



**SOUTH END LANDMARK DISTRICT  
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

Boston City Hall, Boston, MA, 02201

Held virtually via Zoom

**MAY 7, 2024**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** John Amodeo, John Freeman, Catherine Hunt, Chris DeBord.

**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. 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. VIOLATION**

**APP # 24.0933 SE**

**ADDRESS: 647 TREMONT STREET**

Applicant: Irakli Gogitidze

Proposed Work: Refurbish existing storefront doors, replace broken/old gooseneck lights with new, install signage for new restaurant, repaint facade banner black and repaint existing black storefront doors black.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES:** Irakli Gogitidze was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to ratify the existing violation and new proposed work.

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** Documents presented included existing condition photographs of the exterior and rendering images of the proposed signage.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included an overview of the ownership of



the property, the process of renovation on the interior, the process of refurbishing the exterior, the removal and reinstallation of the existing door, the proposal to repaint the entryway black, the proposal to replace of the goosenecks, and the proposal to install new signage, the possibility of new lighting.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: the name of the new business, whether there was any photograph of the existing doors before the renovation, whether white panel boards were installed by the applicants contractor, whether new lighting has been installed, possible locations for new lighting on the exterior.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no public comments.

**COMMISSIONER FREEMAN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: JA, CD, JF, CH)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

- *Final detail to confirm 3 lights over signage, 1 light over the door, and no light over the West Brookline elevation.*

## II. DESIGN REVIEW

**APP # 24.0573 SE**

**ADDRESS: 247 SHAWMUT AVENUE**

Applicant: Peter Vanderweil

Proposed Work: Install new dormer at rear. Continued from the 2/6/2024 SELDC Hearing.

**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 photographs & drawings, certified plot plan, proposed dormer addition drawing, roof shingle product image, rear and side elevation and section drawings, the fourth floor plan, roof framing drawing, proposed window cut sheet.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included an overview of the comments provided by the Commission at the previous hearing on 2/6/24, an overview of the existing conditions at the rear, the proposal to install a new dormer with two windows, the height of the proposed dormer, the visibility of the proposed dormer



from a public way, the proposal to raise the height of the slope ceiling with the skylight to make the area usable, the removal of the skylight, whether the existing footprint and porch will change, the existing and proposed asphalt shingles,

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: the feedback provided by the Commission at the previous hearing, whether the existing door will be altered or replaced, whether the existing pediment will be removed, whether the windows are two over two, whether the submitted drawings for the proposed work are accurate.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no public comments.

**COMMISSIONER HUNT MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. COMMISSIONER DEBORD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: JA, CD, JF, CH)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

- *Update the final drawings with accurate window configurations.*

**APP # 24.0934 SE**

**ADDRESS: 86 WALTHAM STREET**

Applicant: Leonard Cervone

Proposed Work: Remove up to 4" inches of trim/posts, on each side of the three bay windows, so that we can expand the replacement window and ultimately provide more open glass area for the client's dwelling (dining and living room. This proposed modification would require narrower trim on either side of each window, however, we would maintain the same black metal trim and previously approved black windows see APP #24.0474 SE. The resulting change would allow 30% more light.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES:** Leonard Cervone was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to remove 4" inches of trim/posts, on each side of the three bay windows to expand the replacement window.

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** Documents presented included existing condition photographs of the exterior, map view images, and renderings of the proposed windows.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included an overview of the previous proposal and the owners new request, an overview of the new proposal and all modifications to existing conditions, an overview of the existing conditions, the height and dimensions and material of the existing and proposed windows,



alternative examples of the proposed work, the proposed window type, the proposal to cover the wood trim with black metal instead of paint for longevity purposes,

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: an overview of the proposed work that was submitted in an application, whether windows could be added to this application, the windows on the flat, whether the wood trim would be covered in black metal or black paint, the existing paint color of the wood trim, the material and of the slate, the existing gap between the windows and wood trim, historically appropriate window types for the South End, whether the existing replacement windows fit into the existing opening, the dormer and whether its original, the removal of the corbels and the original wood trim.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no public comments.

