



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

Held virtually via Zoom

AUGUST 4, 2020

Commissioners Present: John Amodeo, John Freeman, Catherine Hunt, David Shepperd

Commissioners Absent: Diana Parcon, Fabian D'Souza

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 AGENDA

APP # 20.436 SE

85 WEST NEWTON STREET

Continued from 11/05/2020 2019, 12/03/2020 2019, and 12/17/2020 2019 Public Hearings

Applicant: Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción (IBA)

Proposed Work: Obtain a Certificate of Exemption to demolish the existing former church and parish house (Villa Victoria Center for the Arts).

Vanessa Calderón-Rosado, Peter Munkenbeck, Maureen Cavanaugh, and Sammy Nabulsi were the project representatives. They provided an overview of the building restoration/ renovation over the last several years and an account of the damage and failed building systems. They also explained the past ISD notices of violation.

The Commissioners reviewed and asked questions about the most recent violation notice (#V497024). Unfortunately, the violation notice covered the adjoined parish house, even though that portion of the building appears structurally sound.

The Commission expressed their disappointment in the circumstances surrounding the deteriorated state of the building and cited that the legislation mandated the issuance of a certificate of exemption. They noted that the demolition of the former church and parish house is especially unfortunate considering it is the only one of its kind in the district. They urged the applicants to salvage as much architectural material as possible and encouraged that an interpretive sign be incorporated into the design of the future building. They also requested that the applicants submit full photographic documentation of the interior and exterior of the building in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.



Greg Galer offered public comment and expressed that this situation unfortunately sets a terrible precedent for the district and that noted that there appeared to be no real desire to save the building. Staff M. Cirbus added that the Commission received 36 letters in support of the demolition.

J. Freeman motioned to issue a mandatory Certificate of Exemption pursuant to the enabling legislation as a result of ISD Violation #V497024 which describes the demolition of a building which the building commissioner has certified as being required to remove or rectify a condition dangerous to public safety. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DS).

APP # 21.0022 SE

54-102 WEST NEWTON STREET

Applicant: West Newton Rutland LLC c/o Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción (IBA)

Proposed Work: Replace aluminum storefront systems at 25 rowhouses with wood doors, transoms, and sidelights; and replace handrails (modify Certificate of Design Approval).

Staff M. Cirbus gave a context summary: the Commission previously approved the installation of wood doors, transoms, and sidelights at 25 rowhouses along West Newton Street. The proportions and measurements presented at the original hearings were inaccurate and as a result the proportions of the recently installed doors are inappropriate for the district. Alisa Augenstein and Paul Warkentin were the project representatives. They explained the existing conditions to the Commissioners and noted that they seek another approval for the doors and handrails, and for the installation of a breathable coating system on the masonry. Mr. Warkentin provided additional design details and showed the presented the current shop drawings.

He also showed modifications to the handrail design. Mr. Warkentin explained that the current design is a simple rail that is not attached to the building or the stringer, but rather extends along the treads to the top of the landing. At properties with a shorter landing, the left rail is cut off to accommodate the door swing. Lastly, he explained the proposed breathable masonry coating to be applied to brownstone material or concrete reproductions only. The Commissioners looked at several properties. He noted that brownstone surfaces have been painted. J. Freeman asked that staff approve a color sample. Holes will be patched with mimic mortar.

During questions, the Commissioners reviewed the shop drawings for each door. 54-64 and 68 West Newton Street will have "Door A" configuration. The holes will be patched with either wood or stucco, depending on the existing finish of the landing walls. 66 West Newton Street will have "Door B" configuration (much tighter opening). 72-102



West Newton Street will have “Door C” configuration. Methodology for repairing all holes (stucco, wood, brick, and stone) must be submitted to staff for approval.

J. Amodeo asked questions regarding the installation of railings into the steps, rather than the cheek walls. The Commission does not approve the installation of railings into the steps. Where there is a cheek wall, there should be a side mounting plate and the railings installed into the side of the cheek wall.

All the doors are 96” tall, but the transoms vary in height.

After the motion, D. Shepperd pointed out that 84 West Newton Street appears to have one original newel post. This indicates that the cheek wall was added later. This evidence indicates that there should be a railing other than a simple rail. J. Amodeo suggested that the applicants investigate the historic design of the rail, or replicate the newel post on the other side.

During public comment, John Neale noted that the railings should be installed on top of the stringers. He also mentioned that there should be some kind of differentiation between the doors because there are 10 types of houses along the row. He also objected to the color of the black doors. J. Amodeo responded that there will be three styles down the street. He added that the molding profiles were too flat-looking. After a second review of the shop drawings, the Commission determined that the moldings were too thin. Mr. Neale added that the depth of the molding is the issue, not the height.

