



## BEACON HILL ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION

### Public Hearing Minutes

Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room

Boston, MA, 02201

**October 17, 2019**

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

**Staff Present:** Nicholas Armata, Senior Preservation Planner, Gabriella Amore, Preservation Assistant

---

**5:02 p.m.** Commissioner Rosales called the public hearing to order.

#### I. VIOLATIONS

##### **APP # 20.010 BH 86 Chestnut Street**

**Applicant:** Dustin Nolan

**Proposed Work:** Ratification of unapproved removal of rear garden door and installation of front light, door handle, and alarm bell without BHAC approval.

The applicant explained the details of the violation, and how they would be rectified. The door that was removed at the rear was rebuilt and reinstalled and will be painted black, with the Commission's approval. The applicant also provided alternatives to the existing door handle (at main front entrance) light and alarm bell.

The Commission discussed the options presented to correct the violations. They agreed that the replacement rear door is acceptable, and that it should be painted black to match the original door. The Commission also discussed the door knobs and light fixture that were being proposed, and agreed that they were appropriate for the district. The alarm bell, while inappropriate in its location, is a necessary code requirement.

In conclusion the application was approved as submitted.

**P. Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, M. Rosales seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, and PV).**



**APP # 20.347 BH 24 Joy Street**

**Applicant:** Kristie Aussubel; Cobblestone Convenience LLC

**Proposed Work:** Ratification of unapproved window signage on Myrtle and Joy Street facades.

The applicant explained that the signs were installed without BHAC approval, because they are very similar to the pre-existing signs that date back decades. Ms. Aussubel stated that she has been working in the district for over a decade and had she known there are requirements from the landmarks commission, she would have followed them. The signage violation consisted of the name “Cobblestone Convenience” on each of the four storefront windows, and interior applied “fogged glass” decals below that shielded the outside of the store from the stocked shelves on the inside. Her application was submitted to legalize the changes after receiving a violation notice notifying her of the infraction. The applicant informed the Commission that there would be no additional investment into the signage, and should they come down, signage would not be put back.

During public comment, several members of the community supported the project while others questioned the Commission’s purview, considering the signage is on the inside of the glass.

The Commission discussed the appropriateness of the signage, and decided that the name of the business and simulated fogged glass on all of the storefront windows were inappropriate for the district, and visually cluttered. The Commissioners debated how many of the window signs could stay and whether the “fogged glass” should stay. In conclusion, it was decided that one sign on the window adjacent to the door on the Myrtle Street side of the building would stay, the rest should be removed.

**P. Vineburgh motioned to approve the application with provisos, M. Rosales seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, and PV).**



## II. DESIGN REVIEW

### **APP # 19.777 BH 45 Beacon Street**

**Applicant:** Robert E. McLaughlin Sr. Esq.

**Proposed Work:** Install asphalt berm at rear wall of Carriage barn. (Remanded to Commission for reconsideration per Order of Superior Court),

The applicant returned to the Commission after the application was remanded back to the Commission from the Suffolk County Superior Court for reconsideration. The applicant presented the same details of the asphalt berm at the rear wall of the carriage barn, visible from Spruce Street, citing the length of time that the berm has existed in the past.

The Commission determined that, because there was a precedent of the asphalt berm at this site in the past, they were ready to change the previous decision of the application to approve the proposal as submitted.

**M. Rosales motioned to approve the application, P. Donnelley seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, and PV).**

### **APP # 20.409 BH 28 Pinckney Street:**

**Applicant:** Sander A. Rikleen; Sherin and Lodgen LLP

**Proposed Work:** Install new roll up garage door.

The applicant presented the details of the application to the Commission that was previously denied under a separate application. The space was previously used as a housing unit, converted sometime after World War II to accommodate that large veteran populations in search of housing. The applicant explained that the roll-up door was necessary in the location in order to allow for two vehicles to be parked inside the newly created garage. Installing fold-in doors in the garage, as previously approved would restrict the amount of space where a car could park, due to the swing area. Further, roll-up solid wood doors were impossible to install due to the weight. The applicant also defending the proposal, indicating that the door would look like a traditional swing in barn door from the exterior view and pointed to similar doors in the district that were recently approved. A brief history of



the roll-up door was also introduced, in order to justify the appropriateness of the roll-up door with the age of the structure.

During public comment, several members of the public expressed concern with the loss of the “Mid-Century Modern” façade of the housing unit, as well as the potential loss of several parking spaces on the street to accommodate the turn radius of the cars pulling into the private garage.

