



**SOUTH END LANDMARK DISTRICT
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

Boston City Hall Boston, MA, 02201

Held virtually via Zoom

JANUARY 2, 2024

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: John Amodeo, John Freeman, Catherine Hunt.

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Gabriela Amore, Preservation Planner; Rachel Ericksen, Preservation Planner; Sarah Lawton, Preservation Assistant.

A full recording of the hearing is available at [Boston.gov/landmarks](https://www.boston.gov/landmarks).

5:33 PM: Commissioner Amodeo called the public hearing to order. He explained that, pursuant to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, that the public hearing was being conducted virtually via the online meeting platform Zoom in order to review Design Review applications. S/he also briefly explained how to participate in the online hearing. There were no members of the press present.

Following this brief introduction he called the first Violation application.

I. VIOLATION

APP # 24.0546 SE

ADDRESS: 5 DARTMOUTH PLACE

Applicant: William Nichols

Proposed Work: Remove and replace 12 original and non-original windows at front facade. (#VIO.24.0856).

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Art Marchand, was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes finishing construction at 5 Dartmouth Place, where they had completed work without approval.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images and window details and specifications.

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included replacing the existing wood



windows, there are six original woods and six non-original. The location of the windows that still need to be installed there are approximately ten windows installed and there are three windows remaining that need to be installed. The dimensions and materials of the proposed windows.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, Commissioners asked for more clarification on how many windows were replaced and how many still have to be installed, the materials of the existing and replacement windows, and whether the entire frame of the windows were removed, the dimensions of the proposed windows, the paint color of the new construction windows, whether the original windows could be repaired rather than be replaced.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN MOTIONED TO CONTINUE THE APPLICATION. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 3-0 (Y: HUNT, FREEMAN, AMODEO)(N: NONE).

- *Motioned for a continuance to coordinate with staff to conduct a site visit.*
- *Applicant to provide 2 letters from window restoration specialists to verify whether the original windows need to be replaced or if they could be repaired.*

II. DESIGN REVIEW

APP # 24.0066 SE

ADDRESS: 587 ALBANY STREET

Applicant: Jacob Simmons

Proposed Work: Continued from 9/18/2023 SELDC Public Hearing. Construct a new 6-story residential building. Existing front facade to be preserved and incorporated into a new residential building. Remainder of the existing building to be razed.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Dan Artiges was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes new construction of a six story building with six condominium units.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included an overview of the project, addresses and location of abutters, existing condition images, site, second, third, and ground floor plans, site context map. street views, existing street elevations and facade details from Albany Street, building precedents that depict facade compositions and color schemes, the selected colors for the proposed materials, presentation images of renderings from 595 Albany Street, aerial view



photographs, images of previous proposal and current design, material precedents, proposed and existing elevations, document detailing the tripartite design approach, preliminary shoring design drawings, elevations detailing the full streetscape.

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included a brief overview of the project approval they received from the SELDC in September, site context and construction progress, the dimensions of the proposed project and lot size, original construction on the building, intention to reopen the masonry openings, update the front entrance and reopening the garage door to tie into their bike room. An overview of previous structure issues within the building and the previous design proposal. Discussion also included the materials for all proposed work and the existing materials, introducing a setback to delineate existing and new facade to maintain the streetscape and street wall, the material of the proposed lintels, the design intention and proportion of all proposed windows,

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: an overview of the previous approval and SELDC district standards, the areas of the building that are being defined as the base, middle, and top, the selected colors for the top three stories, the vertical window alignment in comparison to the streetscape, the dimensions of the existing windows, whether the renderings shown are an accurate depiction of the existing building facade, the proposal to add lintels, the proportion and design of the windows on the fourth, dimensions of the setback, whether there is a new development on the site nextdoor. Commissioners suggested that the applicant provide an explanation as to how the new construction ties into the adjacent contributing building at 575 Albany Street. Commissioners also recommended that the applicant reexamine the rendering provided as the proportion and height of the original building may be inaccurate. Commissioners also expressed concern regarding the color scheme for the proposed building as the selected colors does not relate to the existing structure or abutting sites in terms of aesthetic or materials. Commissioners also expressed concern regarding the party and a lack of a transition between the terracotta to cement board.

PUBLIC COMMENT: : During the public comment period, Christopher Barry, expressed concern for the proposed work on the facade and party wall.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN MOTIONED TO REMAND THE APPLICATION TO A SUBCOMMITTEE. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 3-0 (Y: FREEMAN, HUNT, AMODEO)(N: NONE) (ABS: NONE).

