Proposed Work: At front façade main entry, install five new energy panels

The applicant was returning to the commission after the previous application for the same project was approved with the provisos that the panels were installed on the inside rather than the outside. The applicant indicated that this was not possible.

The Commission discussed the details of the application and questioned the reasoning that the panel couldn't be installed. According to staff the proposed panels were specifically called out in the guidelines as being prohibited to be placed over leaded glass.

During public comment, members of the public indicated that the panels should not be approved. Leaded/stained glass would deteriorate under the panels by creating a microclimate that would destroy the glass behind it.

In conclusion the application was denied without prejudice.

Commissioner Donnelly motioned to deny the application with prejudice, Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).

APP # 20.379 BH 10 Otis Place

Applicant: David Doyno

Proposed Work: At rear yard facing Storrow Drive replace chain link fence with cedar privacy fence.

The applicant failed to appear. No vote was taken.



APP # 20.410 BH 104 Mt. Vernon Street (11A West Cedar)

Applicant: Shari Loessberg and Christopher Smart

Proposed Work: At front façade, restore leaded glass on side lights and transom by cleaning and removing existing paint. Restore existing front door, repaint door (BM Grand Entrance Red). Restore 11A main entry repaint door (BM Grand Entrance Red).

The application provided the details of the project that included completely restoring the leaded glass side lights similar to those seen throughout the district. The glass and lead is to be stripped down, restored and reinstalled with the lead unpainted and the surrounds repainted. The two doors are to be repainted as well.

The Commission reviewed the proposal and saw no issues with the work.

In conclusion the application was approved as submitted.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, PV).

APP # 20.459 BH 13 Chestnut Street

Applicant: Oliver Colburn

Proposed Work: Install new light fixture at front façade.

The applicant discussed the details of the project which involved removing the recessed (inappropriate) light and installing a replica of the neighboring properties pendant light.

The Commission thought that the proposed light was appropriate and saw no issues with it.

During public comment there was no objection to the light fixture.

Commissioner Donnelly motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, PV).



APP # 20.470 BH 70 Charles Street

Applicant: Jasmine Punzalan

Proposed Work: Install new signage.

The applicant presented the details of the application. Her existing store in Beacon Hill was closing and she hoped to simply transfer her existing blade sign from that store to her new Charles Street store.

The Commission questioned the materials of the sign and the sign in relation of sign to the rest of the sign seen throughout the street.

During public comment members of the public expressed concern that the sign should look like the other signs seen on the same building for other businesses.

In conclusion the sign was approved with the provisos that all of the signage will be removed if the store is to close or relocate. No additional signage (including window decals) are not proposed but will not be approved.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).

APP # 20.497 BH 145 Pinckney Street

Applicant: Giovanni Grimaldi

Proposed Work: Replace existing perimeter fence in kind.

The applicant provided the details of the project which included replacing several portions of the existing fence exactly as is.

The Commissioners discussed the project and saw no issues with it, considering the project is replacing in kind to a non-contributing structure.

During public comment there was no objection to the project.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).

APP # 20.503 BH 31 Irving Street (Adjacent)



Applicant: Nathaniel Walton

Proposed Work: Install tree guard around street tree.

The applicant presented the details of the proposal which included installing a tree guard around a new tree. The applicant informed the Commission that after speaking with the neighborhood civic associations, this was the preferred model.

The Commission saw no issue with the proposal and asked that if the tree should die or need to be replaced, the tree guard is removed and reinstalled. If the guard is damaged or vandalized, it will be promptly repaired.

During public comment, the Civic Association expressed interest in installing another model.

In conclusion the application was approved with the provisos that the guard is maintained in a state of good repair and that it will be reinstalled if a new tree needs to be planted.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).



APP # 20.510 BH 6 Mt. Vernon Place

Applicant: Stephen Gallagher R.A.

Proposed Work: At front and side facades, install four decorative lights.

The applicant provided the details of the project, which were not facing a public way but were visible from a public way (Joy Street) as well as the Capital grounds. The lights were to replace several utility lights that were not in line with the district guidelines.