The Commission discussed the appropriateness of such a door on the street. M. Rosales, chairperson, still did not feel that folding garage doors in such a location would be appropriate. The rest of the Commission did not concur with that decision, claiming that there would be virtually no visual difference between roll-up doors and folding doors when closed.

Additional details regarding the curb-cut and the utility vault as installed were discussed, but were not part of this application.

In conclusion the application was approved as submitted.

**P. Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, P. Donnelley seconded the motion. The vote was 3-1 (PD, JP, and PV voted to approve, MR voted to deny).**

**APP # 20.209 BH 9 Willow Street**

**Applicant:** Deborah Thomas

**Proposed Work:** At all facades; repaint wood windows, trim, and bays in kind.

The applicant presented the details of the application, which consisted of repainting the bays the same color that was previously approved by the Commission a number of years ago. The application was previously listed under the administrative review on the September hearing but was pulled by the commission after it was thought that the bays would look better with a paint color that was darker, in order to conceal some of the blemishes on the structure.



During public comment, several members of the public expressed concern that the colors the Commission was exploring were not appropriate and that the previous color was already approved by the Commission several years ago.

The Commission decided that several different variations of the color would need to be explored and that the project should be delegated to a subcommittee consisting of M. Rosales and P.T. Vineburgh.

**P. Vineburgh motioned to approve the application, P. Donnelley seconded the motion. The vote was 3-1 (PD, JP, and PV voted to approve, MR voted to deny).**

**APP # 20.382 BH 150 Mount Vernon Street:**

**Applicant:** Simon Boyd

**Proposed Work:** At front façade, replace existing electronic lock and key set, and door knocker. Replace existing door numbers, at side door, replace existing mail slot.

The applicant provided the details to the proposal, which includes replacing several older elements that were in need of replacement.

During public comment, members of the community expressed some concern with the project details because they were not appropriate for the district, specifically the frog door knockers.

The commission discussed several details of the application. Specifically, centering the numbers and the mail slot which should be made with a simple brass design, and to install a simpler version without the elaborate design as proposed. In conclusion that Commission decided that the application would be approved with the provisos that the number will be center mounted and that the mail slot will be made from a simple brass metal.

**M. Rosales motioned to approve the application, P. Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR and PV)**



**APP # 20.283 BH 92 Pinckney Street:**

**Applicant:** Steve Calandrella CM

**Proposed Work:** At north, west and south facades replace all windows (historic and replacement) with proper pane configuration to match existing.

The applicant provided documentation to prove that the windows on the structure, while original, needed to be replaced due to their condition.

During public comment, members of the public expressed concern with replacing the original windows and would prefer that the windows are restored rather than repaired.

The Commission reviewed the presentation and determined that the application would likely be approved but there needed to be shop drawings for the proposed windows submitted before they could be approved.

In conclusion, the Commission decided that the application was to be continued until the next hearing when the applicant would be able to present the proposed replacement manufacturing specifications.

**M. Rosales motioned to continue the application, P. Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR and PV)**

**APP # 20.362 BH 88 Charles Street:**

**Applicant:** Sophie Stokes; Sophie Hughes Inc.

**Proposed Work:** At front façade, install new blade sign.

The applicant provided the details to their signage for their new store on Charles Street. The signage plan consists of a double sided blade sign that uses existing hardware from a previous tenant. Details provided included materials, dimensions, and lighting.

During public comment, a preference for carved wood letters was suggested.

The Commission decided that the sign fits appropriately on the street and matches the existing signs from the surrounding storefronts. The Commission did request



that the letters were carved into the signage. In conclusion, the Commission voted to approve the application with the provisos that the letters on the sign must be carved.

**M. Rosales motioned to approve the application with provisos, P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR and PV)**

**APP # 20.371 BH 151-153 Charles Street**

**Applicant:** Thomas Maguire

**Proposed Work:** At side yard visible from Charles Street, replace wooden picket fence gate with metal diamond plate.

The applicant began their presentation by explaining the need to shield the dumpster area from the street. The existing conditions include a cedar picket fence that needs to be replaced. The proposal called for an iron fence with black diamond plate welded onto the rear of the fence. The entire fence and its components would be painted black. The applicant mentioned that he is using the same contractor that constructed the fence across the street at the new hotel property. The applicant was open to any variation of the fence.

The Commission discussed whether the fence was appropriate and how it should be shaped. There was concern that there were no shop drawings that were submitted with the application and the drawings that were submitted were incomplete. The Commission asked the applicant to request shop drawings with precise details including dimensions. The application was continued until the next hearing for more information.

**P. Donnelly motioned to continue the application, J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR and PV)**

**APP # 20.377 BH 75 Hancock Street:**

**Applicant:** Megan Morgan; Payne/Bouchier

**Proposed Work:** At front façade, install custom window security grill for front street level window.

The applicant presented the details of the proposal. The homeowner is new to the neighborhood and wished to secure the lower level of his home by installing security grates that match the historic metal grates on the front façade of the property.



During public comment, members of the public did not support the project.

The Commission identified the existing metal rails that are part of Asher Benjamin's pattern books and that imitating the patterns would overwhelm the façade. The Commission also questioned why there was a need for such a device considering Beacon Hill was one of the safest neighborhoods in the City.

In conclusion, the Commission voted to deny the application without prejudice.

**M. Rosales motioned to deny the application, P. Donnelley seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR and PV)**

**APP # 20.380 BH 71 Beacon Street #5:**

**Applicant:** Andrew Hamilton

**Proposed Work:** At rear facades level four, replace five, wood, 6 over 6 original windows with five, 6 over 6, simulated divided light windows.

The applicant provided details to the project which is to replace the existing (historic c. 1919) windows with new windows which will look similar to the original. The existing windows have lead paint and with a small child in the unit, there would be concern of exposure. The applicant did explore dipping the windows but indicated that because of the current condition of the windows, they would likely be ruined through the dipping process. The applicant explained how there were additional windows on the property that they felt were not visible, and thus exempt from landmarks review.

During the public comment portion of the hearing, members of the public wished to see the windows dipped rather than replaced.

The Commission discussed the windows that were considered exempt and determined that they were not because they would be visible from Brimmer Street and thus under their purview. Details of those windows would need to be submitted to the Commission for approval. The Commission determined that the photos and documentation were insufficient and additional information was needed, including cut sheets of proposed replacements, to be presented at the next hearing.

**P. Donnelly motioned to continue the application, M. Rosales seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR and PV)**



**APP # 20.381 BH 33 Bowdoin Street:**

**Applicant:** Jan Steenbrugge

**Proposed Work:** At front façade, change the previously approved (App: 16.931) replacement windows from the existing shade of white to black.

The applicant presented details to request that the windows, previously approved to be painted a cream color, changed to a black.

During public comment it was mentioned that the windows were already installed and factory painted.

The Commissioners did not feel that a black color was not appropriate for the windows on the site.

**M. Rosales motioned to deny the application, P. Donnelly seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR and PV)**

**APP # 20.273 BH 10 Walnut Street**

**Applicant:** Tim Sheehan

**Proposed Work:** At front façade, replace 14 original double hung 6 over 6 wood windows. Install horn, fire strobe, and sprinkler connection (See additional items in administrative review).

The applicant presented the details of the application to the Commission. The windows are historic, likely original but in poor condition. The pane configurations of the proposed replacement windows would match the historic windows and are appropriate to the architecture of the structure. As part of the renovation of the structure the applicant is also applying to add several life safety elements at the front face including an alarm, strobe and sprinkler hookup.

During public comment there was a request for the bell alarm and strobe to be on the opposite side of the structure.

The Commission felt that the proposed windows were in fact appropriate and requested for the screens to be installed on the interior of the window frame. They also requested for all of the life safety systems to be coplanar, thus reducing the visual clutter on the front façade.



In conclusion, the application was approved with the provisos that the sprinkler, alarm and strobe were all located on the same plane, and that the window screens were installed on the interior.

**M. Rosales motioned to deny the application, P. Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR and PV)**

### III. Administrative Approval

*In order to expedite the review process, the commission has delegated the approval of certain work items, such as those involving ordinary maintenance and repair, restoration or replacement, or which otherwise have a minimal impact on a building's appearance, to commission staff pending ratification at its monthly public hearing. **Having been identified as meeting these eligibility criteria and all applicable guidelines, the following applications will be approved at this hearing:***

**APP # 20.316 BH 11A Revere Street:** Requested to appear before commission in November

**APP # 20.327 BH 89-91 West Cedar Street:** Requested to appear before commission in November

#### **ALL OTHERS APPROVED AS SUBMITTED 4-0 (MR, PD, JP, PV)**

**APP # 20.294 BH 37 Beacon Street:** At ground level, front and side facades replace five, 8 over 8, wood, windows at front and one window at side façade with 8 over 8 wood, true divided lites. Exterior to be painted Navajo White to match existing.

