

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

November 16, 2017

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

Commissioners Not Present: Thomas Hopkins, Kenneth Taylor, P.T. Vineburgh.

Staff Present: Eric Hill, Preservation Planner; Joseph Cornish, Design Review Director; Kristian Boschetto, Preservation Assistant.

4:57 PM J. Pierce called the public hearing to order.

DESIGN REVIEW:

36 Joy Street (18.295 BH): Ratify the installation of a street address sign on the gate adjacent to the building by modifying the finish (VIO.BH.61).

Representatives: Isabelle Slotine

The applicant presented the work as existing noting that they would like to have the updated signage approved. The Commission still found that the updated signage was inappropriate for the district and for this gate, and noted that this is an iconic gate in the district. Specifically they noted that the sign was not integrated well into the gate and was not centered on the posts. The Commission had previously suggested that the residence number be listed on the top ornamental piece that says "Joy Court" but the applicant objected and said that it would not be visible enough. The Commission suggested that the applicant work with staff and Commissioner M. Rosales for a more appropriate sign configuration.

- **In conclusion the application was granted a continuance to a subsequent hearing. The vote was 3-0 (PD, JP, MR).**

73 Mount Vernon Street (18.303 BH): Request for removal of fire escape at roof and construction of roof decks.

Representatives: Travis, Sousa Design; Bruce Daniel, Attorney

The applicant presented photographs, colored renderings, sightline guides, and architectural plans. The Commission noted that the designs have shown much improvement from what was previously presented. The Commission discussed the removal of the rear stairs, and the applicant confirmed that part of the stairs could be removed because the head house access board said that it was allowable for compliance. Staff mentioned that there had been previous complaints from abutters about holes and venting in the masonry and asked whether this had been remedied. The applicant confirmed that the appropriate vents have been removed but those on the first and second floor remained because as discussed by the Commission they were not visible from a public way.

Public testimony was called for and Josh Lefler, a representative of the BHCA, noted the association's approval of the changes to the deck. David Watson, resident of 75 Mount Vernon Street, presented a few features of the ongoing project that were not in compliance. He stated that the towers on either side of the stairway had been removed and were replaced with something else. He also said the posts on the front railings had been cut and were looking very unsightly. In addition to this, some of the ornamental post toppers on the railings had been removed from the previous configuration. Lastly, he noted that there was a new fan-like object on the top of the chimney that had not previously been there.

The Commission took into account the issues that the neighbor at 75 Mount Vernon Street had presented and asked that staff follow up with the applicant and look into said issues.

- **In conclusion the application was granted a continuance to a subsequent hearing. M. Rosales initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).**

18 Phillips Street (18.568 BH): Install new accessible ramp at the passageway along the east side of the building; convert existing window into an accessible doorway; construct retaining wall with fence and lighting; install new hinges and hardware at existing iron gateway; install storm windows; install five rooftop HVAC condensers; install two security cameras; and install energy recovery unit along south wall of wing.

Representatives: L. Spencer

The applicant presented photographs, plot plans, and architectural drawings of the proposal. The Commission discussed that the material and configuration of the proposed fencing was not appropriate for the district, and that the applicant should design and construct fencing that takes style cues from the fence in the front. The Commission also seemed concerned with the proposed lighting and felt that it was too shiny and visible for what is appropriate in the district. The Commission tried to suggest putting the automatic door opening on the other side and having it recessed, but the applicant said they had already tried that outlet and that the configuration was too awkward for a handicapped person to maneuver.

Public testimony was called for and Charles Dow, an attorney representing 43 Garden Street, voiced his objection for the project, stating that the land the applicants intend to use is commonly owned by the abutting properties and the client he represents. The Commission noted that property and ownership disputes were out of their purview and recommended that the application be continued to another hearing once the issue has been settled.

- **In conclusion the application was granted a continuance to a subsequent hearing. J. Pierce initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).**

14 Mugar Way (18.399 BH): Construct a four-story addition; install signage; and modify landscaping (project approved with provisos at 8-17-2017 public hearing).

Representative: David?

The applicant presented photographs, colored renderings, night lighting diagram and renderings, plot plans, examples of products, and architectural drawings. The Commission noted that the front corner seemed like an improvement but that it still appeared to be unfinished, and they requested that the granite be altered. The Commission also noted that the fencing should be altered by bringing it to the sidewalk and lowering the height in order to match the neighboring fences. The Commissioners felt that the lamp on the front façade was excessive in size and should be made smaller. Additionally they felt that the lamps in the loggia appear to be interior lamps and need to be rethought.

Public testimony was called for and the BHCA noted that they appreciated the revisions, but that they were still concerned with the gas lights; which they noted may not be the concern of the applicant. Additionally they noted that they were still concerned with the configuration of the front entrance as they think it may encourage people to drop off guests along Mugar Way, causing a safety and traffic hazard.

