



**SOUTH END LANDMARK DISTRICT
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

Boston City Hall, Boston, MA, 02201

Held virtually via Zoom

FEBRUARY 6, 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).

5:34 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. 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 Design Review Application.

I. DESIGN REVIEW

APP #24.0624 SE

ADDRESS: 575 TREMONT STREET

Applicant: Jason Parillo

Proposed Work: Install new signage, including vinyl window decals and new panel signage at metal bay.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Jason Parillo, was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to install new store signage and window decals.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images, shop drawings, front elevation drawings, photographs of signage from previous tenants.

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included an overview of the materials of



the signage panel and letters, the dimensions of the proposed signage and decals, the installation method for mounting the signage on the front facade, previous conditions of the front facade before alterations, unapproved alterations of the front facade, existing conditions of the front facade, details regarding the window and door decals, where the installation method will penetrate the original construction of the building.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: the SELDC graphic guidelines, an existing horizontal light fixture, the existing condition of the sign panels, the recessed architectural panel, the unapproved alterations, the appearance of the front facade in previous years, the proposed design, materials, color scheme, and dimensions for the new signage and lettering, whether the proposal has an excessive amount of new signage, whether the violation has to be resolved before they could approve this proposal.

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: JOHN AMODEO, JOHN FREEMAN, CATHERINE HUNT)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).

- *That one window vinyl allowed, applicant choice as to which window has the vinyl.*
- *That signage option discussions be remanded to staff.*
- *That final approval for panel signage is continued.*

APP # 24.0626 SE

ADDRESS: 9 CLAREMONT PARK

Applicant: Girolamo DiPierro

Proposed Work: Install new handrails; ~~install new garden rails~~ (Moved to Administrative Review). See additional items under Administrative Review.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Girolamo DiPierro was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an installation of new handrails.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images of 9 Claremont, existing condition of the neighboring fence and post details for 7,9, and 11 Claremont Park, existing condition of the fence and post installation for 15,19, and 24 Claremont Park, fence post and handrail material details, photographs that show owners request,



DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included the existing condition of the stairs, the original condition of the stairs, whether there was evidence of railings on the stairs, there are currently no handrails, fencing or holes for fencing or railings on the stairs, the owners request to approval a detailed design for the railing posts, examples of safety and decorative rails at other properties in the South End Landmarks District, the owners request to approve a fencing design that is similar to other design in the district, an overview of the site visit conducted by OHP, whether the fences on Claremont Park have original railings, material of the proposed fencing, OHP staff recommendations.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: an overview of the SELDC guidelines pertaining to railings and fencing, whether the railings will be on both sides of the stairs, whether there was evidence of a railing originally being on the stairs, offered recommendations regarding different rail designs that aren't the SELDC safety rail, dimensions of the the proposed railings, the method for installing railings and fencing. Commissioners also expressed concerns about recommending the safety rail design when the applicant's proposal of the oriental design meets district standards. Commissioners also commented that the recommended safety rail does not seem compatible with the Victorian Style building.

PUBLIC COMMENT: During the public comment period, Mark Van Brocklin, offered comments and information about the approved railing designs and work for 11 Claremont Park and 15 Claremont Park.

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

- *That the simple rail is approved, with attachments made into the side wall.*
- *The Commission notes they are open to further research that would support alternate rail designs.*



APP #24.0573 SE

ADDRESS: 247 SHAWMUT AVENUE

Applicant: Peter Vanderweil

Proposed Work: Install new dormer at rear.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Peter Vanderweil was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to install a new dormer at the rear.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images, a certified plot plan, fourth floor plan, rear and side elevations drawings, roof framing drawings, google images and street view photographs that show the view of the dormer from a public way.