APP # 24.0566 SE



ADDRESS: 32 DWIGHT STREET

Applicant: Zachary Millay

Proposed Work: Remove existing non-original front garden rail and install new, replace non-original stoop entry door with new, lower existing front garden and build new window well and new window opening, new FDC connection.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Zachary Millay and Luis Slago were the project representatives. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to remove and install a new front garden rail, a non original entry door replacement, and installation of a new window and window well on the garden level, and a new flower bed.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images and historical images of 32 Dwight Street, the proposed garden level plan, existing garden level plan,

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included the existing condition of the site, a brief overview of the site visit conducted by staff, the fire department bell on the staircase, egress requirements, proposed materials for the window and window well, flower beds around the well, creating window to meet egress requirements, dimensions of the window and rectangular design, the plan to remove concrete e in the area way to allow more planting in the flower beds.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: the area way for the proposed windows, the creation of a new window, the dimensions needed to meet egress requirements. Commissioners commented that district standards suggest that a project should be at the minimum dimensions required by egress code, unless there's a compelling reason that it cannot be done specifically in relation to the new window openings and area ways.

PUBLIC COMMENT: During the public comment period, Valerie Bettini spoke in support of the proposed work and had questions regarding the proposed window well and proposed work listed on the administrative review.

COMMISSIONER HUNT MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. COMMISSIONER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 3-0 (Y: FREEMAN, HUNT, AMODEO)(N: NONE) (ABS: NONE).

- *That full detail of the garden area and window will be provided to staff.*
- *That the front garden areaway be modified to have a thin profile.*
- *That the window well size be the minimum required by code.*



APP # 24.0552 SE

ADDRESS: 58 BERKELEY STREET

Proposed Work: Expand second-floor outdoor learning deck to provide more space for children to learn and play.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Lauren Cook and Joanne Hiromura were the project representatives. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposed work to expand the existing second floor roof deck.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images, an aerial view of the existing roof area, site plan, images of views from Lawrence and Berkeley street,

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included an overview of the proposal to expand the existing roof deck, the existing condition of the roof area, the materials for the proposed roof deck and fence, the dimensions of the fence, new addition of play walls that are not visible from the public view, the visibility of the fence and existing roof deck from a public way, the plexiglass panel that is attached to the inside of the existing fence,

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: the specific location where the existing deck is expanding, whether the proposed fence would also have a plexiglass panel attached.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There were no public comments.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 3-0 (Y: FREEMAN, HUNT, AMODEO)(N: NONE) (ABS: NONE).

- That a detail drawing for deck rail to be submitted to staff for final approval.
- That the approval of plexiglass installed in the interior of the rail system is an exception and non-precedent setting.

APP #24.0563 SE

ADDRESS: 400 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE

Applicant: Anita Huggins

Proposed Work: Remove existing entry vestibule and replace with new.



PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Anita Huggins and Andreas Romero were the project representatives. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes a removal and replacement of an entry vestibule.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included proposed vestibule plan, existing condition images, front and side elevations, 3D rendering of the new vestibule design, side rendering image to detail visibility, vestibule schematic section,

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included a brief overview of the originally proposed that was denied without prejudice, an overview of Commissions input on the original design, dimensions of the existing and proposed vestibule, expanding the enclosure to accommodate an enlarged mailbox area, the materials and architectural style of the existing vestibule, the proposed cornice and roof that are similar to adjacent buildings, the use of brick detailing for the entryway, accent features on the proposed vestibule, vestibule signage,

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: the alignment of the vestibule with the windows above, whether there were horizontal stripes on the masonry or if there was an error on the rendering image, the selected paint color for the proposed work, based on the rendering it depicts the brick detailing as running bond horizontally is the proposed project going to be running bond horizontally rather than full height brick for each course.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

COMMISSIONER HUNT MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. COMMISSIONER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 3-0 (Y: FREEMAN, HUNT, AMODEO)(N: NONE) (ABS: NONE).

- *That any material mockups be submitted to staff.*
- *That any final drawings at 75% completion be submitted to staff.*

APP # 24.0518 SE

ADDRESS: 549 COLUMBUS AVENUE

Applicant: Mark Bogosian

Proposed Work: Remodel office space to include demolition of front door and windows. Install new glass double doors, new sign, and fixed panel windows as well as decorative sidewalk planters and railing.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Brian Thistle were the project representatives.



They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes demolishing the existing front door and windows and replacing them with new glass and fixed panel windows. In addition, the applicant is also looking to install a new railing, sidewalk planters and signage.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images, existing and proposed front elevations, architectural drawing of proposed changes to the front facade, historic images of the front facade, signage specifications,

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included an overview of the original building details, overview of the plans to install new glass with wood framing and trim, proposed paint colors,

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: whether the applicant would be raising the height of the roof, whether the applicant proposed to remove and replace an existing door, the dimensions of doors at adjacent storefront entrances, the proposed light fixtures, whether the proposed planters and furniture were fixed or portable. Commissioners also offered comments regarding the restoration of the storefront and requested revised dimensional drawings, renderings, and elevations that provide context for new construction and of the building next to adjacent buildings. Preference to preserve and restore the architectural details of storefronts rather than removing existing architecture.