**APP # 20.306 BH 41 Beacon Street:** At West (side) façade, remove and replace gutter with new copper gutter.

**APP # 20.322 BH 41 Beacon Street:** At main entrance to 41 and 41A Beacon Street and stone soffit, repair and clean stonework using SEI Chemical Limestone Cleaner AR-104-5. At front façade, remove rust from base of wrought iron fencing where it joins granite using SEI Chemical Masonry Rust Remover AR 103-5. Repoint stonework using type S mortar. Color, style and tooling made to match existing.



**APP # 20.293 BH 91 Beacon Street #3:** At front elevation level four, replace two, wood, non-original bowed 2 over 2 windows with two, wood, bowed 2 over 2 windows painted black to match existing.

**APP # 20.322 BH 39 Brimmer Street:** At front entrance, cut and restore existing masonry, seal with Tremco Building Sealant with color to match existing. Restore base of left column brownstone with cast stone, with integrated color to match existing. Seal top steps with Tremco sealant. At left side of steps, cut and repair cracks, seal with Tremco sealant integrated color to match existing.

**APP # 20.320 BH 77 Charles Street:** At front façade all levels, restore headers and sills as needed, clean façade with sure clean 600, coat headers and sills with Tammscoat, sand and repaint all window trim to match existing, seal existing gutters.

**APP # 20.272 BH 44 Chestnut Street:** At rear façade, scrape and repaint wood trim with BM Aura Exterior Paint, low lustre.

**APP # 20.391 BH 67 Chestnut Street:** At front façade, remove all slate and copper; install high temp ice and water shield, install new slate. Slate is to match existing in color, style and shape. Install new copper gutters, new copper dormer tops, down spout and window pans. At front façade, replace all decorative trim and sills in kind with like materials.

**APP # 20.308 BH 10 Derne Street:** At front façade scrape and repaint entryway front and secondary door. Paint to match existing color; BM Regal Select.

**APP # 20.326 BH 20 Grove Street:** At front façade, cut and repoint brick using mortar type "N" and fine sand, mortar joints to match existing.

**APP # 20.356 BH 11 Irving Street:** At front façade, level 3. Replace 3 non-original wood 6 over 1 windows with 3, wood, 6 over 1 windows.

**APP # 20.387 BH 45 Mount Vernon Street:** At front façade third floor, repoint brick to match existing.

**APP # 20.376 BH 81 Myrtle Street:** At rear façade, replace slate mansard slate with like slate in color, shape and pattern. Install new copper gutter, flashing, and downspout, reset existing fire escape.

**APP # 20.316 BH 11A Revere Street:** At front façade garden level 1, replace two, 1 over 1, wood windows in kind. **PULLED FROM VOTE LIST, REQUEST TO APPEAR ON 11-21**

**APP # 20.291 BH 23 Pinckney Street:** At rear façade, repair and repoint bricks using type N. Repair brick line under gutter, replace deteriorated window sills as needed. Replace all window trim in kind repaint trim to match existing. Repaint steel post on deck rail to match existing.

**APP # 20.310 BH 112 Pinckney Street:** At front façade Unit 34; replace 8 cracked window panes, repaint windows black to match existing.

**APP # 20.273 BH 10 Walnut Street:** At front façade, patch slate roof as needed, replacements to match existing. Replace copper gutter and downspout in kind. Remove 2 storm doors and 3 storm windows at penthouse level (See Additional Items in Design Review).

**APP # 20.327 BH 89-91 West Cedar Street:** At front façade, cut and repoint using mortar type N. At fifth floor replace three 1 over 1 wood windows with three 6 over 6 wood windows. **PULLED FROM VOTE LIST, REQUEST TO APPEAR ON 11-21**



**APP # 20.370 BH 9 Willow Street:** At penthouse level west elevation, replace wood arched window in kind. At southern façade, level 7, replace three 6 light casement windows in kind. Windows are only slightly visible from the Willow Street.

**M. Rosales motioned to Approve the Administrative Items, P. Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS, PV).**

**IV. RATIFICATION OF 9/19/2019 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES & 09/12/2019, 09/19/2019 & 10/2/2019 subcommittee meeting minutes.**

**ALL APPROVED AS SUBMITTED 4-0 (MR, PD, JP, PV)**

**M. Rosales motioned to Approve the minutes, J. Pierce seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS, PV).**

**V. Staff Updates**

**VI. Adjourn – 7:50 p.m.**

**M. Rosales motioned to adjourn the hearing. P.T Vineburgh seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (PD, JP, MR, DS, PV).**