



**SOUTH END LANDMARK DISTRICT COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room
Boston, MA, 02201

FEBRUARY 4, 2020

Commissioners Present: John Amodeo, John Freeman, Catherine Hunt, Diana Parcon, Peter Sanborn

Staff Present: Gabriella Amore, Preservation Assistant; Mary Cirbus, Preservation Planner

5:34 PM J. Freeman called the public hearing to order with C. Hunt and P. Sanborn present. D. Parcon and J. Amodeo joined the hearing during the first presentation.

I. DESIGN REVIEW

APP # 20.468 SE

1313 WASHINGTON STREET

Continued from the 12/03/2019 SELDC Public Hearing

Applicant: Brian Tripp, Wilkes Passage Condominiums

Proposed Work: At the Waltham Street façade, replace a service garage door.

Jeremiah Eck and Brian Tripp were the project representatives. They distributed photographs to the Commissioners. They applicants explained that the removal of the Washington Street doors was approved by the Commissioners, but the Waltham Street door was not approved. They explained that they met with staff M. Cirbus on site and addressed the question of whether or not the Waltham Street façade is more residential. They once again explained that the Waltham Street door is in bad condition and needs to be replaced due to pests. They also suggested that the type of doors they are proposing is in keeping with other types of service doors in the neighborhood.

D. Parcon and J. Amodeo arrived during the first presentation.

The Commissioners explained that the discussion at the last hearing was that the Waltham Street doors should have more texture so that they do not feel so industrial. J. Amodeo reiterated that the door should have more interesting design, and that alternating the perforations and solid panels will be too subtle from the sidewalk, and will still appear too utilitarian. J. Freeman added that the door should have more scale and texture.



The applicants expressed that they are willing to do what the Commission wants, but they do not know what type of door to go with, and added that a custom door is very expensive. J. Freeman suggested that they might incorporate using different panels with complementary colors might create a visual that appears more intentional.

The Commissioners concluded that they would remand the details of the door to staff.

There was no public comment.

J. Freeman motioned to remand the design of the door to staff. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.611 SE

198 WEST SPRINGFIELD STREET

Continued from the 12/03/2019 SELDC Public Hearing

Applicant: Jillian Adler

Proposed Work: Modify a roof deck to comply with the SELDC Standards and Guidelines

Jillian Adler and Marcus Springer were the project representatives. They explained that they met with staff N. Armata and M. Cirbus on site. They also looked at previous approvals for 194 West Springfield Street, which was approved in 2019. They propose to move the railings back, change the railings to match with SELDC Guidelines, and install a dark fascia board. They showed the Commissioners different views from the street and satellite imagery of the existing roofs. If the railings are moved back to a point where they are not visible, the deck will disappear entirely.

The Commissioners noted that 194 West Springfield Street railings were not built in compliance.

The applicants cited the verbiage from the approval for 194 West Springfield Street, which included language that the railings would be moved back 1 foot, in line with 194, replace the railings, and install a dark fascia board. The Commissioners further discussed the proposal and the verbiage of the approval letter for no. 194. The Commissions also discussed the exhaust pipe at the front of the roof and ways to improve the situation – ideally the pipe should be relocated so that it is not visible from any public way.

The Commissioners discussed the best way to move forward and cited that although the model at no. 194 is still very visible, the objective is to implement incremental changes over time so that eventually the visibility of the roof deck disappears entirely. P. Sanborn added that the rail system must be in compliance, unlike no. 194. J. Amodeo noted that once the roof deck is removed to replace a roof, it will not be reapproved.



Eventually the Commissioners concluded that they would approve the simple steel picket railing system as presented, which will align with no. 194, with the proviso that (on the honor system) the applicants investigate remediation for the existing exhaust pipe at the front slope of the roof.

There was no public comment.

J. Freeman motioned to approve the installation of the simple steel picket railing system as presented which will align with no. 194, with the proviso that the applicant will investigate remediation measures for the existing woodstove chimney. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.738 SE

289 SHAWMUT AVENUE

Applicant: Chris Amory

Applicant: At the garden level, remove a security gate and install a door.

Chris Amory (owner) and Ben Gless were the project representatives. They explained the scope of the work, which includes replacing the metal security gate with a door. They also showed the door at no. 287 Shawmut Avenue.

The Commissioners discussed the existing gate and believe that it is a 20th century addition to the building and other cheek wall entrances on the block. They also questioned if historic cheek wall entrances were sturdier, and noted that there are very few, if any, historic doors of this type left. They concluded, however, that there are no historic precedents for all glass doors.

The applicants explained that they want a full glass door in the opening to allow as much natural light as possible.

The Commissioners noted that the door at no. 287 Shawmut is approvable. There was additional discussion about the type of door that might be approvable, and the Commissioners browsed a catalogue of possible doors. The conclusion was that none of the doors in the catalogue were approvable as described. J. Freeman added that these spaces were usually utilitarian.