J. Freeman suggested that the applicants take photographs of historic doors in the neighborhood and try to match that.

J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the proviso that the patching materials and methods be submitted to staff for review; that staff must approve field samples before broad application; that the applicants submit detail drawings of the method of attachment to cheek walls; and that the paint color and stucco coating type be approved by staff. J. Amodeo amended the motion to include the continuation of the railing at 84 West Newton Street. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DS).

APP # 21.0023 SE

62-64 RUTLAND STREET

Applicant: West Newton Rutland LLC c/o Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción (IBA)

Proposed Work: Replace entry doors with new wood doors, sidelights, and transoms; and replace handrails (modify Certificate of Design Approval).



Alisa Augenstein and Paul Warkentin were the project representatives. He explained the context of the review and the previous approvals. There is an existing mullion in the transom; the transom is not salvageable and must be replaced. He also explained that the entry doors were damaged by fire and water and must be replaced.

During a question period, Mr. Warkentin elaborated on the existing damage of the door. C. Hunt noted that the divided transom does not make sense for a single door.

J. Freeman suggested that staff stop by and review the doors since they are original. The Commissioners were reminded that they had approved the replacement of the doors in 2017.

New drawing of the transom must be submitted to staff for approval.

During public comment, John Neale expressed his disappointment that the doors will be replaced and cited it as a terrible precedent for the district.

J. Freeman motioned to approve the application with the same provisos as the previous application with the proviso that the mullion in the transom are removed and that the original doors be retained and stored for possible future use. J. Amodeo amended the motion to include substituting glass with wood panels at the sidelights. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DS).

APP # 21.0002 SE

456 SHAWMUT AVENUE

Applicant: 456 Shawmut Avenue Condominium Trust

Proposed Work: Replace slate shingles at the mansard level with architectural asphalt shingles. *See additional items under Administrative Review.*

Linda Hickman and Brian Jack were the project representatives. They clarified that the section of slate at the rear of the building will remain but that they seek to replace slate shingles at the front with synthetic slate.

Staff explained that slate material must be retained or replaced in kind. The Commissioners briefly discussed similar approvals but determined that slate material should be repaired rather than replaced. J. Amodeo suggested that the Commission required more information regarding the existing condition of the roof and reasons for its replacement. He further suggested that the Commission vote to continue its review of the application pending further information from the roofer.



There was no public comment.

D. Shepperd motioned to continue the review of the application to collect additional information regarding the conditions of the existing roof. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DS).

APP # 21.0044 SE

56 CLARENDON STREET

Applicant: John Bradfield Interior Design

Proposed Work: At the Chandler Street façade mansard level, replace French door and sidelight system.

John Bradfield was the project representative. He explained that the building was constructed in 1997 and the door system needs replacement. Staff noted that the dimensions of the glazing and rails are different from the existing. The new doors will be solid mahogany with simulated divided lite.

There was no public comment.

D. Shepperd motioned to approve the application as submitted. J. Freeman seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DP).

APP # 21.0030 SE

52 DWIGHT STREET

Applicant: Highline Development

Proposed Work: At the front yard and garden level, install a fence and replace entry door under the stoop; ~~at the roof, construct a roof deck~~ (moved to Administrative Review). See *additional items under Administrative Review*.

Norberto Leon was the project representative. He explained the scope of work to the Commission at the garden level entrance, garden fence, and stoop. The existing opening under the stoop will be retained while the door and frame replaced. J. Amodeo noted that the provided sketch was flipped and Mr. Leon confirmed that the proposed door is a mirror image of the submitted drawing.

J. Freeman noted that several row houses along Dwight Street show historic garden and stoop railings, and that the applicants should seek to emulate the historic conditions. The existing stoop railings are not an appropriate model to follow. J. Amodeo suggested



that the applicants search for historic photographs, or look to adjacent or neighboring buildings for more appropriate railings. He also suggested that the applicants work with staff to choose a more appropriate railing. Mr. Leon clarified that the new fence will have the same footprint.

Next the Commissioners discussed the entry door at the garden level. Staff explained that the proposed door is consistent with what the Commission has previously approved. They noted that the door should follow the masonry opening. J. Amodeo asked the applicant to submit further door details (moldings, dimensions, etc).

There was no public comment.

C. Hunt motioned to approve the applications with the provisos that the applicant review historic documentation and suggest a more historic garden rail and submit that design to staff; and that the door under the stoop is oriented correctly and the top of the door follow the masonry opening. J. Amodeo amended the motion to add the provisos that the applicant will research historic models of garden rails through photography and/ or work with staff to choose an appropriate model on the street; and that the applicants submit further detail on the garden entrance door from photographs of approved doors elsewhere on the street; and that no historic material be disturbed in the replacement of the entry door. C. Hunt accepted the amendments. J. Freeman seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DS).