**COMMISSIONER FREEMAN MOTIONED TO DENY THE APPLICATION WITHOUT PREJUDICE. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

- *The proposed work was denied without prejudice because "Changing window openings to accommodate larger sash and frame will not be approved" per the SELDC Standards and Criteria.*

**APP # 24.0748 SE**

**ADDRESS: 1750 WASHINGTON STREET**

Applicant: Ricky Zeng

Proposed Work: Install new signage at sign band and doorway. Continued from 4/2/2024 SELDC Public Hearing.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES:** So Lim Ting was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to install new signage.

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** Documents presented included existing condition photographs of the exterior, proposed signage and mounting specifications and details, proposed signage renderings.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included an overview of the previous proposal, the proposal to keep the black panel, the proposed paint colors for the lettering and signage, sign #2 has been centered over the bay, the signage was adjusted so it could fit within the sign band, the proposed signage color is made to



match the existing paint color of the sign band, and the dimensions of the sign bands.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: whether the signage could have words stacked so they wouldn't display onto Massachusetts Ave, whether the length of the sign could be shortened, whether the proposed signage matches another businesses existing signage above, the dimensions of the gold trim on the sign band, whether the drawings submitted showed the dimensions of the trim, whether there could be more space between the new signage and the sign bands, the dimensions of the signage lettering.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no public comments.

**COMMISSIONER HUNT MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. COMMISSIONER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

- *Final details regarding letter spacing within sign band remanded to staff for final approval.*

**APP # 24.0907 SE**

**ADDRESS: 19 RUTLAND SQUARE**

Applicant: Brian McLean

Proposed Work: Repair damaged wood at facade in-kind where possible, replace areas damaged beyond repair with synthetic siding, replace window sills, paint to match existing in-kind.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES:** Brian McLean was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to repair an existing wooden bay.

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** Documents presented included existing condition photographs of the exterior.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included an overview of the existing condition of the wooden bay, the deterioration and rot found within the bays, the proposal to replace the rot with a synthetic siding that could withstand weather conditions, minor repairs made to the bays, the plans to stage the building to inspect the bays and find the rotting areas, the proposal to rebuild, restore, and repaint the bays to match the existing, the rot found within the second floor window sills,



**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: the proposal; to replace the existing window sills, whether the existing finishing material was wood that was painted, the proposal to install a durable borale finishing product, whether this was stucco on the wood, the materials used to repair rotted areas, the material of the wood, which areas of the facade are being rebuilt, restored and repainted, whether an elevation was submitted with the application, how the new material is going to weather against the existing materials that will not be removed,

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no public comments.

**COMMISSIONER DEBORD MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION AS SUBMITTED. COMMISSIONER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

**APP # 24.0917 SE**

**ADDRESS: 86 PEMBROKE STREET**

Applicant: Mark Van Brocklin

Proposed Work: Construct a new roof deck.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES:** Mark Van Brocklin were the project representatives. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposed work to construct a new roof deck.

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** Documents presented included existing condition photographs, site location map, aerial view 3D image, existing and proposed site plan, site line diagram, deck and deck railing detail, mock up photographs.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included an overview of the proposal to install a new roof deck, the mock up in place, the rear railing which sits five feet back from the rear of the building, the visibility of the new roof deck from a public way, the dimensions of the proposed roof deck, the dimensions and material of the existing railing.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: the visibility of the proposed work from a public way, whether the visibility could be reduced, an overview of the staff comments, whether staff could conduct a site visit to view the visibility.



**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no public comments.

**COMMISSIONER FREEMAN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

- *Final reduced rear deck rail placement remanded to staff for final approval.*

**APP # 24.0932 SE**

**ADDRESS: 96 CHANDLER STREET**

Applicant: Christopher Barry

Proposed Work: At rear penthouse level, remove 6 non-original casement windows and replace with 4 new wood aluminum-clad 2-over-2 double hung windows.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES:** Christopher Barry, was the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to remove existing windows and replace them with new windows.

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** Documents presented included rear existing condition photographs of the interior and exterior, rear existing and proposed elevations.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included an overview of the existing conditions, the proposal to remove the existing casement windows, the plans to replace existing windows with four wood aluminum-clad 2-over-2 double hung windows, the visibility of the windows from a public way, the location of the windows on the building, the proposal to reduce the dimensions of middle post and installing a small post between the other windows, the frame would be maintained, the proposed paint color for the windows,

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: the location of the windows on the building, the visibility of the proposed work from a public way, the original configuration of the building, whether the original configuration was mansard, whether the building had dormers, whether the window framing would be maintained,

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no public comments.





