

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
January 4, 2023

A virtual meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, January 4, 2022 at 6:00PM. Present were: Larry Spang, Mark Meche, Rebecca English, Jamie Graham, Milo Martinez, Mark Pattison, Kelly Tyler-Lewis. Not present: Reed Cutting, Vijay Joyce. Staff present: Patti Kelleher

18 Broad Street

The Pickering Foundation submitted an application for a Certificate of Non-Applicability for exterior restoration.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/4/23
- Photographs

Linda Jenkins and Tim Jenkins were present. Ms. Jenkins thanked the Commission for the hearing. Mr. Jenkins noted that plan is an extensive renovation and thanked the Community Preservation Committee for awarding CPA funds to the project. Mr. Jenkins described plan to replace entire façade of building with high-quality lumber milled tongue and groove; match siding; only minor difference would be width of each plank; painting all surfaces exact to match. Modern materials will be used; work was said to not be observable; will use Tyvek rather than tar paper; stainless steel fasteners (not visible in final project). Mr. Jenkins noted having only partially capped window brows with copper flashing; the plan being to add additional copper flashing to flat surfaces to prevent water permeation into structure. The stated goal was to update in a way that cannot be observed.

Chair Spang confirmed that work will be done likely on all sides; and potentially even the barn, Mr. Jenkins noted. Mr. Jenkins also noted that repairs to window sills will be made as part of project, as well as trim on pilasters and base (higher quality mahogany); though the brackets are in good shape. American Steeple was identified as contractor.

Mr. Jenkins noted that not all of the flushboard siding will be replaced; some siding on portico at ground level with front door was not replaced in 1960s and is in good enough shape to not replace. Mr. Meche recommended using longer pieces of lumber. Mr. Jenkins noted that the house has two facades; 1960s siding was nailed over and on to 1848-1851 siding; this older siding will be retained as part of the renovation where possible. Mr. Meche confirmed that sky-facing flat surfaces will receive copper.

Mr. Martinez asked how much the width of the boards will be changing, which Mr. Jenkins noted the goal is approximately 6" with minimal variability (which is consistent with the current width); anticipated length of boards is 14-16 ft in length. Mr. Pattison noted that Anderson McQuaid sells 18 ft lumber (Mr. Meche noted they have Spanish Cedar, too) and strongly recommended Sapele mahogany.

No public comment.

Chair Spang inquired as to availability of pre-1960 photographs of home in order to get more input on length of lumber used, which Mr. Jenkins noted does still exist from 1848-51 on the house. Chair Spang suggested new copper put over window shrouds is tested first in order to identify any emergent details that need to be accounted for.

**VOTE:** Mr. Meche made a motion to approve application. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, Pattison, Graham, English, Tyler-Lewis (not present), Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

### 3 Federal Court--continuation

Skomurski Development submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate building and carriage house. This item pertained to installation of electrical panel after-the-fact.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/22/22
- Drawings by Seger Architecture
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher noted that Commission members who had listened to prior session on 3 Federal Court were eligible to vote at present meeting.

Dan Ricciarelli, project architect, was present.

Chair Spang noted that screening of electrical panel was to be discussed. Mr. Ricciarelli noted that the owner) had agreed to move electrical panel down from present location, and that the unit would be shifted away from street. Mr. Ricciarelli proposed a solid board fence in conjunction with landscaping to screen. A sketch of proposal was shown: 3' x 6' solid board fence with pyramid caps behind which would be meter and weatherhead, in line with second of two chimneys.

Ms. Graham requested confirmation that detail of this fence would match existing fence in back of house, which Mr. Ricciarelli affirmed. Mr. Martinez requested aerial view of property in order to determine visibility of meter from further away from property. Mr. Ricciarelli admitted that there is no way to completely screen the meter without an entire encasement. Site plan was shown and proposed placement of screening was described. Chair Spang asked about location of hedging in relation to fence. Mr. Ricciarelli noted that landscaping plan would be created showing hedge pulled back from existing placement at back corner of house. Ms. Graham clarified that proposed fence is perpendicular rather than parallel to face of building as an important distinction; no site plan designates it as such.