APP # 21.0032 SE

48 UNION PARK

Applicant: Highline Development

Proposed Work: Replace stoop pipe railing with decorative metal handrail.

Norberto Leon was the project representative. He explained that they had worked with staff M. Cirbus and were instructed to look at no. 42 Union Park. They also looked through the Lawler catalogue. The proposed railing is similar to 42 Union Park in that each rail is attached to the tread. There will also be newel posts at the top.

J. Amodeo noted that typically the Commission does not approve the installation of balusters drilled directly into the treads and expressed concern about the durability of the treads.

Bottom rail, extended pickets – should follow same angle that extends beyond the bottom rail. Should be consistent. Could make it work with Lawler baluster; typical



John Neale offered public comment and shared that the stair rails at no. 42 Union Park are original. He encouraged the Commission to use these railings as models. J. Amodeo suggested that two drills per baluster would be acceptable (but would need a variance from ISD).

Mike Reinders also offered public comment and suggested a method to meet the requirements of ISD while appearing historically appropriate.

J. Freeman motioned to continue the application. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DS).

**APP # 21.0033 SE — ~~49 EAST CONCORD STREET~~
MOVED TO ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW**

Applicant: Highline Development
Proposed Work: Rebuild a roof deck.

APP # 21.0024 SE 11 EAST NEWTON STREET

Applicant: New England Solar Hot Water Inc.
Proposed Work: At the roof, install solar collectors (solar panels); at the side elevation install associated piping.

John Moore was the project representative. He explained that the scope of work includes installing a solar hot water system which includes installing solar collectors at a 45 degree angle at the roof. The building was rehabilitated in 2012. He also explained that a safety rail is required. It is proposed for 3' back from the roof edge. J. Freeman and J. Amodeo suggested that a safety railing may not actually be required. If it is, the railing should be custom so that the railing more in keeping with the district. A discussion of the installation's visibility followed.

The Commission determined that they needed more information regarding the visibility of the rooftop units. They decided to create a subcommittee but noted that they may not be able to approve the installation if visible.

John Neale offered public comment. He explained that he does not have any objection to the rooftop installation and those views of the roof from Washington Street are from a relatively narrow corridor.

D. Shepperd motioned to continue review of the application pending an assessment of the visibility of the installation by a subcommittee consisting of D.



Shepperd and C. Hunt, and confirmation from the applicant if safety railings are necessary. The subcommittee will be required to report back to the Commission at a public hearing. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DS).

APP # 21.0034 SE 116 CHANDLER STREET

Applicant: Embarc Studio LLC

Proposed Work: Construct new entry hood. *See additional work under Administrative Review.*

Mark Van Brocklin was the project representative. He explained that the scope of work includes installing an entry hood to match the adjacent entry hood at no. 118 Chandler Street. The applicants have not located historic photographs showing the entry hood, but they believe the hood matched no. 118.

J. Freeman requested that the applicants submit a section drawing showing the new entry hood.

D. Shepperd motioned to approve the application with the proviso that the applicants provide a section drawing to staff for approval. C. Hunt seconded the motion. The vote was 4-0 (JA, JF, CH, DS).

**APP # 21.0035 SE ~~145 WORCESTER STREET~~
WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

Applicant: Embarc Studio LLC

Proposed Work: ~~Construct a roof deck with hatch access. See additional items under Administrative Review.~~

I. ADVISORY REVIEW

CRITE PARK

Proposed Work: Installation of hardscaping, fence, and trellis in redesigned park space.

Cheryl Dickenson was the project representative. She explained the scope of work, which includes expanding and reconstructing Crite Park and installing a pergola, new fencing, concrete walkways, signage and art panels, and new plantings.

The Commissioners commented that the design of the pergola does not seem sympathetic to the district and that an open mesh roof does not make sense. They also



expressed concern at the proposed art panels on the basis that they assume the character of signage and block views into the park. They also encouraged the applicant to investigate alternate materials for the walkways, especially wire-cut brick.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW/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:***

► Applicants whose projects are listed under this heading **NEED NOT APPEAR** at the hearing. Following the hearing, you will be issued a Determination Sheet to present at the Inspectional Services Department (1010 Massachusetts Avenue) as proof of project approval when applying for permits. ISD personnel will send an electronic copy of your building-permit application to the commission staff for review. (To avoid potential confusion, the text of your building-permit application should be consistent with the project description given below.) Commission staff will accordingly authorize the execution of the work, attaching any applicable provisos, reflecting the relevant guidelines and precedents.