**COMMISSIONER HUNT MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION AS SUBMITTED. COMMISSIONER DEBORD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

**APP # 24.0942 SE**

**ADDRESS: 698 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE**

Applicant: Brian Kelleher

Proposed Work: Install new iron gate door at stoop entry, install new fence gate. See *additional work under Administrative Review.*

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES:** Brian Kelleher 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 iron gate door at the stop entry.

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** Documents presented included existing condition photographs, proposed fence gate and proposed vestibule gate details.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included an overview of the security concerns on the property, the proposal to install a new fence gate to address safety concerns, an overview of the proposed fence gate design, the dimensions and material of the proposed fence gate, the existing conditions at the stoop entry, the security concerns at the vestibule entryway,

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: an overview of the South End district guidelines regarding window and secondary door grates, whether there was a latching mechanism for the proposed gate, examples of other gates within the SELDC, whether a fence would resolve safety concerns.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** During the public comment period, Peter Sandborne asked for clarification regarding the motion and spoke in support of the motion.

**COMMISSIONER HUNT MOTIONED TO DENY THE APPLICATION WITHOUT PREJUDICE. COMMISSIONER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

- *The proposed garden fence was denied without prejudice because the guidelines state "Original front yard fences shall be maintained...Gates and chainlink, concrete block, light gauge metal, and wooden picket or lattice fences are inappropriate for front yards."*

**APP # 24.0531 SE**





**ADDRESS: 8 EAST SPRINGFIELD STREET**

Applicant: Gregory McCarthy

Proposed Work: Construct a new 4 story brick rowhouse. *Previously reviewed at the 1/2/2024 SELDC Public Hearing.*

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES:** Greg McCarthy and Brian Mulligan were the project representatives. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to construct a new 4 story brick rowhouse.

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** Documents presented included 8 Springfield Street title sheet document, exterior elevations, partial elevation of 8 East Springfield, door elevations, door and door frame detail, material palette, first, second, third and fourth floor plans, basement and roof plans, site section, rooftop sight lines, window specifications, railing precedent samples from abutting properties, railing elevation details, baluster detail., front grade detail.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included an overview of the design that's made to match the building next door, architectural differences between the proposed new building and the existing row house at 10 East Springfield St, an overview of the recommendations provided by the Commission at a previous hearing, the amount of egress windows on the new building, the egress window wells, the proposed window types, the material and dimensions of the proposed windows, modifications made to the proposal that incorporate the Commissioner feedback, the proposed roofing material, code requirements for windows and egress, details regarding the proposed door in comparison to existing door at 10 East Springfield St, the proposed paint color for the new door, the proposed paint color for the dormer trim, details regarding AC compressors, visibility of the AC compressors from a public way, details regarding the proposed railing, the details about the proposed window wells, the proposed material of the stoop and curb,

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: an overview of the South End district guidelines regarding residential exterior light fixtures, new masonry penetrations and new openings in masonry, the property lines, whether the proposed railing would carry from one stoop to another, whether the Commission has purview to review the proposed lights flanking the entrance, the proposed material of the front stoop and curb, whether there is a cross section through the window well, details and dimensions regarding window wells and the tops of window wells specifically, the proposed steel plate,



**PUBLIC COMMENT:** During the public comment period, the following participants offered public comment:

During the public comment period, Brian Potter, an abutter spoke in support of the proposed work and offered comments about the elevations that depicted a neighboring building having 2 floors on top but that work had not been completed. Brian recommended that moving forward if that project does not continue that the cornice details would need to be addressed.

During the public comment period, David Tabenken, a resident at 10 East Springfield Street, offered questions and comments regarding the proposed curb and garden. David also offered comments regarding the proposed size and code requirements for windows and egress windows.

During the public comment period, Peter Sandborne, offered questions and comments regarding the exposed side wall at 4-6 East Springfield St.

**COMMISSIONER HUNT MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. COMMISSIONER DEBORD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

- From 1/2/2024 SELDC Hearing:
  - Details are remanded to staff
  - Material mockups remanded to staff
  - Return to the Commission at 75% completion of drawings
- From 5/7/2024 SELDC Hearing, continued from 1/2/2024 hearing:
  - Updated areaway detail remanded to staff.
  - Garden rail to continue across the garden and connect to 10 East Springfield Street rail.