No public comment.

Chair Spang questioned if Commission members' concerns had been resolved based on new plan. Mr. Meche clarified that he would not be eligible to vote given absence from prior meeting, as did Mr. Pattison. Ms. Tyler-Lewis was also ineligible to vote as a new member. Chair Spang noted that the Commission had only a bare quorum eligible to vote. Ms. English and Ms. Graham appreciated the applicants moving the meter and screening with fence (Ms. Graham noted that landscaping could be taken down by future owner and was not a permanent solution) while also expressing dismay that the unit was installed on this façade in the first place. Ms. Graham advocated including strong statement emphasizing that an approval vote would not be precedent-setting and is in no way acceptable to the Commission or constitutive of maintaining the city's historic fabric. Ms. Kelleher noted that future electrical meter permits will be flagged for the City's attention prior to work undertaken, a move which was commended by Commission members.

**VOTE:** Ms. English made a motion to approve the revised plan to move electrical meter between windows 3 and 4; install a 3' x 6' fence for permanent shielding of installation; fence to be painted to match existing/other fence; and revised site plan showing location of fence. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Graham, English, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

62 Forrester Street--continuation

St Nicholas Russian Orthodox Church submitted an application for a waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish 2-family house older than 100 years.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/17/22
- Photographs

Father Lawrence and Church members Diana Dunlap and Mary Rose Andruchow were present.

Ms. Dunlap noted Parish Council's view that planned green space was a net positive, and that the Council did not anticipate concerns about too much open space. Regarding the site inspection, Ms. Dunlap expressed surprise that Commission thought the building was in good condition, which the Parish sees as unsuitable for tenants to live. Ms. Dunlap expressed intent to conduct deed history research on the property.

Father Lawrence seconded Ms. Dunlap's surprise that Commission found property to be in good condition. Expressed concern about the financial drain that would be incurred to rescue the property; as well as about converting property for affordable housing in a way that is respectful to tenants. Chair Spang's sense of feedback from site visit was that structure itself is sound and stable. Mr. Martinez said this was an accurate assessment; the Commission has visited structures that are in much greater need of renovation. Mr. Meche questioned if any further information was gained about history of property. Ms. Kelleher noted that property seems to show up in 1911 atlas. Mr. Meche confirmed that no unique details about the building's architecture were determined. Ms. Kelleher only specified some nice trim (though stock trim) on property. Mr. Meche noted having compelled City to undertake significant background history and research on Camp Naumkeag demolition; and asked if this was to be the convention for the rigor of Demolition Delay Ordinances (DDOs), or because it was City property in that case. Chair Spang noted having requested information on structural issues in cases of requested demolition. Mr. Meche was solidly not in favor of removing a building with a prominent location at street intersection and replacing with green space. Mr. Meche wanted to know if the neighborhood context of a structure was part of the Ordinance's language pertaining to the "historically significant" qualifier. Ms. Kelleher showed the language of the Ordinance.

Ms. Andruchow noted having worked on this property as well as building next to it, the rectory, such as having added back stairs to property. Rectory was finely built by excellent carpenters whereas so-called "three-decker" (i.e. the property in question) is not up to same caliber. The building is sloping in middle and quite a few posts in basement need to be lifted. The fact that the home is encased entirely asbestos is an added concern. Ms. Andruchow noted that the Church did not own this building until late 1990s. The building has a double-brick foundation on top of stone, and some bricks are turning to dust. Bathrooms are pre-WWII building; some are old lead plumbing. Heating vents need to be changed as they are not to

code. Manpower has already been put into structure in an attempt to mitigate ongoing issues. Extensive flooding has occurred.