► **PLEASE NOTE THAT FOLLOWING ISSUANCE OF THE DETERMINATION SHEET NO FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE WILL BE ISSUED FOR THE APPLICATIONS LISTED BELOW.** The electronic building-permit application as annotated by commission staff will constitute your Certificate of Appropriateness; this will be valid for one year from the date of the hearing. The applicant is required to notify the commission of any project changes; failure to do so may affect the status of the approval.

If you have any questions not addressed by the above information, please contact staff at 617.635.3850 or southendldc@boston.gov. Thank you.

APP # 21.0028 SE 130 APPLETON STREET # 1C: At the Appleton Street façade basement level, replace three (3) aluminum windows with two-over-two aluminum-clad windows.

APP # 21.0027 SE 130 APPLETON STREET # 3C: At the Appleton Street façade, replace two (2) two-over-two aluminum windows with new aluminum-clad two-over-two windows.

APP # 21.0036 SE 23 BRADDOCK PARK: At the front façade mansard level, replace asphalt shingles with new synthetic slate shingles.

APP # 21.0037 SE 17 CAZENOVE STREET: At the front façade rake out mortar joints by hand and repoint using a soft mortar mix to match the historic mortar in terms of color, texture, joint width, profile, and tooling.



APP # 21.0034 SE **116 CHANDLER STREET:** Repair paneled entry area. See additional items under Design Review.

APP # 21.0029 SE **144 CHANDLER STREET:** Repoint front façade with new mortar to match historic mortar in terms of color, texture, joint width, profile and tooling; patch and resurface lintels and sills with new mortar to match the historic configuration and historic mortar in terms of color, texture, profile, and tooling.

APP # 21.0030 SE **52 DWIGHT STREET:** At the front façade mansard level, replace scalloped slate in kind; at the front façade all levels restore four (4) curved sash windows; replace six (6) vinyl windows with two-over-two, double-hung, aluminum-clad windows; install copper gutters and downspouts repoint brick joints with new mortar to match historic mortar in terms of color, texture, profile, joint width, and tooling; repair brownstone window sills and lintels and repaint to match the color of the underlying stone (HC-69); restore front stoop and repaint to match the color of the underlying stone (HC-69); open a window well and install new egress window; **construct a non-visible roof deck (to be verified by staff)**. See additional items under Design Review.

APP # 21.0033 SE **49 EAST CONCORD STREET:** Rebuild a non-visible roof deck (to be verified by staff).

APP # 21.0043 SE **18-20 EAST SPRINGFIELD STREET:** Replace paired wood and glass entry doors in kind.

APP # 21.0031 SE **543 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE:** Replace asphalt roof shingles in kind at the rear slope of the roof facing Northampton Street.

APP # 21.0002 SE **456 SHAWMUT AVENUE:** Replace existing rubber roof at rear roof slope and install copper edge metal. See additional items under Design Review.

APP # 21.0025 SE **694 TREMONT STREET:** At the front façade parlor level, replace two (2) two-over-two straight-headed wood windows with two-over-two, arched-headed windows.

APP # 20.1073 SE **85 WALTHAM STREET:** At the front façade second level, replace three (3) one-over-one aluminum windows with two-over-two aluminum-clad windows.

APP # 21.0003 SE **88 WALTHAM STREET:** Replace copper gutter and galvanized downspout with new copper gutter and downspout.

APP # 21.0038 SE **154 WEST CONCORD STREET:** At the front façade mansard level replace dark grey scalloped slate shingles with green scalloped slate shingles; install copper gutter to match existing; replace wood trim in kind; replace wood window sills in kind as needed.

APP # 21.0035 SE **145 WORCESTER STREET:** At the front façade all levels, refinish existing front entry doors; patch and paint front façade; patch and repair mansard roof; repair and restore existing window sills and headers; repair and restore stoop as required; repair and restore existing two-over-two windows. At the front yard remove concrete slab.



J. Freeman motioned to approve the Administrative Review items as submitted, with the exception of 154 West Concord Street, which is approved with the proviso that staff receives a sample of the proposed slate. D. Shepperd seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JA, JF, DS) (Absent – CH)

III. RATIFICATION OF 7/7/2020 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES; 6/08/2020, 6/15/2020, 6/25/2020, and 6/30/2020 SUBCOMMITTEE PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

J. Freeman motioned to approve the 7/7/2020 public hearing minutes and the 6/08/2020 subcommittee meeting minutes. D. Shepperd seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JA, JF, DS) (Absent – CH).

IV. VOTE TO REAPPOINT CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR POSTPONED

V. STAFF UPDATES

There were no staff updates.

VI. ADJOURNMENT: 11:50 PM

J. Freeman motioned to adjourn the hearing. D. Shepperd seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 (JA, JF, DS) (Absent – CH)