



**SOUTH END LANDMARK DISTRICT COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room
Boston, MA, 02201

MARCH 3, 2020

Commissioners Present: John Amodeo, John Freeman, Catherine Hunt, Diana Parcon

Staff Present: Gabriella Amore, Preservation Assistant; Mary Cirbus, Preservation Planner

5:42 PM J. Amodeo called the public hearing to order.

I. DESIGN REVIEW

APP # 20.785 SE

156 WORCESTER STREET

Applicant: Handyman Pro

Proposed Work: Construct a roof deck with spiral staircase

Anthony Catalli (contractor) was the project representative. He walked the Commissioners through the project, which includes constructing a roof deck, adjacent to a previously-approved roof deck, with a spiral staircase. The spiral staircase is necessary because there is no access to the roof.

The Commissioners requested to see a roof plan, which the applicant did not provide. They looked at the roof via satellite imagery. The applicant tried to as best describe the placement of the roof deck without showing drawings. The Commissioners also reviewed the mock-up photographs provided.

Staff confirmed the Commission's purview over sightlines from West Springfield Street. Staff also confirmed that the adjacent deck (rebuilding it) was approved by the Commission, citing its limited visibility due to gaps in the street wall.

The Commissioners felt that they could not make a determination without a roof plan, but the applicant asked if the Commissioners felt they could approve the spiral staircase, because the roof deck will not be possible without the staircase. The Commission has purview over the staircase above the cornice line.

Staff noted that the SELDC has previously remanded spiral stairs to a subcommittee. The Commission agreed to establish this subcommittee. The applicant agreed to prepare the necessary drawings in advance of the subcommittee meeting.

There was no public comment.



J. Freeman motioned to remand the spiral staircase to a subcommittee consisting of J. Amodeo and D. Parcon, with the proviso that the applicant submits architectural plans and elevation of spiral stairs in advance of the subcommittee meeting. J. Amodeo added that the subcommittee will examine the visibility of the roof deck from the front of the building as well. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP).

APP # 20.809 SE

565 TREMONT STREET

Applicant: American Signcrafters

Proposed Work: At the front façade storefront install a wall sign and new vinyl signage

Jim Garatino (contractor) was the project representative. He explained that the scope of work includes updating the existing signage to new branding standards. The Commissioners discussed which portions of the vinyl signage are opaque.

Staff confirmed that the signage is allowed to cover up to 25% of window space.

The Commissioners then moved to a discussion of the wall sign. J. Freeman does not believe that the proposed location was meant to be a sign band but is rather a lintel. Staff explained that historically the building had commercial storefronts with awnings, similar to the neighboring restaurant (Aquitaine) and that this approach would be more appropriate than the installation of a wall sign at the lintel.

J. Amodeo noted that the Commission rarely allows the installation of two signs on the same façade. He also expressed concern that the wall sign would compete with the architectural “St. Cloud” signage over the main entrance and explained that the Commission has to be especially careful with the St. Cloud building, as it was designed by Nathaniel Bradlee, who is one of the more renowned architects of the South End and unlike any other building in the district.

There was no public comment.

J. Freeman motioned to approve the vinyl signage as presented, but to deny the wall sign without prejudice, citing that the Commission might entertain awnings instead. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP).

APP # 20.817 SE

51 RUTLAND SQUARE

Applicant: Pitman & Wardley Associates

Proposed Work: Install a railing at the front façade mansard level (which was modified prior to designation).



Zachary Millay (architect) and Scott Van der Linden (homeowner) were the project representatives. They explained the scope of work, which includes installing a railing on the inside of the parapet for safety issues. There was no railing there previously. The EPDM roofing will be removed on the finish floor and composite decking installed. J. Freeman asked that a section drawing showing the decking be provided. The railings will be 42" from the finish decking.

J. Amodeo noted that the mock-up breaks the roof line. He suggested that a straight line would help minimize visibility, although the deck would be decreased in size by half. The applicants suggested a curved glass rail instead but the Commission felt that glass is too reflective. J. Freeman suggested a subcommittee to examine the placement on site.

There was no public comment.

J. Freeman motioned to approve the installation of a railing in concept, citing safety concerns, but to remand the position and composition of the railing to a subcommittee consisting of J. Amodeo and D. Parcon. He also added that there should be no caps on the railing. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP).