**APP # 24.0941 SE**

**ADDRESS: 575 ALBANY STREET**

Applicant: Marc Savatsky

Proposed Work: Adaptive reuse/renovation of existing structure including sixth floor addition. Proposed multifamily residential building with commercial/corner café.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES:** Mike DelleFave, John Quinn, Mark Sebastian, and David Goldman were the project representative. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to renovate an existing structure.

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** Documents presented included an overview of the development and architectural teams, existing condition photographs, context views and aerial photographs, parcel views, building location within the South End Landmark District, 3D existing and proposed rendering images, 3D rendering images of the previously approved and proposed Massing view, proposed addition height section, massing section, existing site plan, conceptual rendering of the East Dedham Street section.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included an overview of the history of the proposed project and the building, the previous project and approval from the Commission on 5/2/17, an overview of two newly constructed buildings, the development team and ownership of the building, the proposal to add a sixth story and its design to conform with zoning requirements, the visibility of the proposed work from a public way, the features of the building that are existing and proposed, the height limits and dimensional requirements of the PDA, the six story wood frame that's being constructed, the dimensions of the property, the location of the property within the protection area, the proposal to add bay windows on the rear of the building. It was also confirmed that there would be no demolition plans at this project.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater details: an overview of the South End district guidelines regarding the protection area.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** During the public comment period, Marie, a resident on East Brookline Street, offered questions about the purpose of the bay windows in the rear and whether the applicant could show photographs of the bays.



**COMMISSIONER HUNT MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION AS SUBMITTED. COMMISSIONER DEBORD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

**APP # 24.0945 SE**

**ADDRESS: 144 WORCESTER STREET**

Applicant: Pawel Honc

Proposed Work: Project scope includes rooftop addition to a 4-story building in South End to serve as access to the proposed private roof deck, housing life-safety mechanical equipment for the building and an elevator overrun. Proposed roof deck to comply with all setback requirements and proposed addition will comply with Zoning Ordinance's height requirement. Additional project scope includes overall masonry restoration, extension of south façade parapet, restoration of arched transoms, and replacement of windows.

**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES:** Marc LaCasse and Pedro Lucas were the project representatives. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to add a rooftop addition to an existing 4-story building, to extend the south façade parapet, to restore masonry and arched transoms, and to replace windows.

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** Documents presented included existing condition photographs, photograph of the permit application, site location, front elevation drawings of the proposed and existing structures, the previously proposed and new roof level floor plan, 3D renderings of the previous design and new proposed design, the proposed materials for the rear elevation, sight line details, proposed transom and parapet elevations.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included an overview of the previous proposals and appearances to the Commission in June 2023 and January 2024, an overview of their appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals, their various items of zoning relief for groundwater recharged systems, rear roof decks, and the restricted roof structure addition, an overview of the Commissions recommendations comments from their Advisory Reviews, the community garden which is not visible from a public way, details about the mock up that was constructed last summer and one that is currently standing, the reduction of the new addition to cover only sixteen percent of the roof area, the redesign and reduction of the new roof addition, the proposed height of the new addition, an overview of the proposal to restore the full masonry and arch transoms, the proposal to restore windows, the proposal to restore the parapet using matching bricks from the building itself, the proposed material for the roof and sidewall.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater



detail: the proposed material for the roof, the side wall material, whether the sloped roof is visible from a public way, details regarding the roof deck railing, whether the roof deck railing is visible from a public way, whether a subcommittee needed to be established to view the visibility of the proposed work.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

We received nine written comments that were in opposition to the proposed rooftop addition at 144 Worcester Street. A letter of opposition to the proposed work was also submitted by State Representative John F. Moran of the Ninth Suffolk District.

Renee Smith, submitted a written comment and spoke in opposition of the proposed work.

Angie Brutus, a representative from Boston City Councilor Tania Fernade Anderson's office, spoke in opposition to the proposed work.

Marco Petrillo, a resident at 148 Worcester Street, spoke in opposition of the proposed work.

David & Carol Antos, residents at 141 Worcester Street, spoke in opposition of the proposed work.