Ms. Dunlap noted expectation of finding in research of building is that Eastern Europe immigration was happening at time; likely constructed in 1900; constructed by or for immigrant community connected to Parish. Property was owned by Mary K. Smerczynski in 1911, as shown by atlas image. Ms. Dunlap requested that Commission speak more to how removal of the building would alter or damage the streetscape/neighborhood. Chair Spang used atlas image to demonstrate orientation of tight houses lined up Forrester Street (in 1911), most of which have minimal sideyards, backyards, etc. This was one in a number of those types of houses that define this area from a historical development standpoint. To the extent that that gets removed and changed to a blank green space, it opens up a hole in a fairly consistent existing streetscape.

Chair Spang questioned the Parish's reasoning for not selling the property; as well as more details as to the planned use/availability of intended green space. Ms. Andruchow noted not wanting to sell because it is right in middle of property and the Parish is not desirous of losing control of the space. The planned green space would be used primarily and perhaps solely for the Parish's children as a space to congregate with each other and parents. Ms. Andruchow noted that a sketch had been submitted to the Commission as an idea of how the space may look, which was shown.

Ms. Dunlap noted green space was desired given life of Parish space for children is heavy consideration; no outdoor space is held at present (only an alley for garbage pickup; flower beds and sidewalks outside of church); Sunday school space is in basement. Outdoor processions are religious-cultural consideration for this particular Parish. Desire to be more open to surrounding community to make Parish culturally accessible. Fr. Lawrence re-emphasized Ms. Dunlap's remarks on becoming part of surrounding community.

Mr. Meche spoke to possibility of seeking an alternative property for use of the Parish. Chair Spang added that the point of the DDO waiver is to afford additional time to explore alternatives to demolition, whereas present applicants seem committed to demolition as a foregone conclusion.

Ms. Tyler-Lewis noted that based on site visit, demolition of the building would not simply alter the streetscape through absence of home, but would expose the properties/buildings behind on Essex Street. A fairly large gap in the street will be opened (on Forrester), given that Church's parking lot is also nextdoor. Ms. Graham echoed Mr. Meche's comments as to the loss of continuation of streetscape and highlighted the potential for Parish to use existing public spaces (e.g. Salem Common) for the purpose of engaging with community rather than creating their own private open space. Mr. Pattison expressed agreement.

Public comment:

Polly Wilbert, part of South Salem Neighborhood Association, involved for over 25 years, though not speaking on their behalf. Agreed with the Commission taking into value the context of more humble neighborhoods. Voiced the need to respect neighborhoods and structures from early 1900s as well as post-1914 fire the same as more prominent structures.

Barbara Cleary, on behalf of Historic Salem Inc., acknowledged issues that Parish is facing, as well as appreciation of the Church's stewardship. At the same time, was in favor of Commission's discussion as to avoiding potential damage of streetscape.

Mr. Martinez, speaking as resident of community who walks by property on a daily basis, noted that historically, two triple-deckers at 58 and 60 Forrester have already been demolished for a Church parking lot; did not want to see a third building demolished. Alternative ideas should be considered. Mr. Martinez did not consider the desire to not lose control of property to be a compelling argument.

Ms. Dunlap made it clear that the intent is not to devalue immigrant and working-class history in Salem because this is the Parish's history, i.e. the Church was founded by Ukrainian immigrants and continues to be an immigrant parish that welcomes immigrants. The relationship with rental property is not driven by any derogation of that history or of humble architectural structures.

Chair Spang reiterated two main goals of Ordinance from Commission's vantage point; to determine if the property is historically significant; and to determine whether it is preferably preserved or not. One criteria of historical significance pertains to architectural style in relation to other structures in neighborhood/vicinity. There is reasonable basis that this property is historically significant given its part in a composite of the street/neighborhood fabric. If the historical significance of a property is contested, a determination would be needed by the Supreme Judicial Court (SJC). Mr. Martinez remarked as to the elevation of the building, which is quite high; demonstrative of building that anticipated flooding in low elevation and sought to build in such a way with this in mind. Buildings across the street as well as rectory are also tall.

