

Draft
Beacon Hill Architectural Commission
Public Hearing Meeting Minutes
Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room
Boston, Massachusetts, 02201

June 16, 2016

Commissioners Present: Thomas Hopkins, Kenneth Taylor, Paul Donnelly, Joel Pierce

Commissioners Not Present: Mary Fichtner, Susan Knack-Brown, Danielle Santos

Staff Present: Lissa Schwab, Preservation Planner

4:00 PM Request for Certificate of Appropriateness: for 32 Derne Street by Ellen Perko, CBT Architects, to modify the paint color for the faux brick panels; installing rooftop mechanical equipment with screens, and modify the elevator bulkhead.

Representatives:.....

The applicant Ellen Perko starts off the conversation by reinstating what the proposed work will be and what they have done so far. She then says that the panels that they thought were brick turned out to be painted concrete with score marks to resemble brick. K. Taylor then asks can the commission look at the mock up. The applicant replies yes. He then asks are you asking the commission to look at the modifications to the penthouse. The applicant replies yes and proceeds to say that what we proposed back in February of 2015 was to introduce some penthouse space at the rooftop level doing an addition to the side. K. Taylor then asks have you done any construction to the penthouse walls. The applicant responds yes, we were asked to bring the lower pieces down. P. Donnelly joins the conversation and begins by asking about the screen material and mock up. He asks what's up there for the mock up to know what's being proposed and what is the proposed material. The applicant says that that there are screen walls up to screen in the HVAC units to absorb sound because the neighbors were concerned about the noise level. And the material is zinc adhered to a panel. Donnelly then asks is it zinc coated copper. The applicant responds by saying that she is not entirely sure. J. Pierce asks if the walls were visible. The applicant replies yes. T. Hopkins asks if the framework is up for the mock up and if the common areas are accessible. The applicant responds yes, it is fully accessible. He's seen the mock up and the elevator seems to be done. In conclusion the commission wants the applicant to make it clear what is currently up and what is mocked up. The application is still under reviewed and will be on continued at the next hearing. J. Pierce was the first to make the notion. P. Donnelly seconds the notion.

4:15 PM Request for Certificate of Appropriateness: for 70 Revere Street by Steve Harvey, J&S Building Exteriors Inc. to replace the roofing membrane system, install skylight and construct a roof deck with a black metal railing.

Representatives:.....

The applicant begins the conversation by stating that they were originally permitted to replace the existing deck in the original flip grid, turns out that the existing deck didn't have a lawful permit so we stopped construction and started the process of getting it approved. T. Hopkins follows up by asking where were you when you stopped. The applicant responds by saying we were in the process of removing the bench portion of the deck and placing an iron railing. P. Donnelly asks why it looks so tall. The applicant replies the deck itself is not moving up in elevation. You'll only see a small portion of the railing and the stud wall will be removed because there's a fall on the other side that drops about 60 to 40 ft and we were concerned that the height of this so we raised it 6 inches to bring it up to 42 inches because we were worried that someone was going to fall over. J. Pierce then asks is the railing solid iron. The applicant responds yes. He then asks what's the diameter of the posts. The applicant replies and says that they are three quarters of an inch full solid iron. J. Pierce clarifies by saying so you're matching it with the original permitted size. The applicant says no in 1980 it was 14x80. Lastly, K. Taylor asks can you tell us where the deck is in context of the chimneys. The applicants it's not to the left of the chimney, but on the other side. K. Taylor then proceeds to ask can you take a colored line to show the deck railing. The applicants replies we kind of have that right now; like I said you will see very minimal/ just a glimpse of the handrail. So in conclusion the applicant is to use a yellow ribbon to mock up the handrail. T. Hopkins initiates the vote and J. Pierce seconds the vote. The application is approved with provisos 4-0.

4:30 PM Request for Certificate of Appropriateness: for 60 Chestnut Street by Tim Holmes, The Holland Companies, to enlarge the deck on the roof of the rear garage with a wrought iron railing and planter boxes and to replace the garage door.

Representatives:.....

The applicant begins the conversation by letting the commission know that there was an existing deck and that the building was remodeled about three years ago and that the owner wants to extend out the usable deck space. J. Pierce asks is the deck even with the height of the rear wall. The applicant responds yes it's the height of the existing deck. J. Pierce then asks if the garage door is in-kind. The applicant says yes, exactly the same. After an abutter voices their concern about the deck possibly affecting their garden, K. Taylor responds we can't take any action on what is not visible from a public way- the framing from the deck will be independent from the handrail that is visible. P. Donnelly then says that it looks just like what is going on next door with the roof deck. So your concern is the stress that the new deck will have on an antique wall.

The abutter replies yes. The abutter then proceeds to say that what is being proposed looks like a big black cage and now we have a brick wall and a big black structure. T. Hopkins then says all the decks are about the same visibility and then reinstates that there is nothing attached to the party wall. In conclusion the applicant is to verify if the window that was turned into a door was legal and to resolve the corner to make it look finished. J. Pierce initiated the vote and P. Donnelly seconds the vote. The application is approved with provisos 4-0.

4:45 PM Request for Certificate of Appropriateness: for 22 Beacon Street by Patrick Stones, P. Stones Contracting, Inc. to replace the windows and grilles within the bulkhead fronting Beacon street with black painted wood paneling to match the existing bulkhead at the adjacent shopfront within the same building.

Representatives:.....

The applicant did not show, therefore the application has been withdrawn.

5:00 PM Request for Certificate of Appropriateness: for 57A Chestnut Street by Stephen Friedlander, Harvard Musical Association, to restore the gable roof and chimneys on the side elevation; infill modified window openings with brick and roof work.

Representatives:.....

The applicant starts off the conversation by stating the things that have been fixed and the things that they plan to fix that aren't visible from a public way. K. Taylor then redirects the conversation and asks what is the dimension of the chimney. The applicant responds about 18 inches. It won't be as tall so it will be more stable. K. Taylor continues by asking if they could consider keeping it as is. The applicant then says we want to fix the brick on the chimney because it hasn't been touched much in the past 100 years; we also want to fix the infill on the chimney and recreate the gable on top. K. Taylor then asks is there a structural engineers report. The applicant replies the architects report covers it. P. Donnelly asks is it going back to the original and the applicant replies yes, it will match it. T. Hopkins asks are there other bulges. The applicant replies yes, we plan to take the face brick down to the top floor window panels. T. Hopkins then follows up by asking if it looks okay then it will go down past the panels. The applicant replies there is a concern as to whether the lintels even exist at the panels. In conclusion the applicant is to bring the window color back to the commission, match the chimney as it existed in 1912, and the railing is approved as submitted. P. Donnelly initiates the vote and T. Hopkins seconds the vote. The application is approved with provisos 3-0.