**COMMISSIONER DEBORD MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION WITH PROVISOS. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

- *Parapet and window replacement approved.*
- *Headhouse and rail remanded to a subcommittee of John Amodeo and Chris DeBord, and then continued to another hearing for final approval.*

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

### **III. ADVISORY REVIEW**

#### **ADDRESS: 615 ALBANY STREET**

Proposed Work: In protection area - Conversion of existing building to 24 residential units. Renovation of existing building and 1 story addition. As well as roof deck addition for residents.



**PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES:** Greg McCarthy and Bryan Mulligan were the project representatives. They presented the proposed scope of work to the Commission, which includes an overview of the proposal to convert an existing building into twenty-four residential units. In addition to renovating the existing building the proposal includes adding a one story addition and new roof deck.

**DOCUMENTS PRESENTED:** Documents presented included the proposed site plan, existing exterior elevations, Albany Street and Brookline Street elevations.

**DISCUSSION TOPICS:** Discussion topics included the existing condition of the building, an overview of the new story's and additions, the existing headhouse, the proposed roof deck, the height and dimensions of the proposed additions, the proposed egress on the left side of the building, the proposed site plans, whether there were plans to protect existing greenery, whether the applicant could replace any greenery damaged during construction,

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS:** During the Commissioner Comment and discussion period, the following topics were discussed in greater detail: the height, setback, and massing of the existing and proposed structure, whether there were plans to protect the two trees on East Brookline Street during construction.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** There were no public comments.

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

#### IV. ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW/ APPROVAL

- APP # 24.0940 SE**      **114 APPLETON STREET:** At front stairs: Chip the hollow cement off as needed and refinish. Prime and paint with Tammscoat waterproof paint to match the existing.
- APP # 24.0926 SE**      **16 BOND STREET:** Rebuild front facade, reuse face brick and replicate all details in kind. Reset granite base. *Moved from design review.*
- APP # 24.0900 SE**      **53 CHANDLER STREET:** At first floor, replace one 2-over-2 and two 1-over-1 non-original aluminum clad windows in-kind with new aluminum clad windows, replace existing aluminum trim with new wood trim in historically accurate profiles.
- APP # 24.0937 SE**      **108 CHANDLER STREET:** Repoint rear facade and refinish





- lintels and sills in-kind, repair rear mansard roof in-kind.
- APP # 24.0822 SE** **2 CLARENDON STREET:** Remove and replace (5) damaged existing aluminum windows on the 7th floor. The new windows will match the existing window color, glass, and profiles to make the replacement windows unnoticeable. The new windows will have the same glazed opening.
- APP # 24.0896 SE** **356 COLUMBUS AVENUE:** Emergency window replacement. See APP #23.0255 SE.
- APP # 24.0898 SE** **360-376 COLUMBUS AVENUE:** At addresses 360-370: Renovate exterior front brick facades and/or trim in kind. Repair and replace brick and mortar to match existing. All repointing will match the historically original mortar in color, texture, joint, width, and profile. Maintain the façade and trim to match its existing historic style, including around third floor dentils and corbels. At addresses 360-376: Wash, seal and protect exterior brick facade, including brick sides of stair stoops. Test detergent for colorfastness on each brick type, ie, Sandy yellow vs red bricks. Cleaned facades will seek to match historic tone. At addresses 360-376: Renovate top stair and/or bottom riser step of stoops in kind to match original. Match color, texture and profile of existing steps.
- APP # 24.0867 SE** **482 COLUMBUS AVENUE:** Install new stud mounted acrylic letter signage at sign band.
- APP # 24.0902 SE** **37 EAST CONCORD STREET:** At front facade cut 3/4" into the joints of the bricks and repoint in kind. Refinish lintels, sills and front stairs in kind. Paint with Tammscoat waterproof paint to match the existing. Replace the soffit as needed in kind.
- APP # 24.0923 SE** **28 EAST SPRINGFIELD STREET:** Strip the existing rubber roof and install new rubber roof only.
- APP # 24.0947 SE** **43 EAST SPRINGFIELD STREET:** Chip hollow cement off the front stairs as needed and refinish in kind. Scrape, prime and paint with Tammscoat waterproof paint to match the existing.
- APP # 24.0938 SE** **10 HOLYOKE STREET:** Chip the hollow cement off the front stairs as needed and refinish in kind. Scrape, prime and paint with Tammscoat waterproof paint to match the existing.
- APP # 24.0901 SE** **460 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE:** Repoint front facade in-kind to match original, chip hollow cement off all brownstone elements including lintels, sills, apron, and main door surround, and refinish in-kind. Repair with Tammscoat waterproof paint to match the existing in-kind. Replace rotted wood at soffit in-kind as needed.
- ~~**APP # 24.0894 SE** **483 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE:** Replace EPDM roofing in-kind as needed at flat and dormer roofs. **WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**~~





