



**Fort Point Channel Landmark District Commission
Public Hearing Minutes**

Boston City Hall, Piemonte Room
Boston, MA, 02201

SEPTEMBER 12, 2019

Commissioners Present: David Berarducci, John Karoff, Lynn Smiledge
Staff Present: Mary Cirbus, Preservation Planner

5:56 D. Berarducci called the public hearing to order.

I. DESIGN REVIEW

APP # 20.115 FPC 30-40 Melcher Street

Applicant: Andrew Gordon, SPIN Boston, LLC

Proposed Work: At the Melcher Street and Summer Street ground levels, install an awning, signage, and lighting.

Andrew Melcher was the project representative.

The applicants explained that they are proposing several signs along the Melcher Street and Summer Street elevations, including a wall sign, an awning with lighting, and a lit banner sign at Summer Street. There is no entrance at the Summer Street façade. Naomi Kahn, who is the signage contractor, further explained that the blade sign is internally lit with push-through letters (same with the wall sign) but only the letters will light up. The banner on Summer Street will have a bracket with two little spotlights. The awning will have three straight neck lights over it. There will not be any exposed conduits.

The Commissioners first considered the awning. D. Berarducci noted that valences are usually kept loose in landmark districts. J. Karoff asked if the lighting will be attached to the awning. The applicants responded by saying that they would make the awning valence loose and that the lighting will be attached to the brick.

D. Berarducci asked about the wall sign, which prompted discussion about where the entrance to the business is located and which signage is appropriate, especially since the more prominent sign (the wall sign) seems to be located on a secondary entrance. He noted that the plaque-mounted wall sign is aggressive and thinks that two blade signs would be more appropriate and the other Commissioners agreed.



D. Berarducci expressed concern with the internal lighting of the blade sign, but that having only the letters lighted seemed discreet enough. He also CB also about the awning lighting – and how it might damage the brick – which began a discussion about lighting around the awning.

The Commissioners discussed the banner sign on Summer Street. D. Berarducci believed that lighting the banner sign is not warranted. Banners are also not typically lit and the Commissioners do not want to set a precedent for lighting banners.

Sara McCammond offered public comment regarding the banner on Summer Street and suggested that the Commission deny this banner for public safety reasons, due to the danger of the Melcher Street and Summer Street intersection. She also noted that the signage at the Melcher Street elevation is confusing. There was another brief discussion regarding the signage.

After further discussion, the Commissioners decided that the banner sign on Summer Street was excessive and unwarranted, especially since there is no entrance on Summer Street. Essentially the applicants are requesting a directional sign.

Scott Hadley offered additional public comment and expressed concern for establishing a precedent for approving this type of banner signage. The Commissioners also discussed if there was precedence to have a sign in this location.

L. Smiledge motioned to approve the application, with the provisos that the awning valence be loose; that the proposed lighting fixtures illuminating the awning be limited to no more than three fixtures, be as discreet as possible, and approved by staff; that the wall-mounted plaque sign be eliminated from the scope of work and replaced with a blade sign identical to the blade sign approved in this application; and that the proposed banner sign on Summer Street be eliminated from the scope of work. J. Karoff seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (DB, JK, LS).

APP # 20.140

FPC 345 A Street

Applicant: Dan Yaccarino, Lincoln Summer St. Venture, LLC

Proposed Work: At the street level on the A street façade, replace existing double entry doors with new metal and glass entry doors.



Ashley Dunn from Dyer Brown Architects was the project representative. She explained that the location at the ground floor was essentially a crawl space originally and has been renovated to host a new tenant. The applicant wants to replace the existing metal doors with new metal and glass entry doors.

D. Berarducci asked why glass was proposed. The applicant explained that the space is dark and the glazing is to maximize the amount of daylight that enters the space. The doors will be entrance and egress doors. D. Berarducci wondered what the public will see through the doors; if the tenant does not want the public to look in then the glass is not warranted. The applicant noted that there is a stair and a railing inside the space and that directly inside there is a small vestibule.

D. Berarducci asked about the window next to the door. The applicant explained that it is an existing solid shaft panel. D. Berarducci asked about other options for designing the door, i.e trying to emulate other doors of a utilitarian nature.

L. Smiledge asked if the doors will be recessed. The applicant said they would provide a drawing to show the door slightly recessed and that they will incorporate other design elements that better recall the fenestration above.

D. Berarducci expressed concern that the doors will appear an anomaly and wonders if the doors could better reference the windows above so that the doors appear more harmonious with the façade. He would also like to see some recession if possible. J. Karoff noted that the goal would be to keep the glass in the same pane as other glass on the façade. D. Berarducci confirmed that the color needs to be dark green.

There was no public comment.

J. Karoff motioned to deny the application without prejudice. L. Smiledge seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (DB, JK, LS).

APP # 20.151 FPC 347-351 Congress Street

Applicant: David Durgin, 347 Congress Street LLC

Proposed Work: At the roof level, relocate drainage systems and install a parapet and fascia. At the street-facing facades, remove gutters, rain leaders, downspouts, and corresponding street connections.