The Commissioners discussed the details that were presented. The fixtures were appropriate but it was determined that the fixtures seen at the rear of the structure were too overwhelming.

During public comment, members of the public felt that the fixtures were too large.

In conclusion the application was approved with the provisos that there would be only one fixture rather than two at the rear.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).



APP # 20.514 BH 65-66 Beacon Street

Applicant: Daniel Brennan

Proposed Work: At Charles Street façade, replace existing double doors with a single leaf door and sidelight.

The applicant discussed the details of the proposal. The existing doors do not meet the standards for ADA accessibility and they needed to be replaced along with a button that would operate the automatic door function.

The Commission discussed the details of the project and questioned the dimensions of the doors and ways to integrate the existing doors into the project. Unfortunately, the dimensions conflicted for accessibility standards. It was unclear as to whether the illumination of the buttons was required, but it is preferred that they are not illuminated.

During public comment, the civic association questioned why there was a need to replace the door rather than retrofit the existing door.

In conclusion, the application was approved with the provisos that the buttons are installed without the illumination (if not a conflict with the access requirements). If they need to be illuminated the applicant should contact staff for next steps.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).



APP # 20.520 BH 30 Chestnut Street

Applicant: Alex Slote

Proposed Work: At front façade, replace wood shutters. At front and rear facades all levels, replace all wood windows (6 over 6) with 6 over 6 wood windows. Replace granite curbstone with brick. Install steel balconies at second and third level of rear. Relocate downspout at rear of the property. Install roof deck.

The applicant provided details of the project which consists of several repairs to the front and rear of the property. The shutters, which appear to be original were to be repaired due to their deteriorated condition but will be replicated to match existing. The roof deck on the main portion of the house is to be installed because it is not visible from the street, along with the existing head house which is to be re-clad. At the rear of the structure 2 metal decks at the second and third floor are proposed. The downspout at the rear is to be relocated to redirect water runoff and the rear curb is to be leveled in order to remediate a tripping hazard.

The Commission discussed the details of the project, it was discovered that the window professional that was scheduled to remove the windows did not in fact specialize in window restoration. Additionally, a rear roof deck above the garage was proposed but not listed in the work items on the application. Staff informed the applicant that this item will not be reviewed at this hearing.

During public comment, the civic association indicated concerns over zoning and original fabrics of the structure being discarded.

In conclusion, the Commission voted to approve the application with the provisos that the rear balconies are denied, the existing shutters are studied for original paint color, the windows are remanded to staff who will determine if they can be repaired, and the gutters are approved.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).



APP # 20.521 BH 71 Charles Street

Applicant: Monika Pauli

Proposed Work: At front façade, replace existing main front door and side lights, replace existing front garden level door and shave sloped stone, install new light in door well. Repaint door vestibule Whispering Spring. Install two new hand rails, install two new sign, and install wood flowerboxes. Install fire department connection. At front and rear facades, replace existing 6 over 6 wood windows with 6 over 6 wood windows. Install star tiebacks at front façade.

The applicant presented the details to the project which include several changes to the storefront of the building in order to accommodate a new book store.

The Commission decided that because the project consisted of a number of details that need a lengthy negotiation the project should be remanded to a subcommittee consisting of Joel Pierce and P.T. Vineburgh.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to remand the application to a subcommittee, Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).



APP # 20.523 BH 34 Beacon Street

Applicant: Mona Bonnot

Proposed Work: Remove upper railing and hatch at upper roof. At Joy Street façade level 1, replace three 6 over 6 wood windows with 3 6 over 6 windows. At front façade dormer level, replace two, 2 over 2, wood windows with two, 2 over 2, wood windows. Replace flag pole.

The applicant provided the details of the project which included the need to repair the roof of the structure, including removing the decorative rail. The flag pole, which is in serious need of repair, is proposed to be replaced with a PVC flag pole. Several windows, which the applicant provided details as to their condition and need for replacement, were also presented.

The Commission discussed whether the flag pole should be made of PVC or Metal (Or wood) and suggested that a mock up should be set up in order to determine if it is approvable. The Commission saw no issue with removing the metal roof detail as well as the window replacement.