Ms. Andruchow asked for clarification as to the building's historic significance; does the Commission have to establish that the building is historically significant. Chair Spang explained the two-part vote/process of determining that (1) property is historically significant and (2) whether property is preferably preserved. Mr. Meche clarified that the Commission's determination of historical significance is in the context of the DDO; the determination of historical significance would have no larger bearing on the property's designation. The 18-month subsequent timeframe is to come up with alternative options to delay.

**VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion that the property at 62 Forrester is historically significant. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, Pattison, Graham, English, Tyler-Lewis (abstained), Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

**VOTE: Mr. Meche motioned that the property at 62 Forrester is preferably preserved. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, Pattison, Graham, English, Tyler-Lewis (abstained), Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Chair Spang notified Parish members of the Commission's decision; and expressed willingness to work with them moving forward to utilize property in ways to accomplish their goals. There is a lot to be said for development market nearby to re-condition building and place into market; perhaps sell to a developer who can work on the property. Ms. Dunlap noted that the decision would be taken to the Parish Committee and Council for further progress.

149 Federal Street--continuation

Joe and Kathy Archambault submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the applicants are installing a storm window per the Commission's recommendation. Therefore, she recommended Commission deny without prejudice the current application for window replacement.

**VOTE: Ms. English motioned to deny application without prejudice. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, Pattison, Graham, English, Tyler-Lewis, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

275 Lafayette Street--continuation

MD Property Development LLC submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate building and add new construction.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the Applicant has requested continuation to February 1, 2023 meeting in order to complete ZBA process.

**VOTE: Ms. English motioned to continue application to meeting on February 1, 2023. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Tyler-Lewis (absent), Meche, Martinez, Pattison, Graham, English, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

316 Essex Street

First United Church submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new fence.

## Documents &amp; Exhibits

- Application: 12/15/22
- Photographs

Peter Eschauzier was present on the call for the First Unitarian Universal Church. Proposal is to build fence. Henny Penny Nursery uses a temporary barricade that needs to be unrolled from side of Church and then attached to post on other side. Nursery wants permanent fence with gate. Photograph of gate section was shown from Northeastern Fence. Four feet wide, five feet high; would open up into the Church and allow Henny Penny to have fence that they could use for when Church is in session. Fence is steel. Chair Spang questioned if site plan or aerial was available to show proposed placement. View from Essex Street was shown to approximate fence location; which was quite set back from the street. Google Map views were shown to further demonstrate planned placement. Mr. Eschauzier noted 16 feet wide with 4 foot gate in middle is the intended goal. Mr. Eschauzier noted that the fence would comply with Nursery School regulations.

Chair Spang asked why the fence was not being planned to be as far back as possible so as to not disrupt entry/exit from Church door. Mr. Eschauzier noted it was placed there by the chair of the property committee who had installed barricade. Mr. Eschauzier noted the desire to have as much open space as

possible on other side of fence (i.e. courtyard area). Mr. Eschauzier noted that the Church often has picnics and barbecues in this area as well.