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included an overview of the history of the building and dormer, existing and proposed paint color for the dormer, the material and dimensions of the existing and proposed dormer, dimensions of the deck door, access to the existing deck, staff comments and recommendations, the visibility of the dormer from a public way, the proposed expansion of the new dormer, the demolition plan for the dormer, the replacement of skylights,

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: dimensions of the existing and proposed dormer, whether there is an existing dormer, what areas the existing and proposed dormer covers, whether the existing dormer is historic, whether the existing dormer and skylights would be demolished, the existing skylights. Commissioners requested to see more information about the existing condition drawings and details, the roof geometry, and the skyline plans and elevations. Commissioners commented that this project was approvable in concept but they need more information and details.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

COMMISSIONER HUNT MOTIONED TO CONTINUE THE APPLICATION.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 3-0 (Y: JOHN AMODEO, JOHN FREEMAN, CATHERINE HUNT)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).

- *Simple rail is approved, with attachments made into the side wall.*
- *The Commission notes they are open to further research that would support alternate rail designs.*



APP # 24.0484 SE

ADDRESS: 796 TREMONT STREET

Applicant: Natig Jalilov

Proposed Work: Remove existing deck and build same size new deck.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Natig Jalilov, was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to remove the existing roof deck and install a new roof deck with the same dimensions as the existing.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images, site plan, drawings of the proposed plans.

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included an overview of the customers request to install the same railing and roof deck size as the existing roof deck. Whether the representative has contacted the customer to see if they'd be interested in redesigning the roof deck to be in compliance with the SELDC guidelines.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: whether staff has conducted site visit, the visibility of the existing roof deck from a public way, whether the SELDC could approve the proposed work due to its visibility from a public way.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

COMMISSIONER HUNT MOTIONED TO DENY THE APPLICATION WITHOUT PREJUDICE. COMMISSIONER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 3-0 (Y: JOHN AMODEO, JOHN FREEMAN, CATHERINE HUNT)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).

- *The Commission voted to deny the application without prejudice, citing that the proposed deck is visible from a public way.*



APP # 24.0639 SE

ADDRESS: 179 WEST BROOKLINE STREET

Applicant: Marcus Springer

Proposed Work: At garden level stoop, lower areaway and create ramp and increase entrance size 8", and install new door. Install new stained glass fanlight at front entry transom, expand light well in front garden, replace non-original handrail with new historically appropriate rails, replace existing front garden cast iron fence to match adjacent building.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Marcus Springer was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposed work at the front elevation.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images of the interior and exterior windows, the front steps, front door, front vestibule, front garden and stairs, and the front garden light well, elevation drawings, Documents presented also included historical images that show the front entrance.

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included an overview of the existing conditions, the history of alterations and renovations to the building, the proposal to change the iron garden railing and the front door, the proposal to change the front door design to include glass rather than being solid wood, the proposal to restore the brownstone sills and lintels, dimensions of the existing and proposed railings, the expansion of the light wall, the removal of the existing window bars, the material and dimensions of the proposed glass and windows, the light well proposal, whether the new ramp was for accessibility purposes, egress requirements, the dimensions of historic railings in South End, the material for the new ramp.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: which parts of the proposal are exempt from the Commissions review, the removal of the concrete slab, whether the railing examples shown are historic and original to those properties, the front door proposal, the method to install glass panels in the existing front door, the reasoning for installing a new ramp, the material for the new ramp, the proposal to remove the handrail, the replacement of the door panels with glass, whether the door sills would be lowered to create door height, whether the areaway for lightwell would meet egress requirements, the dimensions of the proposed windows, whether the existing door was original to the building.



PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

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

- That the garden rail details remanded to staff for approval.
- That the new light follows the curve of the bay, with steel top included in the detail.
- The ornamental rail not approved, simple rail design detail remanded to staff for approval.
- That the stain glass detail is continued.
- That the glass pane replacement in the front entry door is approved.
- That brick to be used at the ground ramp at stoop.
- That no railings will be approved at the ramp.
- That the lower panels match proportionally at the stoop door.

