



**South End Landmark District Commission
Public Hearing Minutes**

Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room
Boston, MA, 02201

April 2, 2019

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

Staff Present: Nicholas Armata, Senior Preservation Planner

5:38 Commissioner Parcon called the public hearing to order.

I. DESIGN REVIEW

APP # 19.838 SE 565 Columbus Avenue #3

Applicant: Lauren Dickerman

Proposed Work: At commercial storefront replace existing awnings and hanging signage.

The applicant presented the details to their proposal which consisted of new awnings with the business print on it using the existing hardware, and a new blade sign also using the existing blade sign hardware. The blade signage would be the same size as the existing, and have no illumination.

The Commissioners discussed the details of the signage, stating that the blade sign was an improvement from the previous design. The Commissioners did feel that the “glasses” image on the side of the awning was excessive.

There was no public comment.

In conclusion, the application was approved with the provisos that the awning did not include an image of the glasses.

J. FREEMAN motioned to APPROVE the application, C. HUNT seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JF, CH, DP, PS).



APP # 19.877 SE 1771 Washington Street

Applicant: Cambridge Repro-Graphics

Proposed Work: At front façade storefront, install 3 awnings.

Craig Murphy, a representative for Cambridge Repro-Graphics presented the details of the proposed awnings at the property. The applicant indicated that the awnings would be a fabric, not a plastic. The awnings would match the color, shape and size of the existing awnings on the adjacent storefront in the same building.

The Commissioners asked to confirm the details of the materials of the awnings and indicated that vinyl was not acceptable. The Commission did have some questions in regards to the use of the door that is at the center of the storefront. If this was an entrance to the residences above the store, then they debated whether adding an awning would be appropriate and difficult for customers to locate the access door to the storefront.

There was no public comment.

In conclusion, the application was approved with the provisos that the use of the door in question will be reported back to staff and a determination will be made as to whether an awning should be installed there.

J. FREEMAN motioned to APPROVE the application, C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 19.912 SE 534-536 Columbus Avenue

Applicant: Heath Gatlin

Proposed Work: At front façade replace front door, commercial door, restore metal bays that were damaged in a fire (See *additional items in design review*).

Scott Grady and Heath Gatlin, representatives of the building explained that a fire in late 2018 and subsequent fire suppression methods significantly damaged the structure which needed repairs. The metal bays were to be restored to their original condition, the storefront doors would be replaced with a more historically accurate style, and the residential entrance was to be replaced in kind.

The Commission discussed the appropriateness of the double commercial door as well as the design of the residential door. They reminded the applicants that the



glass should be a simple design and not decorative as shown in the manufacturing sheet. The Commission also requested for the Commercial doors to be a single light (per door).

There was no public comment.

In conclusion, the application was approved as submitted.

C. HUNT motioned to APPROVE the application, J. FREEMAN seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 19.918 SE 2 Haven Street

Applicant: Robert Ruley

Proposed Work: At front façade replace front door, side lights and transom (See additional items in administrative review).

Robert Ruley, the contractor for the property provided details to his proposal to replace the existing door, that was not original, as well as the side lights and transoms. The door paneling was also being proposed to be replaced. Mr. Ruley explained that the homeowners did not want to have glass on the sidelights due to safety concerns.

The Commission discussed whether the side light panels of the door should be historically all glass or all wood as they are today. The Commission also determined that the paneling around the door was likely original and must be maintained. The details of this should be sent to staff for final approval.

There was no public comment.

In conclusion, the application was approved with the provisos that the original wood panels of the entry remain, they must be carefully removed should there be a need to do so in order to install the new door. The original frame of the door must also remain.

J. FREEMAN motioned to APPROVE the application, D. PARCON seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 19.923 SE 194-200 Shawmut Avenue

Applicant: Tim Burke and Edward Gottlieb

Proposed Work: Install fencing and dumpster enclosure.



Tim Burke and Edward Gottlieb presented the details of the application for work at the parking lot located in the protection area. The applicants indicated that the work for the fencing had already been completed prior to the hearing. The dumpster enclosure has yet to be completed. The applicants also indicated that the plan was also to install planting beds.

The Commissioners explained that all work must be approved by the Commission prior to work commencing. Had the applicant applied for a building permit, they would have been notified they would be needed to do so. The Commissioners were fine with the proposal, noting that the dumpster enclosure should be painted a dark green rather than what was originally proposed. The green should be darker than the existing guard shack

There was no public comment.

In conclusion, the application was approved with the provisos that the dumpster enclosure will be painted a dark green. Details were to be submitted to staff prior to final signoff.

C. HUNT motioned to APPROVE the application, D. PARCON seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 19.926 SE 70 West Rutland Square #1

Applicant: Kevin Gerhart; Pella Windows and Doors

Proposed Work: Replace steel door with a wood mahogany panel door.

Kevin Gerhart of Pella Windows and Doors presented the details of the proposal. The existing door was a flat panel, metal door and obviously not original. The new door would be made of mahogany panels. The top of the doorway has an arch, but the door will not follow the curve, instead the door will have a straight top which the door jamb will fill in the remaining space in the doorway.

The Commission saw no issue with the door and decided that the trim details of the door jamb at the top are to be submitted to staff for final approval.

There was no public comment.

In conclusion, the application was approved with the provisos that the door jamb trim details were to be submitted to staff prior to final signoff.



C. HUNT motioned to APPROVE the application, D. PARCON seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 19.933 SE 571 Tremont Street

Applicant: Matthew Arnold; Hacin & Associates

Proposed Work: At side façade install new operable window in existing masonry opening.