- **In conclusion the application was granted a continuance to a subsequent hearing. M. Rosales initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).**
 - Fence on rear side property, lower fence to match other properties, move closer to the sidewalk;
 - Refine the lighting, make it simple and compatible;
 - Make alterations to the curbing and entrance by having a solid granite strip outside the entrance and having the remainder of the pavers replaced with brick sidewalk.

40 Beacon Street (17.1159 BH): Construct a rooftop addition on the rear ell extension.

The applicant was not present for the second consecutive hearing.

- **In conclusion the application was denied. J. Pierce initiated the motion and M. Rosales seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).**

83 Chestnut Street (18.424 BH): In-kind replacement of windows and doors; in-kind replacement of deteriorated wood trim; painting of windows, doors and trim to match existing colors; chimney repair, general re-pointing and lintel replacement; removal and re-installation of security grate and railing; in-kind replacement of roof; replacement of skylights; and installation of HVAC equipment.

Representatives: Mark Schmitt; Damon May; Henry Ladd, Contractor

The applicant presented photographs, neighborhood plot plans, and architectural drawings of the proposed work. The Commission discussed the current condition of the northwest window visible from a public way and how the applicant plans on repairing the slant. The Commission also discussed the material and color of the proposed skylight.

- **In conclusion the application was approved as submitted. P. Donnelly initiated the motion and D. Santos seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).**

16 Pinckney Street (18.430 BH): Remove existing roof and dormer and rebuild to match existing pitch, size and trim details; install slate roof, copper flashing and drip edge and copper gutter and downspout; remove and rebuild chimney in-kind; repair masonry;

repair all windows in-kind; replace window trim in-kind; repair front door and restore trim; construct new brick wall to close off walkway to rear yard; repair and re-paint walkway gate; repair walkway; replace coal chute door in-kind.

Representative: Dustin Nolan

The applicant presented plot plans, architectural drawings, and photographs. Staff noted that the applicant had made an amendment to their application and was choosing to maintain the passageway apart from cleaning the masonry. Staff also noted that all the other work is consistent with the guidelines.

Public testimony was called for and Don Shade, resident of 18 Pinckney, noted that there was still a question as to the easement of the property. The Commission stated that discussions on property rights and easements were out of their jurisdiction.

- **In conclusion the application was approved as submitted. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).**

75 Beacon Street (18.423 BH) (Continued from 10/2017): Construct rooftop addition and rear yard addition; modify front areaway including installation of brick paving, granite curbs and iron fencing; and restoration of windows.

Representatives: Ken Lyons; David McWhan; John Meyer

The applicant presented historic photos, current photos, colored renderings, architectural plans, sightline guides, and skyline studies. The Commission noted the staff comment concerning the decorative balusters and asked that the design be symmetrical. The Commission discussed their concerns with the addition on the rear and said it was too large and visible. They asked if there was any way to minimize the addition to make it not visible and the applicant said that they would need to pull it back an additional 8 ft. The applicant also contested that the owner was trying to beautify the building again and that what they are doing is enhancing the building.

- **In conclusion the application was granted a continuance with the following note for the applicant. M. Rosales initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).**
 - **Reduce the rear addition.**

121 Charles Street (18.569 BH): Install hanging projection sign.

Representative: Tyson White, Owner

The applicant presented photographs, a colored rendering, and a drawing of the proposed sign. The Commission discussed the material of the sign and how the lettering would be applied. The Commission requested that the lettering be routed in order to be consistent with the other signs on the street.

Public testimony was called for and the BHAC asked that the sign be two-tone, that the letters be routed, and that the insignia be removed.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. J. Pierce initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).**
 - **Make the lettering carved.**

82 Charles Street (18.466BH): Install hanging projection sign.*Representatives: Tram Duong*

The applicant presented photographs and renderings of the proposed signage. The Commission discussed the material of the proposed sign and found that the material was not appropriate for the district. The Commission also noted that the addition of a secondary sign for the store would be a little excessive, and asked for further information and images to get the perspective of the signs together.

Public testimony was called for and Gneal Widett, a sign manufacturer, noted that the material being proposed would not be able to handle weathering because of its paper face. The BHAC asked that the styles of the two signs mirror each other and that the business services including "waxing" be removed from the sign.

- **In conclusion the application was granted a continuance to a subsequent hearing with the following information requested.**
 - Make a perspective of the two signs together.

84 Charles Street (18.442 BH): Install hanging projection sign.*Representative: Gneal Widett*

The applicant presented photographs and a drawing of the proposed sign. The Commission discussed the details of the sign including the color, material, and size. The Commission felt as though they needed more accurate representations of the signage and asked that the applicant submit additional drawings to staff.