The Commission concluded that they would approve the removal of the security gate and the installation of a new door, and remand the details of the new door design to staff.

There was no public comment.



J. Freeman motioned to approve the removal of the gate and approve the substitution of a new solid privacy door with the exact configuration of the door remanded to staff, the preferences of which were stated during the hearing. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.737 SE

437 SHAWMUT AVENUE

Applicant: Robert B. Greene

Proposed Work: At the rear façade roof level construct a shed dormer.

Bob Greene (owner) and Arthur Choo (architect) were the project representatives. They explained the scope of the project, which includes constructing a shed dormer at the rear roof which is visible from a public way.

The shed dormer will be clad in asphalt shingles, which will match the existing front dormers.

The Commissioners expressed concern that the new dormer will alter the profile of the existing Flemish gable. J. Amodeo noted that he was not sure if the Commission had ever allowed the construction of a brand new dormer and that the Commission needs to know if there is any historic precedence on this particular building. He believes that the application needs to be continued pending the submittal of historic documentation.

The Commissioners discussed the roof deck on the ell, which is not in the scope of work.

The Commissioners reiterated that the applicants will need to examine the roof framing to see if dormers at the rear were ever intended. Knowing this information will help the Commissioners determine if the proposed dormer construction is appropriate. The Commission also has to research to see if adjacent shed dormers (or others) have been approved.

They concluded that the application should be continued for more information.

There was no public comment.

J. Freeman motioned to continue the application for more information. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.690 SE

37 EAST SPRINGFIELD STREET

Applicant: Adegreicio Lima

Proposed Work: Construct a roof deck.



Adegreicio Lima, contractor, was the project representative. He explained the scope of the project to the commissioners, which includes constructing a roof deck.

Staff M. Cirbus noted that the roof deck is visible East Springfield Street, and the Commissioners explained that the mockup will have to be re-reviewed by staff while determining the placement of the railings. They also explained that any visible railings will need to be black metal picket.

The Commissioners concluded that they would remand the placement of the railings to staff.

There was no public comment.

J. Freeman motioned to remand the placement of the railings to staff. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.726 SE

5 RUTLAND SQUARE

Applicant: Joseph Holland, Holland Construction
Proposed Work: Construct a roof deck.

Matthew Rider (architect) and Zachary Shedlock (contractor) were the project architects. They explained the scope of work to the Commissioners, which includes constructing a roof deck with a kitchen wall, planter screen, and privacy walls. They also explained the context of the project with regard to neighboring roof decks. The Commissioners discussed with the applicants about discrepancies between the rendering and the mock-up, namely the height of the privacy screen. They also reviewed photographs of the mock-up.

The Commissioners explained that the SELDC has purview over any park of the roof deck that can be seen from a public way. Furthermore, any portion of the deck that is visible needs to be a black metal rail. The Commissioners also noted that staff will need to investigate whether the adjacent roof decks (which are very visible) were approved.

The Commissioners gave an overview of the subcommittee process and the applicants asked additional questions about the visibility of the neighboring roof decks. C. Hunt and J. Amodeo volunteered to be on the subcommittee. J. Freeman also asked to see a vertical section drawing to show the rail height. This drawing will need to be presented at the subcommittee meeting.

The Commissioner concluded that they would remand this application to a subcommittee consisting of J. Amodeo and C. Hunt.



There was no public comment.

J. Freeman motioned to remand the application to a subcommittee consisting of J. Amodeo and C. Hunt. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.736 SE

150 WEST CANTON STREET

Applicant: Jim Burke, Cambridgeport Construction

Proposed Work: Construct a roof deck

Graham Proud (owner) and Owen Thomas (architect) were the project architects. They explained the scope of work, which includes constructing a roof deck that contains a trellis. They further explained that the new construction, as proposed, will be visible from Montgomery Street.

After discussing the extent of visibility from Montgomery Street, the Commissioners concluded that they should form a subcommittee to review the mockup on site. They also reiterated that an integral (or fixed) shade structure could not be approved if visible but that temporary shade is not in SELDC purview. They added that any visible railings must be steel metal picket.

The Commissioners decided to remand the roof deck to a subcommittee consisting of J. Amodeo and C. Hunt.

There was no public comment.

J. Freeman motioned to remand this application to a subcommittee consisting of J. Amodeo and C. Hunt. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.744 SE

25 CLAREMONT PARK

Applicant: Dartagnan Brown, Embarc Studio

Proposed Work: Construct a penthouse and roof deck and modify the cornice line at the rear.

Mark van Brocklin, Carolyn Keller, Jas Bhogal and Thomas Calus were the project representatives. They explained the scope of the project, which includes constructing a penthouse and roof deck. The penthouse will not have any setback from the rear of the building.



