



**SOUTH END LANDMARK DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**  
*Held virtually via Zoom*

**MAY 5, 2020**

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

**Staff Present:** Gabriela Amore, Preservation Assistant; Mary Cirbus, Preservation Planner, Joseph Cornish, Director of Design Review

---

**5:32 PM** J. Amodeo called the public hearing to order.

**I. DESIGN REVIEW**

**APP # 20.973 SE**

**TREMONT STREET**

Applicant: Boston Transportation Department

Proposed Work: Modify Tremont Street layout and intersections; construct raised crossings, built islands, and raised bus stop platforms; and relocate select utilities

John Monacelli (Boston Transportation Department) was the project representative. He walked the Commissioners through the modifications to Tremont Street, which is part of a city project to increase pedestrian and cyclist safety along this corridor. The Commissioners observed the existing and proposed conditions at each intersection.

The Commissioners asked for clarification regarding the raised crosswalks and relocating street lights. They also asked about the approach to replacing brick. There was also discussion about the street trees, and the Commission expressed that street trees should be retained or replaced since tree-lined streets are a character-defining feature of the South End.

During the comment period, the Commissioners expressed concern about matching replacement brick at the sidewalks. They also wondered if some street lights could remain in their existing location so as to decrease the number of areas of brick replacement.

Commissioner Amodeo requested that “pork chop” islands be brick and not concrete. He also expressed concern about bollards. He also expressed concern about introducing pre-cast material to the bike lane and that this material should be replaced with granite. He cited the limited durability of pre-cast stone. He also requested that an arborist be on the project team to protect trees.

There was additional discussion about the proposed brick and concrete footprints.



Commissioner Amodeo suggested that the application be remanded to subcommittee to review further design details of the proposed work.

J. Freeman motioned to approve the application in concept, with the proviso that the islands contain granite curbs and brick material unless there are plantings; and to remand materiality and transition discussions to a subcommittee consisting of J. Amodeo and C. Hunt. C. Hunt seconded the motion.

Charles Denison, Mike Reinders, and Ken Krukemeyer offered public comment and asked additional questions. Jacob Wetzel, a city employee, asked that the Commission not require the use of granite curbing.

J. Freeman amended his motion to remand the discussion of granite curbing to the subcommittee.

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application in concept, with the provisos that the islands contain granite curbs and brick material unless there are plantings; and to remand discussions of materiality and transition to a subcommittee consisting of J. Amodeo and C. Hunt. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.972 SE**

**685 TREMONT STREET**

Applicant: Friends of the South End Library (FOSEL)  
Proposed Work: Install fencing at Library Park

Marleen Neinhuis (FOSEL) was the project representative. She explained the scope of work, which includes installing fencing in Library Park as part of overall park improvements. She described the new fence, which is post and chain, and its location. The fence will be painted black.

The Commissioners moved to accept the application.

Sarah Mooradian offered public comment.

**C. Hunt motioned to approve the application as submitted. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.908 SE**

**293 NORTHAMPTON STREET**

Applicant: Stanhope Garage, Inc  
Proposed Work: Install a fence, granite curb, planting bed, and landscaping

David Gottlieb, Marc Lederman, and Timothy Burke were the project representatives. They walked the Commissioners through the improvement plan for a parking facility. The also explained that the existing planting bed has eroded and plantings will be



replaced. The existing fence is also deteriorated. All existing signage will be removed except for those signs required by the Boston Transportation Department.

There will be no changes to the curb cut. J. Freeman asked if it more typical to use flat stock metal. J. Amodeo confirmed that it is acceptable to use the channel rail. A brief discussion followed about extending a portion of the fence to better conceal the parking lot.

The discussion moved towards the planting bed. J. Amodeo suggested that the planting plan be amended to include an evergreen screen that will better conceal the parking behind it.

Constituent Tori Reilly asked about replacing additional plantings and also about the property ownership. Michael Workman offered additional public comment. Theresa Breazeale asked questions pertaining to asphalt at the sidewalk.

**J. Freeman motioned to accept the fence as presented, require screening be changed to produce continuous evergreen screen. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.737 SE**

**437 SHAWMUT AVENUE**

*Continued from the 2/04/2020 SELDC Public Hearing*

Applicant: Robert B. Greene

Proposed Work: Construct a rear shed dormer at the roof

Bob Greene (homeowner) and Arthur Choo (architect) were the project representatives. He explained that he had found evidence that a shed dormer had been approved at this property in 1924. The Commissioners looked at the ISD documents. J. Freeman explained that this evidence is not enough because it does not indicate that a dormer ever existed at this location. He further explained that the Commission needs to follow the historic precedent. The approval from 1924 does not reflect the historic configuration of the building.

The Commissioners also reviewed a similar approval at 298 Shawmut, which was presented as precedence in the neighborhood. The Commission recollected that this dormer had been approved because there was an existing dormer(s) at this property. There was further discussion about the approval at this property. The Commissioners expressed again that the Commission must work within the Standards and Criteria.

Romeo Mirzac, an abutter, submitted public comment in advance and expressed his opposition to the proposal. There was no additional public comment.

**J. Freeman motioned to deny the application without prejudice. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS). C. Hunt voted via the chat feature.**



**APP # 20.940 SE**

**9 CAZENOVE STREET**

Applicant: Ferrara Roofing & Contracting  
Proposed Work: Construct a roof deck

Emily Dutile was the project representative. She explained that the scope of work is to rebuild an existing roof deck in an expanded footprint. The proposed railings will be composite.

