

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

December 21, 2017

Commissioners Present: Paul Donnelly, Joel Pierce, Miguel Rosales, Kenneth Taylor, P.T. Vineburgh.

Commissioners Not Present: Thomas Hopkins, Danielle Santos.

Staff Present: Eric Hill, Preservation Planner; Kristian Boschetto, Preservation Assistant

5:02 PM K. Taylor called the public hearing to order.

VIOLATIONS:

81 Mount Vernon Street (VIO.BH.116) (18.098 BH): Paint front door and trim; install two light fixtures flanking front entrance; replace all storm windows on front elevation; repair and repaint iron railings.

Representative: Maria Tamvakologos, Owner

The applicant presented photographs of the existing conditions and violations as well as examples of the proposed storm windows, light fixtures, and colors to be used. The Commission showed a preference for restoring the door trim to its original color, and asked that a historic photograph be presented to confirm that it had been historically ivory in color. The Commission found that the placement of the light fixtures was odd but staff and the applicant noted that this was the location of the light fixtures originally. The Commission also showed preference for the smaller light fixtures being proposed if they were painted black to be historically accurate. The Commission was also concerned that the side lites of the door had been filled in and felt that it should be corrected.

- **In conclusion the application was continued to a subsequent hearing with the request that accurate dimensions and drawings be presented of the proposed storm windows and door. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**

DESIGN REVIEW:

73 Mount Vernon Street (18.303 BH) (continued from 11-2017 hearing): Removal and reinstallation of iron picket caps; remove protruding pickets in granite wall; install chimney cap.

Representatives: Travis Blake, Sousa Design Architects

The applicant presented photographs of the existing conditions and photographs of neighboring buildings as examples of precedence for the chimney cap. The Commission asked the applicant to clarify what happened to the fence and why it was cut and reinstalled in this fashion. The applicant confirmed that the sub-contractor did

not do as he asked and that they were currently trying to rectify the situation. Additionally the Commission asked why the end post had not been replaced yet and the applicant explained that the neighboring property intends to remove a tree that is affecting the fence, and that the end post will be reinstalled once the tree is removed. The Commission was concerned with the repair and reinstallation of the fencing and felt that it was necessary for the applicant to do a test of their proposed epoxy and present the results to the Commission.

Public testimony was called for and Charlotte Tibideau of the Beacon Hill Civic Association expressed that she was concerned how the applicant keeps returning to the Commission, and each time there is something else that is not in keeping with the guidelines. She said that the work deserves to be done right on behalf of the district. Sarah Cherry of 28 Pinckney Street asked the Commission to address the venting that was installed in the rear, and staff confirmed that it had been addressed and rectified at a previous hearing.

- **In conclusion the application was granted a continuance to a subsequent hearing. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**
 - **The Commission requested that the applicant bring in information and a mock-up of how to repair the damaged granite curbing and fencing;**
 - **Additionally the Commission asked for a historic photo of the fencing;**
 - **The Commission requested that the chimney cap be painted black;**
 - **The Commission chose to approve the replacement of the finials.**

18 Phillips Street (18.568 BH) (continued from 11-2017 hearing): 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 two security cameras.

Representative: Lynn Vogt, Spencer Vogt Group; Stewart Offner, Lawyer

The applicant presented photographs, plot plans, drawings, and samples of the proposed products. Due to an ownership dispute at the previous hearing, the Commission asked the applicant to explain what portion of the alleyway that they currently owned. The applicant noted that all of the proposed work is fully located within the boundary of 18 Phillips Street. Mr. Dow, a representative of an owner at 43 Garden Street noted that the proposal should not be allowed as the work is taking place in the accessibility easement. After discussing the details of the easement, staff told the Commission that issues with the easement were a civil dispute and out of the Commissions purview as told by legal counsel. The Commission was then asked to review the application as a whole and as there was not an ownership dispute. After reviewing the project, the Commission felt that the fencing should be thinner and more in keeping with the fencing at the front façade. The applicant explained that the fencing needed to be thicker in order to support itself. The Commission also felt that the light proposal seemed a bit excessive and that only one light was needed, but the applicant explained that the lights served two different purposes. The Commission asked what the material of the new ramp would be, and asked that the proposed concrete have a smooth finish. Lastly, the Commission asked for details of the camera, and asked that it be installed into the masonry joints.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. K. Taylor initiated the motion and M. Rosales seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**
 - **Motion detector door opener is acceptable;**
 - **Approve doorway;**
 - **Submit retaining wall articulation to staff;**
 - **Approve fencing;**
 - **Approve fence plates to match concrete;**
 - **Approve storm windows except at front elevation;**
 - **Approve light fixtures;**
 - **Approve security camera if installed into mortar joints and not installed on the key of the corner.**

82 Charles Street (18.466 BH): Install hanging projection sign.

Representative: Mary (Tram) Duong

The applicant presented an updated proposal showing a wood engraved sign and additional detail on the bracket design, dimensions and how it would be installed. The Commission noted that the proposed location of the sign was a little off and that the sign bracket should be installed in-line with the bottom of the wall sign.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following proviso. M. Rosales initiated the motion and P.T Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**
 - **Sign bracket is to be in line with the bottom of the wall sign.**

14 Mugar Way (18.399 BH) (continued from 11-2017 hearing): Construct a four-story addition; install signage and lighting; and modify landscaping/hardscaping.