APP # 20.743 SE

64 WEST RUTLAND SQUARE

Applicant: Embarc Studio

Proposed Work: Construct a roof deck, modify the mansard, and construct a rear addition through the cornice line

Mark van Brocklin, Carolyn Keller (both on the design team) and John Moran (attorney) were the project representatives. They walked the Commissioners through the proposal, which will essentially replicate the existing conditions at no. 66 West Rutland Square, which was determined to be exempt by commission staff. The roof deck is also visible from Titus Sparrow Park.

The applicants ensured that the rear addition will not penetrate the brick corbeling at the cornice line.

The Commissioners then moved to discussing the rear mansard. There is no documentation showing the original configuration of the rear dormer, nor are there models to imitate. J. Amodeo noted that a full shed dormer would not have been typical of the time the building was constructed.



J. Freeman explained that the Commission has allowed a wide dormer with a reveal at the second and fourth windows with a sense of three expressed windows with a steep mansard in between. A drawing of the modified mansard will be required.

The Commission then moved to a discussion of the roof deck, which will be visible over Titus Sparrow Park. J. Amodeo explained that a subcommittee will be required to review the deck on site. He cited that the wide views over the park will likely mean that the deck will not achieve invisibility, but that modifying its placement may improve views.

There was no public comment.

J. Freeman motioned to approve the dormer in concept with a different configuration showing with a three-part, tripartite configuration represented, and that the drawing be submitted to staff; and to remand the roof deck to a subcommittee consisting of C. Hunt and P. Sanborn, with J. Amodeo as a back-up. J. Amodeo added that if the drawing of the new dormer configuration was prepared in advance, the subcommittee will review the drawing at the subcommittee meeting. J. Freeman further amended the motion to add that the windows on the rear dormer should be two-over-two configuration. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP).

APP # 20.418 SE

34 CLARENDON STREET

Applicant: Christopher Lapan

Proposed Work: At the front façade parlor through mansard levels, replace seven (7) six-over-six, double-hung wood windows in kind.

Jude Waters (contractor) was the project representative. He explained that the homeowners are only replacing some of the windows at this time, and they do not want an irregular fenestration pattern on the façade. The existing windows are not historic.

The Commissioners discussed the composition of the proposed window, which is a wood composite.

The Commissioners explained that in the absence of historic documentation, the best configuration to go with is two-over-two sash. J. Freeman also pointed out that the proposal also calls for inserts, rather than new construction windows. The windows need to be replaced so that the glass line is not changed. The Commissioners determined that the application should be continued for more information regarding the glass line and material.



A member of the community asked for clarification regarding the configuration. There was no other public comment.

J. Freeman motioned to continue the application pending the receipt of additional information regarding the material and glass line. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP).

II. ADVISORY REVIEW

115 WORCESTER STREET

Proposed Work: Construct a new building

Marci Booth (LIHC) and Jay Symanzki were the project representatives. They explained the progress made in the design and addressed comments from Commissioners from the previous Advisory Review. They also noted that the first floor has to be raised above grade in order to comply with floodplain requirements and that the previous design of parallel sidewalks must remain in order to make those first floor units accessible.

During a question period, J. Freeman asked for more detail regarding the hoods over the entries. D. Parcon asked about the main entry. C. Hunt asked about additional detailing on the façade, particularly over the main entry.

David Hamilton (direct abutter) asked about the cornice line and offered additional public comment about the design of the building. Jill Christians (abutter) offered additional public comment about the building design. Both representatives expressed concern about the height and massing, as well as the design of the rear of the building. She also expressed concern about the foundations of adjacent buildings. Abraham McLaughlin expressed concern about plummeting property values. Additional members of the community spoke in opposition to the proposal. One member of the community spoke in support of the proposal. Renee Smith expressed concern about the lack of quality of community outreach. John Moran noted the existence of the open space in accordance with the South End Urban Renewal plan.

J. Amodeo noted that the Commission does not have purview over parking or open space. Alexa Pinard (BPDA) clarified zoning requirements.

During the Commissioner comment period, D. Parcon expressed appreciation that the applicants lowered the height of the building, but noted that the building still feels too distant from the vocabulary of the South End. C. Hunt noted the drop-off in detail as the building extends towards Tremont Street, and she feels like the design still has some ways to go. J.