There was some discussion about the views from the rear of the building from Chandler Street. P. Sanborn asked that the front railings be pulled back from the front so as to eliminate visibility.

There was no public comment.

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the proviso that the front deck railing be pushed back to eliminate all visibility over the front façade. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, DP, PS). C. Hunt was absent for the vote.**

**APP # 20.944 SE**

**5 RUTLAND SQUARE**

Applicant: M. Holland & Sons Construction  
Proposed Work: Construct a roof deck

Zachary Shedlock, Matthew Rider, and Bob Foreman were the project representatives. They explained the scope of the project and the design alterations made to the design since the previous proposal. They also addressed precedent at neighboring properties and elsewhere in the district.

P. Sanborn asked if the applicants would consider pulling the rear railings to the minimum amount required for clearance. The applicants responded that the rear of the deck would essentially become unusable. There was further discussion regarding the abutting roof decks at no. 3 and 7.

P. Sanborn shared additional observations regarding visibility from the subcommittee meeting and noted that the Commission is in a difficult position. He reiterated that pulling the railings in at the rear would help. The Commission had a brief discussion whether or not a subcommittee was necessary. He noted that he does that believe that the visibility can be eliminated over the rear of the building.

Staff shared a letter of support from the Rutland Square Association, and additional comments from the abutters at nos. 3 and 7.

There was no additional public comment.



After public comment, J. Amodeo asked that the railings be steel picket, and not a pre-fab aluminum system. The top bar will need to be flat, and not a tube.

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the proviso that the rear railings be pushed from the rear façade to a point where the minimum hatch clearance is met; and that the railings be a simple steel picket with a flat top bar. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.909 SE**

**11 BRADFORD STREET**

Applicant: Allen Gove

Proposed Work: At the roof level, demolish penthouse/solarium and construct stair head house and roof deck; at the front façade third level modify shed dormer openings, install three new windows, and install cladding; at the front façade basement through second levels install fire bell and water connection; replace entry door and infill with new doors and transom; replace vents; and paint concrete base and trim.

Allen Gove, Brad Blake, Randi Lathrop, and Nick Paolucci were the project representatives.

The Commissioners discussed some discrepancies between the rendering and the plans regarding the position of the head house. The plan of the new head house will be in the same plane as the existing windows at the solarium. The Commissioners asked for corrected drawings.

P. Sanborn asked about the entry door. It is set back 3” from the façade, which aligns with the other entry doors on the block. The applicants responded that it is not possible to set the door further back. P. Sanborn noted that originally all of the neighboring doors were recessed.

J. Amodeo commented that the door and transom are appropriate for the district. There was further discussion about the fire department connections and the vent covers. J. Amodeo also noted that the top rail is rendered heavy, and reiterated the district requirements of roof deck railings.

**J. Freeman motioned to approve the application as submitted, but noted that the Commission would like to see final construction documents, details of the windows and doors, and roof deck railing. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).**

**APP # 20.827 SE**

**566 COLUMBUS AVENUE**

Applicant: New Boston Ventures

Proposed Work: Construct a new building



J. Amodeo recused himself from the review.

David Goldman and Jonathan Garland were the project representatives. They presented the current proposal to the Commissioners and highlighted design changes from the last advisory review at the January 2020 hearing. P. Sanborn asked several questions regarding the design.

The Commission opted to take public comment before offering Commissioner comments.

During public comment period, a number of constituents expressed concerned with the height of the building, the shadows caused by the new construction, and also commented on their frustration with the public process. Fernando Domenech, a member of the original South End Landmark District Study Committee, offered support to the project. The project team answered questions from the public as they were asked via the chat feature.

There were also several questions asked over video and voice. Many of these questions were procedural questions and comments on the process. Additional comments focused on the height of West Springfield Street. Staff G. Amore also read mentions received via Twitter. Staff M. Cirbus gave a summarization of the public comments received prior to the hearing.

The Commissioners decided to continue the review of the application to a second hearing given the late hour. All agreed that the project was not ready to go to subcommittee. P. Sanborn asked to see more details for the next meeting.

**J. Freeman motioned to continue the review to a future hearing. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JF, CH, DP, PS) (JA- ABS).**

## II. RATIFICATION OF MEETING MINUTES

**The ratification of meeting minutes was postponed.**

**J. F; C.H. AR**

## III. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW/ APPROVAL

**APP # 18.1132 SE    30 EAST CONCORD STREET:** Replace the following items in kind: wood panel cladding on penthouse; wood edge of roof; individual damaged slate shingles on mansard roof. Rebuild existing masonry chimney in kind, paint metal at tops of dormers to match existing. Extension of Certificate of Design Approval to expire on 5/01/2020.

**APP # 20.972 SE    685 TREMONT STREET:** Repair and refurbish existing exterior fence at Library Park. *See additional items under Design Review.*



**APP # 20.970 SE 84 WEST CONCORD STREET:** At the front façade street level, replace seven one-over-one aluminum windows with one-over-one, aluminum-clad windows.

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

**IV. Adjourn – 12:00 AM**

**J. Freeman motioned to adjourn the hearing. D. Parcon seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP, PS).**