Representatives: David J. Hacin; Mike Ross; Andrew Hayes; David Tiban

The applicant presented photographs, detailed architectural drawings, and colored renderings. The Commission was shown two options for the granite paving at the entrance to the hotel, and they favored the option with less granite extending into the sidewalk, suggesting that the planters be removed to expose more of the granite material. They then discussed the brick and concrete paving on the public sidewalk and asked why the design did not show the corrections from the previous hearing. The applicant explained that they had not changed it because it was a public way and because it was not in the original design, but they agreed to extend the concrete walkway. The Commission then the discussed the new lighting fixture and suggested that the extension of the lower portion of the fixture be pulled down to enforce the scale of the building.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. P. T. Vineburgh initiated the motion and M. Rosales seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**
 - **Use option 1 for granite paving;**
 - **Pull concrete further out onto Mugar Way to the landscape line;**
 - **Extend light bracket 12 inches down.**

75 Beacon Street (18.423 BH) (continued from 11-2017 hearing): Construct rooftop addition and rear yard addition; modify front area-way including installation of brick paving, granite curbs and iron fencing; and restoration of windows.

Representatives: Mark Beaulieu, Joe Mullin; David McWhan; John Meyer

The applicant presented current photographs, architectural drawings, and colored renderings. The applicant noted that the proposed addition had been altered and pulled back as much as possible according to the Commission's requests. The Commission noted that although the addition is still visible, the applicant is making an improvement to the current conditions. However, they felt that the window configuration was inaccurate for the district and should be changed from a 4 window pattern to a 3 window pattern to conform.

Public testimony was called for and Richard Goldstein, resident of the abutting property, said that the adjacent brick courtyard wall belongs to his building and that they had spent a large sum to repoint and repair it. He asked if the addition would affect or damage his wall. The applicant said that they would be happy to put a spacer between the addition and his wall to protect its integrity. Charlotte Thibodeau expressed concern with the 4 window configuration on the addition and said that it was inconsistent with the district.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. P. T. Vineburgh initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**
 - **Reduce window pattern to 3 instead of 4 and submit new scale and drawings to staff.**

34 ½ Beacon Street (18.567 BH) (continued from 11-2017 hearing): 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

The applicant presented existing condition photographs, architectural drawings, colored renderings, and sightline guides. The Commission discussed the visibility of the project and found that the majority of the new proposal was visible from a public way. The applicant said that the pergolas had previously been approved and that these were more visible than what they are currently proposing. They also said that the pergolas had been hidden by planter boxes and that they could propose that as well for the new addition. However, the Commission said that they could not rely on planter boxes to hide the visibility. The Commission noted that if there was a way to make the additions not visible at all, then it would be out of their purview. Also, they said that if the pergolas were replaced as they had been previously approved, then they could not deny them.

- **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 new mock-ups for review where necessary.**

22 Beacon Street (18.406 BH): Install wall sign on both Beacon and Park Street sides; replace awnings with Sunbrella in black with logos printed.
Representatives: Mark Demden; Tamara Petit

The applicant presented existing condition photographs and renderings of the proposed awnings with signage. The Commission felt that it would be inappropriate to have an additional sign on the Park Street side of the building. The Commission felt that based on the dimensions, the awnings were more similar to banners, and would likely not provide much protection from the elements and the leaking that had been a long time problem. The applicant presented a second design for the awnings and signage and the Commission favored its simplicity over the original.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. P.T. Vineburgh initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**
 - **Use Option 2 design with the graphics of Option 1.**

70 Mount Vernon Street (18.706 BH): Replace three historic 6/6 wood windows on third floor in kind; remove storm windows.
Representatives: None

The applicant did not appear at the hearing and the Commission was unable to vote on this application.

54 Charles Street (18.642 BH): Reconfigure existing wall sign to hanging sign above front entry; relocate listings board from entry way to mounted on front elevation.
Representatives: Lauren Gishel; Jack Gurnon

The applicant presented existing condition photographs, product examples, and an explanation of the proposal. The Commission discussed what the adjacent hardware store currently has for signage and if the proposed signage would be excessive. The Commission felt that the display box was too visible and that it would be better placed in the side wall of the recessed doorway. The Commission also felt that a blade sign above the doorway would be more appropriate for this area of the district.

Public testimony was called for and Daniel Prager, a representative of the Beacon Hill Civic Association, said that the BHCA had no objections to the display box if it is mounted into the mortar joints, but felt that a blade sign above the door would be more appropriate than the flat sign proposal. Jack, the owner of the adjacent hardware store, expressed his concern with the blade sign blocking the sign of his store.