Northeast Fence will supply the fence; they also are the company responsible for the fence behind the Church. The posts are 4" diameter, Mr. Eschauzier was not sure of the exact dimensions. Chair Spang asked if they were round or square; Mr. Meche said they could be either, according to the business's brochure. Ms. English confirmed that top of fence is pointed, and expressed surprise given its installation for safety of pre-schoolers. A review of the Montage fence style indicated that there are other versions without points; one with a single rail at the top would be more in line with the front of Church's fence. Mr. Martinez asked if fence in the back was the same style of fence. Chair Spang noted that that fence was cedar board. Conversation shifted to the pointy tops of fences around the Church property. Iron spike fence was of concern to Mr. Martinez based on potential lack of precedent for this style. Ms. Kelleher noted that metal picket fence on Common at 21 Washington Sq had been approved; to which Mr. Martinez noted that this was a custom build near Witch Museum. Chair Spang called the planned fence a modern interpretation of historic wrought iron. Mr. Meche proposed going to see sample in person. Mr. Meche showed alternative fence types; images from Ameristar supplier website's 20-page brochure. Mr. Eschauzier noted that pointed posts were selected to match the existing fence on Essex Street as closely as possible. Ms. Kelleher proposed a site visit to see selected sample fence from Essex Street. Mr. Martinez expressed concern for this fence being seen by other residents as precedent-setting for installation of similar fences.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez moved to continue application to afford time for site visit to inspect proposed fence sample. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, Pattison, Graham, English, Tyler-Lewis (recused), Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

### 301 Essex Street

Jerry's LLC submitted a request to waive Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish roof.

### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/8/22
- Drawings by Seger Architects
- Photographs

Mike Becker, owner and Dan Ricciarelli, Seger Architects, were present.

Mr. Ricciarelli discussed plan to add addition on Jerry's Department Store at corner of Essex and Summer. Built in 1895, the building has been through various uses. Proposal is to build on top of building; inset new floor which will require removing current roof. Currently there is a flat-sloped roof over tar and gravel; not currently visible from street view. The applicants plan on restoring base of the structure. Mr. Ricciarelli was of the mind that removing a roof from structure should not fall under the Demolition Delay Ordinance (DDO) given that the roof is not visible from public way and does not contribute to historical significance of structure. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Ordinance language indicates that removal of 50% or more of roof does technically constitute demolition. Mr. Ricciarelli highlighted certain language from the DDO to suggest that the removal of the roof of 301 Essex would not be subject to the Ordinance. Mr. Ricciarelli noted that he and client had met with SRA, DRB, and HSI regarding this project/proposal.

Chair Spang wanted to see what preservation of the structure (other than the planned demolished roof) would look like via drawings, including what is being added above 301 Essex following the proposed roof demolition. Mr. Meche questioned what precedent projects exist for potential guidance in determining process at 301 Essex, specifically noting the North Shore Bank at corner of Derby and Lafayette. Ms. Kelleher said that that particular project proposed to retain the façade with a new building behind and it had gone through a similar review process. Mr. Meche noted that that project had come to SHC after it had already gone through DRB; though Mr. Martinez said that the reverse was true; i.e. SHC was consulted prior to DRB. Ms. Kelleher addressed a question from Mr. Becker to noted that because the building is currently a flat-roof one-story building, the existing roof is a character-defining feature and is thus subject to the DDO. DRB has jurisdiction over the look of the project, said Chair Spang. Chair Spang discouraged questions about hypothetical supposition projects pertaining to the DDO.

Mr. Ricciarelli showed exhibit of planned project; site plan; etc. Historic photographs of corner in question were shown, which showed that a three-story building once existed where Jerry's Department Store is currently located. Precedent images shown in terms of massing. Elevation plans were shown along Essex Street. Mr. Ricciarelli noted the zoning allows buildings up to 70 feet tall. Mr. Ricciarelli spoke to the plan to pull back from façade in order to preserve it. Mr. Ricciarelli was careful to note that the images showed options rather than a definitive finished proposal. Mr. Meche asked if applicants need to go to Planning Board, which Mr. Becker affirmed for site plan review, draining, and parking circulation. An additional presentation the applicants had submitted to the DRB was shown, featuring what Mr. Ricciarelli characterized as more of a hybrid of punched-openings/more glass fenestration look. Mr. Meche remarked on the precedents that were used to inform the shown addition; which are elsewhere on Essex Street. Chair Spang asked if a plan at the roof level was available to see showing the setback of the planned addition; a plan/cross section was consequently shown. Mr. Ricciarelli noted that the desired height for retail space would be 9' though are still in early stages of the project. Chair Spang expressed concern for future retailers occupying the space, given the low ceiling height. Mr. Decker noted that each residential unit would be 14' wide. Mr. Ricciarelli reiterated that the goal of project – i.e. adding to roof – would be to preserve existing parapet. Mr. Meche asked if the second floor would be behind the sign band, which Mr. Ricciarelli said it would be just at the transom of the windows. Mr. Ricciarelli noted that no section was available perpendicular to Essex Street, to Chair Spang's inquiry. Chair Spang suggested that a more finalized plan/proposal was necessary as a condition of seeking a waiver for DDO. Mr. Meche and Chair Spang expressed concern that the façade would be altered as part of the proposal, and wanted to see what would happen to the part of the façade that is being preserved.