Freeman expressed that the design has come a long way since the previous advisory review. He agreed with D. Parcon in that it still does not feel like a South End building. He expressed that the building needs to incorporate more of the South End vocabulary, especially with the articulation of the ground level around the entrances. He also suggested that the entrance be more articulated and suggested adding a modern articulation of a cornice.

J. Amodeo noted that he would like to see more detail at the top floor. He also noted that the precedent-setting examples provided are not appropriate for this site. With regard to the landscaping and parallel walkways, he noted that there may be ways to minimize and reduce the amount the secondary walks shown. He also expressed that more texture would help.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW/ APPROVAL

APP # 20.826 SE 70 APPLETON STREET: At the rear façade mansard level, replace slate shingles in kind and install new copper gutter.

APP # 20.749 SE 26 CHANDLER STREET: At the Chandler Street façade ground level, replace double entry doors in kind. *Withdrawn by staff*

APP # 20.810 SE 24 HOLYOKE STREET: At the front façade all levels, repair cracking around windows and elsewhere as needed and repaint patched areas to match existing painted sandstone.

APP # 20.817 SE 51 RUTLAND SQUARE #2: At the front façade mansard level (which was modified prior to designation), replace a sliding glass door. *See additional items under Design Review.*

APP #20.754 SE 540 TREMONT STREET: At the second level of the Tremont Street and Hansen Street facades, replace sixteen (16) one-over-one, double-hung, aluminum windows in kind.

APP # 20.814 SE 557 TREMONT STREET: At the signband of the Tremont Street and Clarendon Street ground level storefront and ATM entrance, replace four (4) wall-mounted non-illuminated signs to reflect updated corporate branding.

APP # 20.779 SE 771 TREMONT STREET: Install a gate at the areaway to match existing fence.

APP # 20.780 SE 59 RUTLAND STREET: At the front façade roof and dormer level, replace asphalt shingles in kind, repair wood trim, and install copper drip edges; at the front façade, repair and repaint lintels and sills to match the color of the underlying stone; and repair and replace copper gutters and downspout in kind.



APP # 20.662 SE — 23 UPTON STREET: At the parlor and second levels of the front façade, restore six (6) original two-over-two, double-hung, wood windows (including four (4) curved sash windows); at the basement level replace two (2) two-over-two, double-hung, curved sashed wood windows in kind; at the third level replace three (3) one-over-one, double-hung wood windows with two-over-two, double-hung wood windows; at the mansard level replace two (2) two-over-two, double-hung, wood windows and two (2) one-over-one, double-hung wood windows in kind. *See additional items under Design Review. Withdrawn by applicant*

APP # 20.750 SE 227, 229, 231, 233 WEST CANTON STREET: At the mansard level, replace asphalt shingles with slate shingles and replace wood fascia in kind.

APP # 20.743 SE 64 WEST RUTLAND SQUARE: At the front façade basement, parlor, second, and third levels, restore all existing two-over-two, double-hung, wood windows (including eight (8) curved sash); At the front façade mansard level, install one (1) two-over-two and two (2) one-over-one, double-hung, wood windows; at the front façade, repoint brick joints, and restore brownstone sills and lintels, stoop; and refinish entry doors. *See additional items under Design Review.*

APP # 20.813 SE 76 WEST RUTLAND SQUARE #401: At the front façade fourth level, replace four (4) one-over-one wood windows in kind.

APP # 20.182 SE 76 WEST RUTLAND SQUARE #502: At the front façade fifth level, replace eight (8) one-over-one, wood windows in kind.

APP # 20.806 SE 81 WORCESTER STREET: At the front façade all levels, repoint brick joints; repair and patch lintels and sills and repaint to match the color of the underlying stone.

Staff and Commissioners had a brief discussion regarding the proposed signage at 540 Tremont Street and the Commissioners determined that the signage replacement was appropriate.

C. Hunt motioned to approve the Administrative Review applications as submitted.

D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP).

IV. RATIFICATION OF 1/07/2020 AND 2/4/2020 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES AND 2/26/2020 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

C. Hunt motioned to approve the minutes as submitted. J. Freeman seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP).

V. ADJOURNMENT – 9:04 PM



City of Boston
Environment



City of Boston
Mayor Martin J. Walsh

C. Hunt motioned to adjourn the hearing. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP).