



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

Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room  
Boston, MA, 02201

**OCTOBER 1, 2019**

**Commissioners Present:** John Freeman, Diana Parcon, Peter Sanborn

**Staff Present:** Mary Cirbus, Preservation Planner; Gabriela Amore, Preservation Assistant

---

**5:30 PM** D. Parcon called the public hearing to order.

**I. VIOLATIONS**

**VIO. 20.007/ APP # 20.374 SE 129 West Concord Street**

**Applicant:** Peter Readdy

**Proposed Work:** Repointing of façade, removal of star-shaped tiebacks, and installation of windows at the front façade without SELDC approval.

Brad Stanton (attorney for the applicant) was the project representative. Peter Readdy joined the hearing when he arrived. Mr. Stanton explained that they submitted an application to ratify the work which was completed around 2014. The homeowner was under the impression that his permit from the building department also covered SELDC approval and did not know there was another application required. He explained that the six tiebacks can be reinstalled, as they were removed so that the façade could be repointed. The windows were replaced due to extreme deterioration and rot but there is no report stating that the windows were beyond repair. The repointing was completed to preserve the structural integrity of the building.

The Commissioners moved on to reviewing the specific violations. There was a brief discussion of the tiebacks. J. Freeman suggested that a structural engineer examine the façade to ensure it is structurally sound before the tiebacks are reinstalled. Next the Commissioners moved on to discussing the window replacements. P. Sanborn explained that the new windows approximate, and do not replicate, the historic configuration. The openings are panned in. J. Freeman asked about the mortar repointing. The applicant confirmed that the mortar joints were overcut, which made the joints very thick, and claimed that the mortar matches that of the adjacent property (it does not).

The Commissioners commented that there is little that can be done about the



brick, as the joints are now very thick and there is greater risk of causing more damage to the brick. Regarding the windows, the Commissioners commented that some of the replacement windows may be accurate in terms of historic measurements, but requested that staff conduct a site inspection to confirm. P. Sanborn commented that at the very least the Commission needs to address the parlor floor and basement. He also noted that the entry doors were replaced.

J. Freeman noted that the Commission should deny the application without prejudice and request that the applicant submit new applications for remedial work. He also requested that staff to conduct site visit with close up photographs of the windows, particularly of the upper stories which may be appropriate. The Commissioners are unsure about if repointing can be completed without causing more damage to the brick, but a preservation specialist might be able to make that determination.

There was no public comment.

**J. Freeman motioned to deny the application without prejudice, P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

\*\*\*

**VIO. 18.098/ APP # 20.541 SE 40 East Springfield Street**

**Applicant:** Joe Curley, Pine Street Inn

**Proposed Work:** Painting of stone and installation of a door without SELDC approval

Kitty Ryan, The Narrow Gate Architecture, was the project representative. She explained that the door was replaced and the lower band on the sills was painted about 2 years ago. The applicant explained that the lower band has been painted green for at least 25 years.

J. Freeman made some comments about the existing door and noted that it would not have been the historic configuration of the original doors but the Commissioner understands that the applicants cannot return to a more historic door configuration because of egress requirements. P. Sanborn suggested two arched windows to better recall the historic configuration, but the sidelights (which are not in violation) may conflict too much. The Commissioners requested that the masonry belt be painted the color of brownstone.

J. Freeman suggested that the Commissioners approve the replacement of the door and remand the design details to staff. P. Sanborn added that the masonry belt might be granite, rather than brownstone, and requested that the paint be removed and left bare if it is granite.



P. Sanborn motioned to approve the application with the following provisos:

- That the applicant come up with new door design to submit to staff;
- That the sills in question be repainted to brownstone and belt be repainted to brownstone if it is the underlying material;
- However, if the belt is granite it will be stripped of paint and left natural.

There was no public comment.

**P. Sanborn motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos, J. Freeman seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

\*\*\*

## II. DESIGN REVIEW

### **APP # 20.285 SE 77 Worcester Street**

**Applicant:** Syed and Brynn Jafry c/o Michael Ross

**Proposed Work:** At the roof level install a deck and railings, visible from a public way.

Mike Ross, attorney for the applicant, was the project representative. The deck will consist of a hatch, metal railings, and pressure-treated posts.

The Commissioners examined the position of the building in relation to its surroundings. The building is located across the street from a large school recreation field which creates a large range of visibility from West Springfield Street. The deck is set back very close to the rear façade which faces a public way. The Commissioners looked at the positions of other roof decks along Worcester Street, which are also visible over school property.

J. Freeman explained that the railing design will have to redesign to incorporate a simple metal rail with a thin profile, and that the deck should be lowered structurally as much as possible. P. Sanborn noted that a simple cable system would be less visible. J. Freeman was willing to approve the cable system as an experiment. The cable system should be as thin as possible, consisting of metal posts with a brushed stainless visible to eliminate reflectivity.

The Commissioners arrived at the following conditions for approving the application:

- That the applicant provides more information regarding the lowest possible height of the deck in the form of a detail drawing to show any possible trip hazards at the hatch;
- And that railing system is redesigned to a metal cable system consisting of a natural brushed metal, non-reflective, matte finish, which will help it recede from view.

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos, P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**



\*\*\*

**APP # 20.299 SE 4 Ringgold Street**

**Applicant:** Marcus Springer, Springer Architects LLC

**Proposed Work:** At the rear roof level, modify the roof and construct a roof deck visible from a public way. See additional items under Administrative Review.

Marcus Springer (architect) was the project representative. He presented the site plan and the existing conditions of the property. He explained that the project includes a new roof deck with daylighter system, a type of head house, which will face the alley. The proposed deck includes a glass railing system.

Mr. Springer presented several views of the property and the mock-up. The deck is not visible over the front of the building because all work is contained to an area below the original ridgeline, which will remain the same. The rear façade is visible from Hanson Street and Waltham Street. The daylighter system is hidden from view by the chimney, but the top will be visible when open.

The Commissioners discussed the visibility of the glass rail system – Commissioners find that glass rails are actually quite visible. Since reducing the footprint of the deck will not decrease visibility, P. Sanborn suggested that a cable system would be the least conspicuous. The Commissioners also wondered if the daylighter system can be altered so that the door is hinged on the side, rather than the top, so that the door will not be visible over the front of the façade when open. The applicant indicated that they would investigate this option.

The Commissioners arrived at the following conditions:

- That the applicant investigate alternate ways to open the daylighter, specifically hinging it on the side;
- And that the glass railing system is redesigned to a metal cable system with a brushed metal, non-reflective, matte finish.

There was no public comment.

**P. Sanborn motioned to approve the application with the above-mentioned provisos. J. Freeman seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

\*\*\*

**APP # 20.210 SE 77 Warren Avenue**

**Applicant:** Jason Goldie



**Proposed Work:** At the front façade, replace a door and remove wood side panels in vestibule. At the roof level, install a roof deck and mechanical equipment. At the front façade mansard level, remove one eight-over-eight and two four-over-four double-hung windows, modify the dormer, and install four two-over-two, double-hung, wood windows. See *additional items under Administrative Review*.

Jason Golding (homeowner) and Marty Dykas (designer) were the project representatives. Mr. Golding explained that they are attempting to restore the house to the historic configuration and to add a roof deck and relocate HVAC equipment. He walked the Commission through sightline drawings and photographs of the mockup. He also showed pictures of the existing door and transom, and explained that the door is not original and contains leaded glass. He also does not believe that the paneling is original.

The Commissioners asked for more information about the paneling. Along with staff, they looked at other examples of doors along Warren Street. J. Freeman noted that vestibules with panels often have a brick return. P. Sanborn noted that if the paneling is proud of the brick, it indicates that it was added later.

The applicants then walked the Commissioners through the window replacement at the dormer. Staff clarified the window configuration at the dormer: the drawings show two, two-over-two windows in the center window opening, but the applicant explained that they are instead proposing one two-over-two window in this opening. J. Freeman noted that the Commissioners would rather see the configuration depicted in the drawings, as a large center window would look ungainly and is not appropriate for Victorian-era buildings. The Commissioners and staff then looked at other dormer windows along Warren Avenue to see if they could see any indication of the original configuration. They could not. The Commissioners decided to remand the deck to a subcommittee.

The Commissioners arrived at the following provisos:

- That staff inspect the side paneling prior to its proposed removal to determine if the paneling is original;
- That the proposed window schedule at the dormer is modified to include double-framed two-over-two windows (installed side-by-side) in the center opening with two-over-two windows on each side;
- And that the proposed deck is remanded to a subcommittee consisting of Commissioners Sanborn and Hunt.

There was no public comment.

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

\*\*\*

**APP # 20.182 SE 11HF Claremont Park**



**Applicant:** Dartagnan Brown, Embarc Studio LLC

**Proposed Work:** At the roof level, construct a roof deck visible from a public way. At all levels of the front façade, replace existing one-over-one metal windows with one-over-one wood windows. See *additional items under Administrative Review*.

Mark Van Brocklin, Embarc Studio, was the project representative. He began by walking the Commissioners through the site plan and the building's location on the block. He showed the windows at the basement level first. They propose to replace the basement windows with wood windows with hopper style operation. He further explained that the windows will be replaced with one-over-one wood windows on the upper stories.

P. Sanborn asked if there were any historic photographs of the property and the applicant shared images from the South End Historical Society which shows one-over-one windows. The Commissioners examined the photographs which showed that the adjacent buildings have two-over-two windows. They expressed that two-over-two configuration would be a safe choice. Next the Commissioners moved on to discussing the basement windows and agreed that the windows look old, but are most likely not original. They determined that an appropriate configuration is a three-light configuration in the center, and two-light configuration on each side.

The Commissioners moved on to discussing the roof deck, and determined that it will require a subcommittee because the position of the property on the block makes the roof deck very visible.

The Commissioners arrived at the following provisos:

- That the wood replacement windows at the front façade be reconfigured from one-over-one to two-over-two;
- That the wood replacement windows at the basement be a three-light configuration in the center, with a two-light configuration on each side, all with hopper style operation;
- And that the proposed roof deck is remanded to a subcommittee consisting of Commissioner Hunt and Commissioner Sanborn.

There was no public comment.

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos, P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

\*\*\*

**APP # 20.330 SE 65 East Newton Street**

**Applicant:** Paul Fowkes, Northeastern Mechanical Inc.

**Proposed Work:** At the roof level, install a relocated generator.





Paul Fowkes, Northeastern Mechanical, was the project representative. Mr. Fowkes walked the Commissioners through the site plan and the location of the abandoned chiller, along with dimensions and setback. He also shared some photographs from the street.

Along with staff, the Commissioners looked at images from the street and Google Street views of the property and saw that the rooftop unit will be visible.

The Commissioners decided that they did not see issue with approving the application as submitted, considering the installation is of a similar size and footprint, and its installation on this already complex mechanical landscape on the roof.

**P. Sanborn motioned to approve the application as submitted. J. Freeman seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

\*\*\*

**APP # 20.340 SE 63 Harrison Archway (14 East Newton Street)**

**Applicant:** Rick Jegerow, BHA

**Proposed Work:** At the side of the building, replace a generator and pad visible from a public way.

Rick Jegerow, Project Manager at the Boston Housing Authority was the project representative. He walked the Commissioners through the site plan. He explained this application is to replace an emergency generator which serves 84 units. He also showed photographs of project site and views from the street. He also explained the project plans and explained that the the proposed fencing (vinyl-clad chain link) was chosen to allow for the maximum air flow. He also showed the Commissioners previously-approved fencing for dumpsters, which BHA would be open to incorporating into the project plans. The Commissioners wondered if the dumpster fencing was possible if the height was raised. The applicant offered another possible solution to incorporate the dumpster fencing on the two visible sides, and chain link on the nonvisible side, which would allow for proper air flow. The Commissioners agreed that this solution would be alright with them to allow for proper ventilation while bettering the appearance of the installation.

The Commission arrived at the following proviso:

- That the applicant install a 45° steel slat fence on the two visible sides and vinyl-clad chain link with a black finish on the third, non-visible side.



There was no public comment.

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned proviso. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

\*\*\*

**APP # 20.245 SE 24 Dartmouth Street**

**Applicant:** Gary Anthony, Anthony's Construction and Roofing Corp

**Proposed Work:** Replace the EPDM coating on a roof modified without SELDC approval.

Gary Anthony was the project representative. Staff explained that we were examining this application because the rear of the roof has been significantly modified. Mr. Anthony showed pictures of the roof.

The Commissioners discussed the existing conditions and wondered if this alteration occurred before the district was established. The Commissioners wondered if they have the authority to order that the roof be restored. They discussed which roof deck is going to be removed (the top deck). The Commissioners believe that this roof deck may have been modified in the late 1970s or 1980s. A discussion followed, along with various satellite images of the roof.

The Commissioners could not determine an intervention that might bring the roof closer to its historic configuration, and they asked that Mr. Anthony submit a detail drawing of the ridge cap to staff and that to gravel stop be included on the edge.

There was no public comment.

**J. Freeman motioned that the application be approved as submitted. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

\*\*\*

**APP # 20.305 SE 508 Columbus Avenue # 1**

**Applicant:** Anthony Griseto, Pella Windows and Doors

**Proposed Work:** At the front façade under the stoop, replace entry door. *See additional items under Administrative Review.*





Applicant did not show/ withdrawn by the applicant.

\*\*\*

- APP # 20.212 SE Tremont Street at Clarendon Street**
- APP # 20.213 SE Columbus Avenue at West Canton Street (2 Yarmouth Street)**
- APP # 20.214 SE Columbus Avenue at Dartmouth Street (150 Chandler Street)**
- APP # 20.215 SE Tremont Street, east of Dartmouth Street (595-597 Tremont Street)**
- APP # 20.216 SE Tremont Street at West Brookline Street (647 Tremont Street)**
- APP # 20.217 SE Massachusetts Avenue at Tremont Street (504 Massachusetts Avenue)**
- APP # 20.218 SE Columbus Avenue at West Newton Street**
- APP # 20.219 SE Columbus Avenue at Claremont Park (535 Columbus Avenue)**
- APP # 20.220 SE Tremont Street at Rutland Street**
- APP # 20.221 SE Carleton Street at Braddock Park**
- APP # 20.222 SE Columbus Avenue at Clarendon Street**

**Applicant:** (All): Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, Michael S. Giaimo, Attorney  
**Proposed Work:** Replace existing light pole with new light pole with base and antennae.

Michael S. Giaimo, Attorney for the applicant, was the project representative. He explained that these applications are to replace city-owned light poles with new light poles with small cell node equipment. The light fixtures are not acorn-style typical of the South End but rather a cobra head style. The Commissioners decided to look at each light pole individually (notes follow) but discussed common themes throughout, including the increase in height of the pole and the increase in width at the base. They also discussed the challenge of hanging the equipment off the pole; none of these locations will allow for hanging equipment (such as street signs). Verizon does not share poles with any other telecommunications companies.

Staff explained conversations are ongoing with Streets Department regarding the design of light fixtures to accommodate the small cell node equipment. The Commissioners agreed that the cobra head style is appropriate for major thoroughfares. The discussion returned to the issue of installing the equipment on the side of the pole, rather than at the base. Installing equipment on the side of the pole allows for updates to technology without needing to replace the pole. The applicants said that the base is the preferred design. The Commissioners inquired about what has been approved in other districts. Staff explained



that other Commissions have approved similar light poles in areas of visual “clutter”; on intersections where a taller fixture is appropriate; and in areas that will not obscure any particularly significant buildings.

Telecommunications equipment is currently not allowed on city traffic lights.

The Commissioners decided that there is no alternative to these street lights at this point. Verizon does not know how these poles have been incorporated into other historic districts in other cities.

APP # 20.212 SE Tremont Street at Clarendon Street (565 Tremont Street)

Commissioners determined that this location is appropriate. The pole will be located in a dense area.

APP # 20.213 SE Columbus Avenue at West Canton Street (2 Yarmouth Street)

The pole is actually located on West Canton Street. The adjacent buildings are noncontributing. This location is appropriate.

APP # 20.214 SE Columbus Avenue at Dartmouth Street (150 Chandler Street)

This location is appropriate.

APP # 20.215 SE Tremont Street, east of Dartmouth Street (595-597 Tremont Street)

This pole is located midblock and will be higher than the other adjacent fixtures. The Commissioners asked that the applicants investigate a more appropriate location and report their findings to staff.

APP # 20.216 SE Tremont Street at West Brookline Street (647 Tremont Street)

This location is appropriate.

APP # 20.217 SE Massachusetts Avenue at Tremont Street (504 Massachusetts Avenue)

This location is appropriate.

APP # 20.218 SE Columbus Avenue at West Newton Street

This location is appropriate. The pole cannot be relocated to any other location. There already is an existing pole so the Commissioners decided that the impact would not significantly different.

APP # 20.219 SE Columbus Avenue at Claremont Park (535 Columbus Avenue)



This location is appropriate.

APP # 20.220 SE Tremont Street at Rutland Street

This location is appropriate.

APP # 20.221 SE Carleton Street at Braddock Park

This location is appropriate.

APP # 20.222 SE Columbus Avenue at Clarendon Street

This light pole is located outside of the district.

Along with the above mentioned provisos, the Commissioners also stipulated the following proviso:

- That Verizon provide annual updates to the South End Landmark District Commission as technology progresses regarding design options and changes as well as developments on the implementation of this technology in other historic districts.

There was no public comment.

**APP # 20.212 SE Tremont Street at Clarendon Street**

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.213 SE Columbus Avenue at West Canton Street (2 Yarmouth Street)**

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.214 SE Columbus Avenue at Dartmouth Street (150 Chandler Street)**

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.215 SE Tremont Street, east of Dartmouth Street (595-597 Tremont Street)**

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.216 SE Tremont Street at West Brookline Street (647 Tremont Street)**



**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.217 SE Massachusetts Avenue at Tremont Street (504 Massachusetts Avenue)**

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.218 SE Columbus Avenue at West Newton Street**

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.219 SE Columbus Avenue at Claremont Park (535 Columbus Avenue)**

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.220 SE Tremont Street at Rutland Street**

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.221 SE Carleton Street at Braddock Park**

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the above mentioned provisos. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.222 SE Columbus Avenue at Clarendon Street**

**J. Freeman motioned to withdraw the application because the pole is located outside of the district. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

\*\*\*

### **III. Administrative Review/ Approval**

**APP # 20.292 SE 4 Cazenove Street #2:** At the parlor and second levels of the front façade, replace four four-over-four and two six-over-six replacement windows with two two-over-two and four one-over-one double-hung, wood windows.

**APP # 20.182 SE 11HF Claremont Park:** At all levels of the front façade, repair and restore existing cornice; repair and repoint brick masonry; repair and restore window sills and headers, ornament, and door surround; relocate historic interior



vestibule double doors to exterior; replace non-historic garden railing with black metal rail to match the adjacent no. 15 Claremont Park; repair and restore stoop. See *additional items under Design Review*.

**APP # 20.266 SE**      **310 Columbus Avenue #1:** At the front and rear façade which faces a public way, replace ten two-over-two, double-hung, vinyl windows with two-over-two, double-hung, wood windows.

**APP # 20.269 SE**      **433 Columbus Avenue #4:** At the front façade mansard level, replace four one-over-one, aluminum windows with two two-over-two, double-hung, aluminum clad windows and two one-over-one, double-hung, aluminum clad windows and replace wood brick mold in kind.