During public comment the civic association recommended that the decorative metal on the roof should be preserved.

In conclusion the application was approved with the provisos that a mockup of the flag pole using different materials to determine appropriateness.

Those details are to be submitted to staff to determine next steps.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).



APP # 20.603 BH 82 Chestnut Street

Applicant: Sean Cryts

Proposed Work: At River Street façade, level four, replace six, 6 over 1 wood sash sets with 6 over 1 wood sash sets in existing frames.

The applicant provided details to the proposal which involved replacing six older replacement windows with historically appropriate windows. The existing windows were significantly deteriorated and not worth restoring.

The Commission discussed the details of the project and reviewed the evidence provided to justify the replacement. They felt that the windows could be replaced.

During the public comment period the Civic Association wished to see the windows repaired rather than replaced.

In conclusion the application was approved as submitted.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).



APP # 20.610 BH 137 Charles Street

Applicant: Rosanna Miller; Luxor Hair

Proposed Work: At storefront, install wall sign, blade sign, and window decals.

The applicant provided details of their proposal which involves installing signage for a new store at the property. The signage as proposed is made from metal. Additional signage includes window decals and a blade sign similar in size to the existing sign.

The Commission discussed the project and thought that the signage collectively is somewhat overwhelming. They wished to see less logo branding. Additionally, the signage would look better and fit into the neighborhood by making it from wood. The Commission asked the applicant if that was ok, the applicant confirmed.

There was no public comment.

In conclusion, the application was approved with the provisos that the blade sign and banner sign are made from carved wood and that there would be no window decals.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).



APP # 20.612 BH 44 Beacon Street

Applicant: Sophie Mankins

Proposed Work: Repaint front door and porch Benjamin Moore Essex Green High Gloss (Door), Chalk white semi-gloss (Trim and columns).

The applicant presented the details to the project and indicated that the paint colors exist today and that they were simply repainting the elements listed in the application.

The Commission pointed that if staff reviewed the colors on site then there isn't any issue with the proposal.

There was no public comment.

In conclusion the application was approved as submitted.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application.

Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).



APP # 20.615 BH 105 Pinckney Street

Applicant: Kelly Robbins

Proposed Work: At front façade, install black metal handrail on front stoop.

The applicant provided the details of the proposal which included installing a simple metal handrail at the front of the property.

The Commission debated whether the metal rail was appropriate and whether it could mimic other rails seen on the block. The Commission agreed that it should be modelled after area examples and that the applicant should work with staff to come up with a simple and non-invasive rail.

There was no public comment.

In conclusion, the application was approved with the provisos that the rail details are remanded to staff for final approval. They should match 82 Pinkney Street in style.

Commissioner Donnelly motioned to approve the application.

Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).

APP # 20.617 BH 33 Bowdoin Street

Applicant: Jan Steenbrugge

Proposed Work: At all facades, repaint windows and trim black (*Previously reviewed under 20.381 BH*).

The applicant returned to the Commission to seek approval for painting the windows black. This was previously denied under a separate application. The applicant has since located historic evidence that the windows were painted a darker color originally.

The Commission thought that the newly presented evidence was sufficient and motioned to approve the application as submitted.

During the public comment section the civic association had concerns over the color and suggested that the proposal does not fit the character of the neighborhood and that the existing color was “factory painted.”

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application.

Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).



APP # 20.630 BH 35 Bowdoin Street

Applicant: Jan Steenbrugge

Proposed Work: At South elevation, replace existing basement level double hung windows to match existing window configuration, materials and dimensions. Replace two (basement) windows at south elevation with doors to match existing window styles.

The applicant was returning to the commission to update their original approval. The windows that were originally supposed to be repaired were in fact beyond repair. Additionally, the applicant wished to now replace the windows with doors with similar pane configurations.

The commission discussed the visibility of the new doors that were located in the alley next to the property. While staff had concerns over the proportions of the door, the Commission decided that they were minimally visible and saw no issue.

During public comment the civic association stressed concern over the gas meters and whether the new doors needed zoning sign off.

In conclusion the application was approved as submitted.

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the application.

Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, and PV).



II. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW/APPROVAL: *In order to expedite the review process, the commission has delegated the approval of certain work items, such as those involving ordinary maintenance and repair, restoration or replacement, or which otherwise have a minimal impact on a building's appearance, to commission staff pending ratification at its monthly public hearing. Having been identified as meeting these eligibility criteria and all applicable guidelines, the following applications will be approved at this hearing:*

APP # 20.319 BH **34 1/2 Beacon Street:** At front façade, remove and replace raised panels and replace/repaint in kind.

APP # 20.523 BH **34 Beacon Street:** At front façade, level 2, replace standing seam copper roof, install TPO roofing system. *(See Additional Items under Design Review).*

APP # 20.521 BH **71 Charles Street:** Replace existing front and rear gutters in kind with copper gutters, replace existing roof level flashing in kind with copper flashing. At front façade, restore existing windows on level two and three. At front façade level 1, repair metal detail in kind. Repair snow guards, Rebuild existing chimney in kind. Repair front door vestibule molding in kind. At rear façade, repoint brick, in kind. *(See Additional Items in Design Review)*

APP # 20.520 BH **30 Chestnut Street:** At front and rear facades, clean and repoint brick in kind. At rear façade, repair garage header in kind, replace copper gutter in kind. *(See Additional Items under Design Review).*

APP # 20.495 BH **130 Chestnut Street:** Paint front main vestibule BM - Windham Cream

APP # 20.613 BH **46-48/52-54 Irving Street:** At all facades, replace all windows which are 1 over 1 and vinyl with 1 over 1, aluminum clad.

APP # 20.384 BH **37 Joy Street:** At front and rear facades, repair spalled brick and cast stone sill, stabilize displaced brick and reset cast stone lintels and sills, repair step cracks, spot repoint as needed. All work is to be done in kind.

APP # 20.619 BH **39 Joy Street:***(Pending Missing Information)* At front façade, level two replace four, 6 over 1, wood windows with 6 over 1 wood windows.

APP # 20.467 BH **129-131 Mount Vernon Street:** At front façade level one; replace two, 2 over 2, wood windows and four, one over one, wood windows in kind.

APP # 20.460 BH **54 Myrtle Street #5:** At front façade, level three replace three, 1 over 1, wood, windows with three, 1 over 1, wood windows.

APP # 20.517 BH **69 Phillips Street:** At front façade levels 1-5, replace all one over one wood windows with 1 over 1 wood windows. Total of 14 windows.

APP # 20.616 BH **105 Pinckney Street:** At rear façade, level 1 & 2 replace 5 windows.

APP # 20.513 BH **123 Pinckney Street:** Paint and repair wood storefront in kind.

APP # 20.522 BH **1 Primus Avenue:** At front and side elevation levels 4 and 5, replace eight, 6 over 6, wood, replacement windows with six over six wood windows.

APP # 20.316 BH **11A Revere Street:** At level one, replace two one over one aluminum clad windows with 1 over 1 aluminum clad windows.



APP # 20.466 BH **75 Revere Street:** At front façade level three, replace two, non-historic, 6 over 6 wood windows with two, 6 over 6 wood windows.

APP # 20.395 BH **104 Revere Street:** Refinish existing shutters, repaint in the same color.

APP # 20.515 BH **33-61 Temple Street:** Restore Derne and Temple Streets.

APP # 20.511 BH ~~**87 West Cedar Street:**~~ *(Pending Missing Information)* Repaint entry door and trim in kind. *Removed by Staff*

APP # 20.327 BH ~~**89-91 West Cedar Street:**~~ *(Pending Missing Information)* Cut and repoint brick using type "N" mortar *(See Additional Items under Design Review)*. *Removed by Staff*

Commissioner Pierce motioned to approve the minutes, Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, PV).

III. Ratification of Meeting Minutes from 10/17/2019

Commissioner Vineburgh motioned to approve the minutes, Commissioner Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, PV).

IV. Staff Updates

V. Adjorn – 8:15

Commissioner Pierce motioned to adjorn the hearing. Commissioner Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, PV).