- **In conclusion the applicant was granted a continuance to a subsequent hearing with the following provisos. P. T. Vineburgh initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**
 - **Primary signage should be a blade sign;**
 - **Scale display box to location and make it smaller.**

92 Beacon Street (18.699 BH): Re-install roofdeck in same location as existing.
Representatives: Dan Shina, Trustee

The applicant presented photographs of the existing conditions, architectural drawings, and product examples. The Commission asked if the height of the new railing would be different and the applicant explained that it would be the same but modular. The Commission felt that the deck would be better off pulled 10 feet back and that it should have a black iron railing.

Public testimony was called for and Dan Prager of the Beacon Hill Civic Association expressed concern that the modular roof deck system would make the height taller. Additionally they felt that the roof deck should be replaced in kind with iron railings and not TRex railings.

- **In conclusion the application was approved with the following provisos. P. T. Vineburgh initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**
 - **Use a black wrought iron railing;**
 - **Pull back roof deck so that it is not visible.**

95 Beacon Street (17.1369 BH): Install garden fence at front yard.

This application was withdrawn prior to the hearing and will be reviewed by the Commission at a subsequent hearing.

34 Beacon Street (18.713 BH): Replace front door to match existing and reinstall existing hardware; replace intercom system in same location as existing; replace glass panes in front door sidelites with laminated glass; install four security cameras on building; replace existing wood side door with metal door to match existing detailing, dimensions and color.

This application was withdrawn prior to the hearing and will be reviewed by the Commission at a subsequent hearing.

11 Irving Street (18.615 BH): Install solid wood paneled door in line with frontmost façade of structure at garden level entrance.

This application was withdrawn prior to the hearing and will be reviewed by the Commission at a subsequent hearing.

4 Charles River Square (18.709 BH): Install new 6/6 wood window and storm window insert in non-existing opening on rear elevation.

Representatives: Diana Coldren; Sean P. Cryts

The applicant presented current condition photographs and drawings of the proposed window configuration. The Commission discussed the material of the existing headers and what material the new header would be. The Commission was concerned with the project and felt that the addition of the window would look too crowded. The applicant felt that there was precedence for the addition of the window but the Commission explained that they make their decisions on a case by case basis.

Public testimony was called for and Dan Prager of the Beacon Hill Civic Association recommended denial because the addition of the window would ruin the symmetry.

- **In conclusion the application was denied. P. Donnelly initiated the motion and P. T. Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**

112 Revere Street (18.588 BH): Construct two enclosures on roof of main structure to house mechanical equipment and antennas.

Representatives: Chris Swiniarski

The applicant presented existing condition photographs, plot plans, architectural drawings, and renderings. The Commission was concerned with the placement of the structure and asked if it could be moved back further to reduce its visibility or if it could be moved to another location. The applicant explained that if the structure was pulled back further it would obstruct the antenna signals and that they had done extensive studies to find the most suitable location. Some of the Commissioners felt the addition of the antenna structure would disrupt the historic fabric of the district, while others agreed that it would bring public benefit with increased cellular signals.

Public testimony was called for and Dan Prager of the Beacon Hill Civic Association read their recommendation for denial without prejudice due to the structure's visibility. Additionally they suggested that another material be used and that a loading study be conducted to make sure the structure does not shift.

- **In conclusion the application was granted a continuance to a subsequent hearing with the following suggestions. K. Taylor initiated the motion and J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).**
 - **Build a mock up for staff to review;**
 - **Research and present other viable locations at next hearing.**

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWS

- 18.632 BH 16 Beacon Street: Repoint mortar to match existing; repaint wood window trim, balconies, and entrance to match existing; re-caulk windows to match existing color.
- 18.666 BH 74 Beacon Street: Install storm windows to two parlor-level windows and arched transoms.
- 18.708 BH 43 Bowdoin Street: Replace existing sign on door to match existing with new company name; repair entry doors; repaint entry walls and ceiling to match existing.
- 18.665 BH 37 Brimmer Street: Dig-up front garden at foundation and apply waterproof sealant to foundation wall; re-lay dirt and flooring.
- 18.624 BH 18 Hancock Street: Replace two garden-level windows on front of main structure to match.
- 18.582 BH 67 Mount Vernon Street: Repoint portions on front and rear elevation using mortar to match; repair cornice and stone lintels and strip paint; wash and seal all brick; replace sections of rotten wood trim to match existing; paint steel railings in kind.
- 18.711 BH 75 Mount Vernon Street: Repair existing metal front yard fence and gate in kind; reset and clean existing stone wall.
- 18.614 BH 32 Myrtle Street: Remove and realign brickwork at front of building which was pulling away from the structure.

- 18.662 BH 1 Park Street: Update previously approved proposal to replace paired entry doors and frames on 1970s addition of Park Street Church in aluminum and glass from approved bronze and glass.
- 18.373 BH 66 Revere Street: Repair and repaint front door and sidelites in kind.
- 18.707 BH 13 South Russell Street: Replace three non-original 2/2 wood dormer windows to match existing.
- 18.633 BH 5 West Hill Place: Repair limestone parapet and cornice.

In conclusion the applications were approved as submitted. J. Pierce initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).

Ratification of the November 16, 2017 Public Hearing Minutes

Approved as submitted J. Pierce initiated the motion and P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (PD, JP, MR, KT, PTV).

9:55 P.M.: J. Pierce adjourned the public hearing.