- **In conclusion the application was approved the following proviso. M. Rosales initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).**
 - Remand details of the mounting, colors, and size to staff for review.

34 ½ Beacon Street (18.567 BH): Renovate and expand the existing 9th floor headhouse; install rooftop deck, pergola, landscaping and vegetated screen; install new window in enclosed opening on 8th floor.*Representatives: Jean Roberts; Rebecca Burner; Gara Sharma, Owner*

The applicant presented plot plans of the neighborhood, architectural drawings, colored renderings, sightline guides, and photographs. The Commission discussed the visibility of the project and found that the majority of the proposal was visible from a public way. The Commission asked that the applicant work with the large amount of space and that they find a way to make the proposed structures not visible. Commissioner Donnelly suggested that as there were two pergola features up on the roof before and removed to replace the roof, it would be acceptable to go back with the same amount or less blockage of sky view as before. It was mentioned at the hearing that the applicant should look at expanding the footprint of the headhouse a little southward and a little westward to the point where the addition would not be visible. A mockup of the head house addition and pergola with vegetative screen should be installed before the next hearing.

- **In conclusion the application was granted a continuance to a subsequent hearing with the following revisions requested. M. Rosales initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion.**
 - **Make the proposed headhouse renovations and landscaping not visible from a public way;**
 - **Construct mock-ups for review where necessary.**

65 Philips Street (18.513 BH): Construct roof deck and wrought iron railing.

Representatives: Michael Carey

The applicant presented photographs of the existing conditions of the decking and displayed the proposed drawings and plans. The railing as built was visible from the street so the Commission suggested that the deck is pushed back to be less or not visible, the applicant was agreeable.

- **In conclusion, the Commission approved the proposed work with the proviso that the deck is setback far enough as to not be visible from a public right of way, and thus, exempt from review. J. Pierce initiated the motion and D. Santos seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).**

48 Mount Vernon Street (18.571 BH): Raise railing on roof deck from 36" to 42" for code compliance.

- **This application was determined by staff to be exempt from review and was withdrawn from the agenda.**

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

- **18.446 BH 68 Beacon Street:** Reseal 10 vertical joints on structure; repaint all windows, flower boxes and balconies to match existing color.
- **18.465 BH 122-126 Charles Street:** Repair and repaint first floor windows and entrances.
- **18.438 BH 16 Chestnut Street:** Replace wood side door on side elevation at side patio.
- **18.495 BH 16 Chestnut Street:** Level curb, evacuate underfill and level brick pavers at side patio; pressure wash granite curb and columns; pressure wash existing blue stone at rear patio.
- **18.539 BH 22 Chestnut Street:** Remove, refurbish and repaint 22 shutters.
- **18.564 BH 94 Chestnut Street:** Repair windows; replace storm windows to match existing; restore brownstone; repoint mortar; replace intercom and door hardware; restore and repaint existing entry door, pilasters, brackets and trim; replace ground-level door and hardware; repair and repaint snow fence; replace dormer windows to match existing; replace missing slate shingles and reset loose pieces; replace flashings; remove two existing skylights.
- **18.566 BH 23 Joy Street:** Replace two non-original wood 6/6 windows with new windows to match existing.
- **18.520 BH 34 Lime Street:** Re-paint front door red and surrounding trim to match.
- **18.451 BH 103 Mount Vernon Street:** Re-paint front entry door black and surrounding woodwork white.
- **18.462 BH 108 Mount Vernon Street:** Repoint two chimneys and install copper capping; replace two steel window lintels and install new with flashing; remove

brick from bulging section at side and replace. Work approved as emergency CA.

- 18.524 BH 25 Phillips Street: Replace five wood non-original wood windows and replace in-kind.
- 18.576 BH 68 Pinckney Street: Replace slate roof to match existing; replace 20 oz. copper gutter to match existing.
- 18.456 BH 52 River Street: Replace two 8/8 wood dormer windows to match existing and remove storm windows.
- 18.573 BH 5 Rollins Place: Cut and point brick mortar; replace gutters to match existing; replace slate roof with purple slate to match original.
- 18.510 BH 24 West Cedar Street: Replace roof slate, copper gutters and downspouts, flashing to match existing; repair and paint existing windows.
- 18.501 BH 91 West Cedar Street: Replace non-original windows at 2nd floor front façade with wood 6/6 single-hung true divided lite windows.

In conclusion the applications were approved as submitted. J. Pierce initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).

Ratification of the July 20, 2017 & August 17, 2017, and October 19, 2017 Public Hearing Minutes

Approved as submitted J. Pierce initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS).

9:40 P.M.: J. Pierce adjourned the public hearing.