PUBLIC COMMENT: During the public comment period, Bob Barney, spoke in support of the proposed work.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN MOTIONED TO APPROVED THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 3-0 (Y: HUNT, FREEMAN, AMODEO)(N: NONE).

- *That the applicant submit a demolition drawing.*
- *Dimension drawings of existing conditions and the proposed.*
- *Window details to be submitted to staff.*
- *Detail the context of the site alongside adjacent buildings.*

APP # 24.0531 SE

ADDRESS: 8 EAST SPRINGFIELD STREET

Applicant: Gregory McCarthy

Proposed Work: Construct a new 4 story brick rowhouse.



PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Greg McCarthy and Bryan Mulligan were the project representatives. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes the plan to construct a new four story brick rowhouse.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included front and rear elevations, existing condition images,

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included a presentation of the new construction, the dimensional information regarding the proposed windows and doors, egress requirements.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, Commissioner had questions regarding the details of all the proposed construction as there is only one drawing submitted. Commissioners also commented that the project could be approved by concept however, they will need to have more details and specifications regarding the proposed work.

PUBLIC COMMENT: During the public comment period, Chris Barry expressed concern regarding the applicants decision to replicate #10 E Springfield St. Also, Chris suggested that abutters to this site were not notified that this project was being reviewed by the SELDC. David Tabenken, offered suggestions for the applicant and clarified details regarding #10 E Springfield St.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 3-0 (Y: HUNT, FREEMAN, AMODEO)(N: NONE).

- *Final details remanded to staff.*
- *Material mockups remanded to staff.*
- *Return to the Commission for final presentation at 75% CD.*

The Chair announced that the Commission would next review Administrative Review/ Approval applications.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW/ APPROVAL

APP # 24.0519 SE 30 CLAREMONT PARK: Emergency repair due to leaks: Caulk and seal joints on stairs to match existing; mortar to match existing; repair bottom step in kind; paint front steps and stone at ground level to match existing.



APP # 24.0548 SE 15 BRADDOCK PARK #1: Remove 2 existing ground level windows in the front bay, and replace with new 2-over-2 windows.

APP # 24.0542 SE 5 DARTMOUTH PLACE: Repoint front facade in-kind, refinish and repaint lintels and sills in-kind, replace rotted wood at bay window in-kind.

APP # 24.0528 SE 130 DARTMOUTH STREET: Remove exterior canopy signs and scrape vinyl decals from door.

APP # 24.0556 SE 32 DWIGHT STREET: Restore parlor level windows to the original opening by lowering sill height, remove all non-original windows and replace with new wood 2-over-2 window painted black. Repair existing sills and lintels in-kind and paint with Benjamin Moore HC-69, and restore parlor level lintels to historic profile. Replace existing asphalt shingles with new synthetic slate shingles, and repair dormer trim in-kind, repoint and repair brick, repair front stairs and entry door in-kind.

APP # 24.0477 SE 37 EAST SPRINGFIELD STREET: Remove copper gutters, apron, and trim around dormer windows and soffit, mansard scalloped slate and replace in kind.

APP # 24.0564 SE 20 GREENWICH PARK: Emergency repair: Cut out the rotten area of soffit which is actively falling to the ground below. Replace wood and rotten corbel with matching. Prime and paint to match existing.

APP # 24.0553 SE 30 HOLYOKE STREET: At the front facade and third floor, replacing four non-original wood windows in-kind with wood windows, maintaining muntin design.

APP # 24.0569 SE 479 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE: Emergency repair due to active leaks: replace existing EPDM rubber roof and scalloped shingle mansard roof that is facing the street.

APP # 24.0515 SE 577 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE: Emergency repair due to active leaks: remove and replace existing asphalt roof shingles with new.

APP # 24.0526 SE 22 RUTLAND SQUARE: Remove mansard tile trim, soffit, and copper gutters and apron - replace in kind. Remove aluminum round window and replace with round wood window.

APP # 24.0555 SE 27 RUTLAND STREET: Remove and replace existing rear fence in kind.



APP # 24.0536 SE 100 WALTHAM STREET: Emergency repair and repointing of front stoop due to active leak.

APP # 24.0558 SE 1138 WASHINGTON STREET: Remove existing sign and install updated signage within existing sign band.

APP # 24.0530 SE 80 WEST CONCORD STREET: At 2nd story, replace 1 front and 3 rear non-original 2-over-2 wood windows in-kind with new 2-over-2 wood windows.

APP # 24.0527 SE 49 UNION PARK STREET: Install three historic sash packs into existing wood frames on the second floor.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW ITEMS. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 3-0 (Y: HUNT, FREEMAN, AMODEO)(N: NONE).

IV. RATIFICATION OF HEARING MINUTES

Review and ratification of public hearing minutes from 12/5/2023.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 3-0 (Y: HUNT, FREEMAN, AMODEO)(N: NONE).

IV. STAFF UPDATES

The public hearing minutes for 9/18/23 will be voted on at the February hearing.

V. ADJOURN – 8:35 PM