The Commissioners mentioned that SELDC purview extends to any public way. J. Amodeo noted that a subcommittee should be formed to evaluate the visibility of the mock-up.

The Commissioners discussed the visibility along Claremont Park and other public streets. There was also some discussion about the SELDC's purview from Claremont Street and the SW corridor.

The Commissioners concluded that forming a subcommittee would be the best course of action moving forward. D. Parcon and J. Amodeo volunteered for a subcommittee. J. Freeman volunteered to serve as an alternate member of the subcommittee.

Zoran Zvonar, direct abutter, expressed his concern over the construction of the penthouse and presented various photographs of the mockup. Rob Lachenaur, direct abutter, also asked questions about SELDC's purview over views from SW Corridor and Claremont Street. The Commissioners responded that they are ironing out the details over views from Claremont Street because it may be considered a private street.

J. Freeman motioned to remand the application to a subcommittee consisting of J. Amodeo and D. Parcon, with J. Freeman as a backup member if necessary. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

APP # 20.745 SE

116 CHANDLER STREET

Applicant: Dartagnan Brown, Embarc Studio

Proposed Work: Construct a roof deck, rear decks, and rear yard addition; modify rear fire escapes; replace two (2) existing windows at the rear façade with aluminum doors; and construct a fence at the rear yard.

Mark van Brocklin, Carolyn Keller, Jas Bhogal and Thomas Calus were the project representatives. They began by explaining the site context to the Commissioners and the overall project to the Commissioners. The rear of the building faces Lawrence Street. The applicants explained that the rear addition and deck will not be visible due to the steep slope below grade at Lawrence Street.

The Commissioners explained that they have allowed modifications of the ground floor in these circumstances as long no modifications are visible from any public way. They noted that they have to confirm that the ground floor is not visible. Lowering the sill of a window to accommodate a door is not allowable unless the sill is not visible from a public way.

Staff M. Cirbus explained that the roof deck mock-up was not visible. The applicants also confirmed that the roof deck is not visible.



The applicants went on to explain the rear privacy fence. Staff M. Cirbus explained that the rear façade is visible due to a lower abutter fence. The Commissioners moved on to reviewing the rear deck that will be installed above the rear addition and expressed that there should not be any steps from the sill of the new door to the base of the deck. The deck will be supported by brackets. The fire escapes will also be cut back on the rear façade. The applicants noted that the fire escapes are incorrectly rendered in the drawings.

The Commissioners want to see a detail drawing of the bracket supports, and a detail drawing to show how the fire escapes of the neighboring property will connect to the new deck, which is mandatory for egress.

There was additional discussion if the rear addition will actually not be visible. J. Amodeo explained that the applicants will install a divider fence at the abutting property to completely obscure the addition at the rear.

P. Sanborn mentioned that this work presents a good opportunity to restore the main entry hood at the Chandler Street façade to match the building to the right, although it is not included as part of the application. There was additional discussion about this work. The Commission noted that they cannot force this work, but would very much appreciate it. It would be remanded to staff.

Anne Wadsworth offered public comment on behalf of the condo association of 114 Chandler Street. She asked for additional clarification regarding the extension at the ground floor, and requested that the applicants provide a project contact.

The Commissioners concluded that they could approve the application with several provisos.

J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the following provisos:

- **That the applicants provide drawings and provide more information regarding the bracket supports for the rear deck;**
- **That the doors at the decks be designed to resemble two-over-two windows with both interior and exterior muntins, and that the applicants submit detail drawings of these doors to staff;**
- **That the applicants provide plans and a detail drawing showing the relationship and connection between the adjacent fire escape and the proposed new deck;**
- **That the side fences and rear fence be built high enough to make the bottom of the windows and new addition below not visible from any public way; and**
- **That the drawings be updated to show corrections and aforementioned provisos, and provided to staff.**



D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

II. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

There was no public comment regarding Administrative Review items.

C. Hunt motioned to approve the Administrative Review items. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

III. RATIFICATION OF 12/03/2019 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES; 11/14/2019 PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES; 12/12/2019 PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES; 12/17/2019 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES; 1/07/2019 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES; 1/08/2020 PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES; 1/14/2020 PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES; AND 1/21/2020 PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

J. Amodeo explained that he requested staff edit the 12/03/2019 Public Hearing Minutes for 45 West Newton Street wherein the wording should be changed to note that horizontal wood railings should be the model for decks on rear ell in the district.

C. Hunt motioned to approve the minutes as submitted and amended by J. Amodeo, D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).

IV. STAFF UPDATES

There was a discussion regarding the recent complaints about the length and lateness of South End hearings with J. Cornish, Director of Design Review.

V. ADJOURNMENT – 8:37 PM

J. Amodeo motioned to adjourn the hearing. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).