Mr. Ricciarelli expressed appreciation for Commission's input while noting that the property is not part of a historic district; and that the designers of the project would be in touch with SHC for feedback on the project moving forward. Chair Spang stated that the look of the façade moving forward is under SHC review. Ms. Graham agreed with Mr. Meche and Chair Spang's stated points about the pertinence of the WDDO in this case. Chair Spang raised the prospect of reaching out to City Solicitor for guidance on interpretation of WDDO, given that the Commission and Mr. Ricciarelli were at an impasse as to its applicability regarding the roof at 301 Essex. Mr. Becker wanted to know of stipulations the SHC has prior to going to DRB and SRA in the case that stipulations are incongruent among these review bodies. Mr. Meche expressed particular concern about preserving existing glass; not changing to spandrel. Mr. Becker was desirous of a vote at the present meeting.

Public comment:

Barbara Cleary, speaking for HSI, commended SHC for being on point in deliberations. Ms. Cleary noted that the Demolition Delay ordinance stipulates when a waiver is granted, development plans can be taken into account well as preservation and treatment of interior and exterior character-defining elements.

Mr. Ricciarelli reiterated that the goal of project managers is to respect existing façade. Ms. Kelleher noted that HSI submitted a comment letter and shared screen to show. A summary of the letters main points: changes at this prominent location demand rigorous review; this building is significant for its placement and history; multi-floor addition is appropriate and has potential to enhance/contribute to location; SHC was urged to delay voting or if a vote must happen to deny the waiver; more preliminary design approval is needed prior to a vote; application for WDDO waiver does not appear to be complete, lacking existing conditions, photographs, and a description of proposed reuse.

**VOTE: Mr. Meche moved to find 301 Essex Street historically significant. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, Pattison, Graham, English, Tyler-Lewis, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Chair Spang expressed agreement with HSI letter, noting that more information would need before granting a waiver of the demolition delay. Mr. Becker clarified that an approval or denial vote on WDDO would allow applicants to continue working on facilitating conditions for a potential reconsideration of waiver over 18-month period, which Chair Spang affirmed. Chair Spang's advice for Commission was to continue application prior to voting preferably preserved/waiver of DDO. Chair Spang did not feel that enough information was presented on what would be added to the façade in order to vote one way or another. Ms. Kelleher noted that a vote to preferably preserve would start the 18-month clock for the DDO. Mr. Ricciarelli was amenable to starting the clock and working with the SHC moving forward. Ms. Kelleher cautiously advised applicants that a vote to deny the waiver at this point *may* not be overturned for the applicants moving forward.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez moved to find roof of 301 Essex preferably preserved, invoking 18-month demolition delay. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, Pattison (abstain), Graham, English, Tyler-Lewis, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 18 Washington Square

Hawthorne Hotel submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a chimney cap.

Ms. Kelleher reported that this application was reviewed and approved under minor change category.

#### 55 Summer Street

David and Kelly Shutoff submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace rear windows.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the public hearing for this item was not advertised properly and the application will be heard at the meeting on January 18, 2023.

Adjournment

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, Pattison, Graham, English, Tyler-Lewis, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:00PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dan Graham, Historical Commission Clerk