Matthew Arnold, a representative for Hacin & Associates discussed the proposal to open a former window area that was at one point part of a storefront. Currently the window is bricked up. There were two options that were proposed, the first option proposed a full window with only the top transoms as operable. The second option had the large window split in thirds where the middle third would be operable and fold in.

The Commission debated which option would be the most appropriate considering this was in fact once a storefront as indicated in the historic photographs. The Commission did have some concern over why the windows would only fold in the middle and not a full foldable doorway. The applicants indicated that there was some equipment on the interior which prohibited them from being full length.

The Commission preferred this option (#2) but recommended that there be a better design to match up with the existing front window proportions.

There was no public comment.

In conclusion, both options were approved the second option was preferred with the provisos that the proportion of the windows are rethought and submitted to staff for final approval.

D. PARCON motioned to APPROVE the application, C. HUNT seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, and PS).

APP # 19.933 SE 171 West Brookline

Applicant: Lawrence Rudolph; RBTV Realty Trust

Proposed Work: At front façade, restore (missing) front stoop, garden curb wall, side stoop, front door, front entrance hood,



front yard fence. Replace all historic windows. (See additional items in administrative review).

Larry Rudolph, the representative for the project presented the details to the complete rehab and restoration of this property to its original condition. The work would involve reconstructing the front stoop restoring and replacing the front windows among other architectural details that are missing on the front façade.

The Commission was presented with details (photos) related to the condition of the windows on the front façade. Many of the windows were in a severe state of deterioration and could not be replaced. Other windows had been damaged during the deconstruction of the interior of the photos. It was determined that several of the windows could be repaired which, at the request of the applicant, could be retrofitted with tempered/glazed glass. The Commission commended the applicant for their attention to details, and asked that the brownstone color in the reconstructed stoop be integrated, not exterior applied. Additionally, the proposed hand rail was to have a lambs tongue, and have a shorter tongue

There was no public comment.

In commission voted to approve the application with the provisos that the salvageable windows are restored with modernized glass, the handrail is updated to have a shorted end and lambs tongue shape, and that these details are remanded to staff for final approval.

J. Freeman motioned to Approve the applications, D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).



APP # 19.955 SE 211 West Springfield Street

Applicant: Naselle Aponte; Apointe Development

Proposed Work: At mansard level, replace all casement windows (front and back of property) with three, 2 over 2, wood windows, reframe and replace shingles with slate and clapboard, remove sliding door and replace with new oriel. Replace non-historic front fence with new fence (*See additional items in administrative review*).

Applicant representative Naselle Aponte and Andreas Hwang presented the details to the proposal which consisted of a complete rehabilitation of the property. The existing mansard roof was significantly modified in the past and no longer maintained the original shape. While the applicants were renovating the structure to resemble its original configuration, they were not creating a true mansard roof. The oriel that was located at the second level, where a sliding door currently exists, was to be rebuilt and replaced.

The Commission discussed the details of the dormer, and what window configuration would be appropriate for the location. It was decided that three windows built as if they were three separate dormers was the best possible option. This also applies to the rear of the structure as well. In order to understand how the dormers interact with the rest of the façade, the Commission requested for cross section elevations.

The steps of the property were also discussed. The proposed rail and garden fence were determined to be appropriate for the neighborhood. The original holes of the existing rails are to be filled with Dutchman fill.

During the public comment section, Ben Manafrow of Massachusetts Avenue spoke in favor of the project.

- In conclusion, the application was approved in concept contingent upon submitting a cross-section and more developed elevations of the dormer (front and back), in order to understand the trim and layout prior to final approval.

J. FREEMAN motioned to approve the application in concept, C. HUNT seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, and PS).



APP # 19.933 SE 171 WEST BROOKLINE

Applicant: Naselle Aponte; Apointe Development

Proposed Work: At mansard level (front and back of property), replace casement windows with three (on front and back) 2 over 2, wood windows, reframe front roof, replace oriel, replace front garden fence (*See additional items in administrative review*).

The applicants indicated that the proposal was almost identical to the previous application at 211 W. Springfield; these properties are adjacent to one another and were being worked on during the same time period.

The Commission reviewed the application content and determined that the same details needed to be submitted to the Commission prior to approval. The application was approved in concept contingent upon cross sections and greater details for the dormer level.

There was no public comment.

J. FREEMAN motioned to approve the application in concept, C. HUNT seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, and PS).

II. ADVISORY REVIEW

36 & 48 Rutland Street

Applicant: Maicharia Z. Weir; United South End Settlements

Proposed Work: Addition to the United South End Settlement Property.

The representatives for the United South End Settlement presented their proposal to add an addition to the historic structures at their property on Rutland Street. The details include some restoration of the front façade of the existing structures as well as the front play area.

The Commissioners were receptive to the concept; they thought that the scale, setback and materials used were appropriate for the neighborhood. There was some debate over the existing brick walls that enclosed the front and whether it is important to the district. Additionally, the Commission also felt that the window fenestrations on the structure needed additional thought, citing the irregularities of their proportions compared to the existing structure.



Overall the Commission felt that the project was well thought through and that with a few modifications the project was approvable.

II. RATIFICATION OF 2/5/2018 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES & RATIFICATION OF PREVIOUSLY APPROVED 01/22/2019, 02/26/19 SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES& RATIFICATION OF 7/2018 SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES

D. PARCON motioned to approve the minutes, J. FREEMAN seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, and PS).

- III. Staff Updates**
- IV. Adjorn – 8:30**

D. PARCON motioned to adjourn the hearing. J. FREEMAN seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

DRAFT