**APP # 20.247 SE**      **507 Columbus Avenue #4:** At the level below the mansard, replace four two-over-two, double-hung, wood windows in kind.

**APP # 20.305 SE**      **508 Columbus Avenue #1:** At the front façade garden and parlor levels, replace non-historic two-over-two wood windows in kind. See *additional items under Design Review*.

**APP # 20.288 SE**      **15 Concord Square #3:** At the front and rear façade which faces a public way, repair four historic two-over-two, double-hung, wood windows.

**APP # 20.298 SE**      **28 Concord Square:** At the front façade mansard level, replace aluminum siding with grey slate shingles to match the mansard of the adjacent no. 26.

**APP # 20.352 SE**      **20 Gray Street:** At the front elevation, replace non-original six-over-six wood windows with new wood windows to match the historic configuration.

**APP # 20.314 SE**      **84 East Brookline Street:** At the front façade mansard level, replace deteriorated wood dormers in kind.

**APP # 20.300 SE**      **96 East Brookline Street:** At all levels of the front façade, repair step-cracking of brick, repoint, replace flashing, joint sealant, and expansion joints in kind; replace damaged brick in kind; replace two brownstone-colored curved concrete lintels in kind; replace two brownstone sills with cast concrete sills tinted to match the color of brownstone; repair five lintels and sills; and replace existing downspout with new galvanized metal downspout.

**APP # 20.304 SE**      **25 Milford Street:** At the front entrance, replace existing double doors and transom in kind. *Pulled for more information.*

**APP # 20.299 SE**      **4 Ringgold Street:** At the front façade, replace nine two-over-two, double-hung, aluminum windows with two-over-two, double-hung, aluminum-clad windows. See *additional items under Design Review*.

**APP # 20.295 SE**      **301 Shawmut Avenue #24:** At the fourth level of the front façade, replace four four-over-four, double-hung aluminum windows with two two-over-two, and two one-over one, double-hung aluminum-clad windows.

**APP # 20.270 SE**      **19 Union Park:** At the front façade garden level, open a window well. *Moved from Design Review.*

**APP # 20.210 SE**      **77 Warren Avenue:** At the front façade all levels, replace six-over-six, double-hung windows with two-over-two, double-hung, wood windows; repairing existing painted masonry lintels and sills and repainting to match the color of



the underlying stone; repair wood entry hood; replace metal gutter and downspouts in copper; repoint and repair brick in kind. *See additional items under Design Review.*

**APP # 20.250 SE** **111 Warren Avenue:** At the front façade mansard level, install new copper gutter and trim at top fascia and replace wood trim.

**APP # 20.323 SE** **19 Wellington Street:** At the front façade all levels, repoint masonry in kind; repair sandstone sills to match original profile and repaint to match existing; repaint stoop to match existing color (HC-69).

**APP # 20.183 SE** **160 West Canton Street:** At the front façade all levels, repair one-over-one windows wood at the dormer and all existing two-over-two, double-hung, wood windows (including six curved-sash windows); install two-over-two, double-hung, wood sash where missing; repair existing front entry doors; replace copper gutter and downspout. At the stoop and garden, repair front stoop rail, garden rail, and garden level window grills.

**APP # 20.297 SE** **208 West Canton Street:** At the roof, replace copper edge metal. At the front mansard, replace rotted wood soffit boards in kind.

**APP # 20.269 SE** **73 Worcester Street:** At the parlor level of the front elevation, replace two one-over-one, double-hung, aluminum windows with two-over-two, double-hung, aluminum-clad windows.

The Commissioners arrived at the following proviso:

- APP # 20.304 SE 25 Milford Street pulled for more information.

**J. Freeman made the motion to approve the applications except for APP #20.304 SE 25 Milford Street. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

#### **IV. Ratification of Meeting Minutes from 09/03/2019**

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the minutes, P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**

#### **V. Staff Updates**

#### **VI. Adjourn – 8:53 PM**

**J. Freeman motioned to adjourn the hearing. P. Sanborn seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JF, DP, PS).**