David Durgin was the project representative. He explained that the building has experienced problems with severe icing problems associated with the gutters. They want to relocate the gutters to the interior of the building and to do so they need to install a parapet on the roof.



D. Berarducci asked how the water gets into these internal gutters. The applicant explained that there are drains on the roof and that the roof will be angled towards the drains. There will be beehive type drains at the roof. D. Berarducci asked the reason why the parapet is required and applicant said it is to stop the rain and snow from falling off the roof. J. Karoff asked for clarification – what protects the snow from falling off the roof if it falls on the street side of the parapet? The applicant explained that the gutters are useless in the winter, freezing ice accumulates above them. The idea is to keep the snow behind the snow break as much as possible. Some snow will accumulate in front of the gutter but the problem will not be nearly as bad as it currently is. D. Berarducci asked for clarification on what happens when it rains and thinks that it will be a drip hazard. The applicants think that the rain water will not be a problem.

The applicant explained that the roof will be replaced. D. Berarducci wondered if the applicants can re-pitch the roof and install scuppers at the parapet so that the water can run underneath.

The applicant reviewed the mockup photographs and staff observed it on the map. D. Berarducci asked why the parapet is 16” high – is there room to adjust the parapet so that it can be lowered or pushed back? The applicants think there might be room to adjust.

L. Smiledge asked about the gutter – if the gutters are removed, then we will see a light-colored fascia, which changes the look of the building. The applicant explained that the fascia will come down about a foot – and the commissioners expressed concern about architectural features the fascia may hide. D. Berarducci said that the fascia should not hang down any further than the existing rain gutter obscures. J. Karoff said it should also be a neutral color – the color of the existing gutter. D. Berarducci said that it should be a deep bronze color that matches the windows to help it recede from view.

DB thinks the applicant should work with the engineer to modify the parapet so that it will be pushed back or lowered so that it is not visible. And regrade the roof so that the water goes towards the parapet through scupper openings so that water does not fly over the building.

Tom Reddy asked a question about the roof and asked confirmation on the color of the parapet.

D. Berarducci motioned to approve the application with the provisos that the parapet height be adjusted and/ or pushed back so that the parapet is non-visible, and/ or minimally visible from the Summer Street vantage point; that the color of the parapet and fascia be dark bronze and a non-



reflective material; that the applicant further investigate the effects of rain and snow accumulation on the parapet setback and properly address these concerns; and that any scarring or holes as a result of the removal of the downspouts be patched or filled in. L. Smiledge seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (DB, JK, LS).

APP # 20.161 FPC 308-316 Congress Street

Applicant: David Hoogasian, Extenet Systems

Proposed Work: Replace a single light pole with new double light pole with telecommunication equipment.

Keenan Breen was the project representative. He explained the project, which includes replacing a single light pole with new double light pole and telecommunication equipment in front of 308-316 Congress Street, which is in front of the Yawkey Center. The antenna will stick up from the top and the shroud will be located approximately halfway up the pole.

L. Smiledge asked if the pole will be for more than one carrier, and the applicant responded that it will only be one carrier.

D. Berarducci asked clarifying questions to determine the visual impact of the installation. The applicant explained that the pole is located right over the Congress Street bridge, in a very busy area on a concrete sidewalk. The pole will be located two feet away from the existing pole. The lights will be perpendicular to the sidewalk.

There was a discussion with staff regarding the height discrepancy, as the drawings do not contain an accurately scaled drawing. The proposed light pole is significantly larger than the existing pole. L. Smiledge mentioned that she would like to see a rendering showing the existing and proposed light pole next to each other.

D. Berarducci noted that he would like to see the pole on the other side of the street, so as not to obscure important views into the district. Having the light pole next to the traffic light would help minimize visual impact if it is grouped with other street clutter.

J. Karoff asked if the height of the pole or the antenna can be modified to be more in proportion with the existing light poles.

D. Berarducci reiterated that he would prefer the pole replacement to occur on the other side of the street. The view coming over Congress Street is essential and should be kept as clean as possible to preserve the viewshed.



After some discussion, the Commissioners decided that they want to see computer renderings showing the existing and proposed light poles next to each other. The applicant should also investigate an alternate location across the street next to the traffic light.

The Commissioners would be okay with a scaled down pole to “human scale” with a higher antenna.

Sara McHammond offered public comment and expressed concern about the alternate placement across the street due to it being a school bus stop.

J. Karoff motioned to deny the application without prejudice. L. Smiledge seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (DB, JK, LS).

II. Ratification of Meeting Minutes from 08/08/2019

L. Smiledge motioned to approve the minutes, J. Karoff seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (DB, JK, LS).

III. Staff Updates

IV. Adjourn – 7:42 pm

J. Karoff motioned to adjourn the hearing. L. Smiledge seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (DB, JK, LS).