**APP # 24.0942 SE**

**698 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE:** Repair concrete garden stoop stairs in-kind to match existing. *See additional items under Design Review.*

**APP # 24.0935 SE**

**44 MONTGOMERY STREET:** Replace Eleven (11) non original windows at front facade. Windows frame, sashes, and trim will be painted black. Replace Seven (7) non original windows of the entire side/alley. Windows frame, sashes, and trim will be painted black. Removal of vines, cut, repoint, and wash front and side/alley brick exterior walls. Restore all headers and sills. Replace Slate roof to match existing. Restore fire escapes and handrail and sidewalk railing, scrape, paint black. Replace curved gutter and downspout. (Copper) Bay window replace rotted trim to match existing. Bay window restore and paint to existing.

**APP # 24.0824 SE**

**75 MONTGOMERY STREET:** Front Stairs: chip the hollow cement off as needed and refinish. Paint with Tammscoat waterproof paint to match the existing.

**APP # 24.0931 SE**

**32 RUTLAND SQUARE:** Replacing one flat non-original double hung 2 over 2 window in-kind with Pella Reserve wood exterior 2 over 2 double hung window. The exterior of the new window will be wood, painted to match the existing window. It will have a 2 over 2 grille pattern and the grilles will be Pella's historically accurate ILT grille with a putty trapezoidal profile. That grille is permanently bonded to the exterior and interior of the glass with a dark spacer between the glass. The existing trim will be removed and replaced with painted wood trim in historically accurate profiles. This window will match the three Pella windows in the unit directly above.

**APP # 24.0872 SE**

**75 RUTLAND STREET:** Repoint front facade to match original mortar.

**APP # 24.0904 SE**

**427 SHAWMUT AVENUE:** Spot repoint at front facade, match existing mortar in-kind.

**APP # 24.0823 SE**

**613 TREMONT STREET:** Repair cement front stairs and curb walls in-kind, repaint with Tammscoat waterproof paint to match existing.

**APP # 24.0834 SE**

**548 TREMONT STREET:** Install new logo on an existing blade sign at front entrance.

**APP # 24.0906 SE**

**54 WALTHAM STREET:** Replace 2 non-original wood curved sash windows in-kind with new wood curved sash, and replace 1 non-original flat window in-kind.

**APP # 24.0873 SE**

**1677-1679 WASHINGTON STREET:** Repoint front and left facades 100% to match original.

**APP # 24.0939 SE**

**173 WEST BROOKLINE STREET:** Chip hollow cement from front stairs, refinish in-kind and paint HC-69 to match original masonry. Waterproof bluestone walkway.



**APP # 24.0913 SE**

**25 WORCESTER STREET:** Remove cement from joints at granite front steps and recaulk with flexible caulking, power wash masonry.

**APP # 24.0945 SE**

**144 WORCESTER STREET:** Overall masonry restoration, restoration of arched transoms, and replacement of windows.

**APP # 24.0920 SE**

**148 WORCESTER STREET:** Reclad existing head house.  
*Moved from design review.*

**COMMISSIONER DEBORD MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW ITEMS. COMMISSIONER HUNT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

#### **IV. RATIFICATION OF HEARING/ MEETING MINUTES**

Ratification of 4/2/24 meeting minutes.

**COMMISSIONER HUNT MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES. COMMISSIONER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**

#### **V. STAFF UPDATES**

Gabriela Amore, Preservation Planner, welcomed Chris DeBord who was newly appointed to the South End Landmark District Commission. Chris will now serve as a Commissioner and there will hopefully be more Commissioners joining the Commission in the future.

#### **VI. ADJOURN – 10:00 PM**

**COMMISSIONER MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE HEARING. COMMISSIONER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE VOTE WAS 4-0-0 (Y: CH, JF, JA, CD)(N: NONE)(ABS: NONE).**