APP # 24.0524 SE

ADDRESS: 667 TREMONT STREET

Applicant: Gregory McCarthy

Proposed Work: Convert existing storefront level to a new brick facade with new windows and a new door. Replace windows, ~~install new roof deck~~(Exempted by staff) , restore existing entry doors, repair and replace brick and lintels as needed.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Gregory McCarthy, was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to convert an existing storefront level to a brick facade with new door and window additions.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images, front and rear exterior elevations drawings, railing specifications, shop drawings of the deck railing, shop drawings of the hood bracket, masonry material details, roofing materials details, miscellaneous metals details, entry awning details, wall section drawing, floor plans,

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included an overview of the existing conditions, existing brick conditions, the proposal to repair and replace the brick, alterations made to build the storefront, the condition of the stairs and railings, window details, the hood addition, iron railing details.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: the dimensions of the new windows, whether the applicant can use existing brick instead of new brick, whether the windows were original or replacements, the hood bracket profile design, whether the original hood was made from stone,



whether there was documentation about the top and bottom railing, the balustrades design, whether the stoop would be rebuilt or altered, whether the dormer was original, the material for the areaway step down.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

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

- That the staff to be kept updated throughout work taking place.
- That window replacement was approved confirming all windows are already replacements.
- That the stoop door detail be remanded to staff for approval.
- That an updated rail detail reflecting historic context be remanded to staff for approval.
- That a full detail for the proposed door entry hood be remanded to staff, pending additional historic context.
- That the details for garden level and stairs be remanded to staff.

APP # 24.0654 SE

ADDRESS: 403 SHAWMUT AVENUE

Applicant: Vanessa Calderón-Rosado

Proposed Work: ~~Remove existing original metal attachments at exterior masonry walls, remove and replace existing 1-over-1 windows with new 1-over-1 aluminum clad windows. Install new rooftop mechanical systems and chimneys, replace existing storefront windows and doors to match existing, remove and replace brownstone lintels and sills in-kind, remove and replace existing roof access ladder.~~ (Moved to Administrative Review) See additional items under Administrative Review.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Mayra Negron-Roche, Lia Scheele, Eryn Boyce, were the project representatives. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to remove and replace windows and a door.

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images, window replacement details and specifications, door jamb detail, entrance door elevation drawings, shop drawings of proposed new metal door, images of other metal storefront framed doors in the South End, historic images that show replacement windows.



DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included a historic overview of their organization, an overview of the history of the building, the exterior scope of work, the condition of the existing windows and doors, the proposal to repair and restore the original wood trim, the dimensions and material of the existing windows and door.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: an overview of the SELDC guidelines in relation to windows, the year the building was constructed, whether the existing door was original or new.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

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

The Chair announced that the Commission would next review the Advisory Review item.

II. ADVISORY REVIEW

ADDRESS: 16 BOND STREET

Applicant: Mark Van Brocklin

Proposed Work: Replace existing roof deck framing and deck boards. Remove tall wood screen/railing and install new black metal railing, 42" high. Expand existing dormer at rear of building towards #14 Bond. Replace door and add windows: aluminum clad wood, black finish. Replace existing non-historic skylights in gable roof facing alley with new skylights in the same footprint, black aluminum frame.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES: Mark Van Brocklin was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to replace and

DOCUMENTS PRESENTED: Documents presented included existing condition images, the existing and proposed site plan, the site location, existing and proposed West elevations, existing and proposed partial North elevations, views of the existing roof deck, perspective view images and drawings.

DISCUSSION TOPICS: Discussion topics included an overview of the existing conditions of the building, an overview of the new additions of doors and windows, an review of the main portion of building, the construction of the rood, the location



of the single dormer on the roof, the dormer expansion plan, dimensions of the new dormer, existing skylights they will be replacing, the existing and proposed roof deck plans, the material of the new deck and railing, the dimensions of the existing and proposed roof deck, the visibility of the existing and proposed roof deck and dormer from a public way, existing condition of the railing, material of the door and window, height of the new deck, the existing chimney, when the roof deck was constructed, whether the roof deck was constructed legally,

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS: During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: whether the roof deck, dormer, and chimney were original, the dimensions of the existing and proposed deck and dormer, the expansion of the dormer, the visibility of the dormer and new roof deck from a public way, the dimensions and material of the proposed railing.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

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

III. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW/ APPROVAL

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

IV. RATIFICATION OF HEARING/ MEETING MINUTES

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

IV. STAFF UPDATES

Gabriela Amore, Preservation Planner offered updates on the Commissioner appointment swearing in ceremony.

V. ADJOURN – 9:06 PM