

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
July 19, 2023

A regular meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, July 19, 2023, at 6:00 pm.

VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING. Present were: Vijay Joyce, Mark Meche, Milo Martinez, Jamie Graham, Kelly Tyler-Lewis, Larry Spang (arrived later in meeting). Staff: Patti Kelleher. Not present: Rebecca English, Reed Cutting, Mark Pattison.

275 Lafayette Street– continuation

MD Property Development LLC submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate building and new construction

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant requested a continuance.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting on August 2, 2023. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Graham, Meche, Tyler-Lewis and Joyce.

149 Federal Street– continuation

Joseph Archambault submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint colors and fencing

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant requested a continuance.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting on August 2, 2023. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Graham, Meche, Tyler-Lewis and Joyce.

57 Warren Street– continuation

Jessica Santos submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace entry steps.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant requested a continuation, and she will schedule a site visit for the Commission to review the stairs.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting on August 2, 2023. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Graham, Meche, Tyler-Lewis and Joyce.

12 Carpenter Street– continuation

William Grover submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for solar panels.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant requested to withdraw without prejudice due to supply chain issues and trying to locate an appropriate path for the conduit.

VOTE: Graham made a motion to accept the request to withdraw without prejudice. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Graham, Meche, Tyler-Lewis and Joyce.

1 Harrington Court– Continuation

Deirdre Majeski submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new roof, trim and gutters.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/7/23

- Photographs

Mitchell Mangahas (Contractor) was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Mangahas stated that the owner wanted to install a new roof, wrap fascia board and soffit in PVC coated alum and install new gutters in the wrapping.

Ms. Kelleher stated that there are 2 local properties to review, Albion Street and Winthrop Street. Mr. Mitchell noted that the Graphite color is their version of black roof shingle color. Ms. Kelleher noted that the design guidelines prioritize solid color roof with less 3-dimensional qualities. Acting Chair Joyce noted that the Graphite color had minimal variation in color.

Mr. Meche stated that while he is not crazy about the geometry, he's flexible. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that the new roofing would be highly visible given the pitch. Ms. Graham noted her previous concern with the need for an approval of all items. Mr. Mangahas noted that the trim and gutters go hand-in-hand only. Ms. Graham raised concerns with visibility and setting a precedent. Mr. Mangahas noted that the homeowner would like a determination by the end of this meeting to know whether they should seek an alternative contractor or a shingle that they would prefer.

Mr. Martinez noted that he visited both example locations and the gutter and wrap would not meet the Commission's criteria. He is not convinced of the shingle color because the color variation and cut angles are clear in-person. Ms. Tyler-Lewis agreed with Mr. Martinez regarding the color differences that appear flattened in photos but are more dimensional in-person.

Mr. Spang joined the meeting at this time.

Public Comment: No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Meche presented photos of the property, noting that the porch details and clapboards are newer, the beam at the porch was boxed in, rot was present above the roof at a corner board, and overlapping roof plains with simple that should be redone because water is getting through. He suggested the applicant withdrawal without prejudice and an alternative roof product and shingle color be suggested. He also noted that there may be sheet metal over some of the boards. Mr. Mangahas noted that the rot at roof would not be address as part of this project because they do not consider it trim.

Acting Chair Joyce noted the Commission's hesitancy to approve the combination of products and set a precedent and knowing the rot won't be repaired.

Mr. Martinez suggested a continuance since they don't know the owner's preference. Mr. Mangahas noted that the owner wanted to expedite this process in the future.

Ms. Kelleher suggested that based on the Commission's discussion, the board was not in support of the proposed roof shingle and wrap material. She suggested that the owner be directed to find a different roof shingle. Mr. Mangahas reiterated that owner wants a decision.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to deny the application with the roofing shingle and products presented. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Graham, Meche, Tyler-Lewis and Joyce. (Spang abstained due to missing half of presentation.)

Ms. Kelleher to provide shingle information and colors approved at prominent roofs in the historic district.

115 Derby Street

The House of the Seven Gables submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace roofing on the Tea House and Barn

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/5/23
- Photographs

Paul Wright (Dir. of Preservation and Maintenance at the House of Seven Gables) was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Wright stated that the Gables applied for CPA funds this year, the existing material are asbestos roof shingles, and it is unknown when they were added, and asbestos is not a replaceable material. For consistency, they want to use cedar shingles that have already been used on site, at the barn and archway. The asbestos shingles are composite and pressed to resemble slate and the drip edges and gutters would be a replacement in-kind. The potential change would be to replace the gutter material, but they want to increase the capacity, as part of coastal zone management grant. They would switch from existing V-shaped wood gutter to one with a V-shaped copper gutter liner. If they used cooper, it wouldn't match. They would also increase the lip by 1-inch to better direct the rainwater. The flashing material is presumed to be copper but would also be replaced in-kind. The proposed shingle is Western Red Cedar that will age naturally, and they will use a cedar breather.

Mr. Martinez asked what product was used when the house was re-shingled several years ago. Mr. Wright noted the same shingles are proposed, but at the time the 3/16 stainless steel nails used for the project were not galvanized and failed after less than 20-years. Mr. Martinez noted that this prominent historic site does a good job and he is in support.

Mr. Wright noted that they are having more roof leaks on various locations, including at a skylight and peak of the roof, and they are hoping for an approval to begin abatement late next week.

Public Comment: No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Acting-Chair Joyce asked if they would use the same contractor. Mr. Wright replied no, that person retired, and they will now use Old Mohawk who did the report. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that the report provided was only for The House of the Seven Gables. Mr. Wright to provide the correct report and noted that they used a program using Google Maps to obtain area calculations.

VOTE: Spang made a motion to approve change of roofing shingles from asbestos to western red shingles to match previous approved house, flashing to match existing, downspout and details to return to the commission for review and approval. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Graham, Meche, Tyler-Lewis, Spang, and Joyce.

Ms. Graham left the meeting at this time.

City of Salem Updates on Camp Naumkeag (85 Memorial Drive) Demolition Delay and Pioneer Village Project

Chris Genter of Oudens Ello Architecture, Michael Crounse, Signature Park Project Manager for City of Salem, and Matt Kirchman of Object Idea (Interpretive Planning and Design) were present to discuss the project.

Chair Spang stated that after their presentation 18-months ago, the Commission voted to not waive the demolition delay. Mr. Genter noted that they last presented in February and the Commission requested a few items, including a cost estimate which they have been compiling. Chair Spang noted that the demolition delay expired today, and the Commission's legal jurisdiction has ended. While they no longer vote on anything, they do have an advocacy role to play for the historic interests of the city.

Mr. Genter noted that at their February presentation they presented progress on Camp Naumkeag, including a structural assessment report prepared by Structures North, and four options for restoration or re-use of one cabin into the proposed plan for the Pioneer Village relocation, including their preferred option. Regarding Pioneer Village, they crafted a memo response to the Sec. of the Interior Standards for flood adaptation on site, provided the structural assessment and moving recommendations for the Pioneer Village structures, a storm threat and storm surge study comparison diagrams for the current and new site, the relocation of historic buildings, as well as parking diagrams, landscape, and pedestrian access for the relocation site.

Mr. Genter noted that the current items to review include: Camp Naumkeag: the possible re-use and cost to restore one cabin, photographic documentation, and demolition plan. Pioneer Village: Review of the business and operations plan from (ConsultEcon), interpretive plans, National Register status and an update on the overall schedule.

Camp Naumkeag site

Mr. Genter presented the current master plan for a relocated Pioneer Village on the Camp Naumkeag site, with the Pioneer Village structures on the lower site facing the water, proposed visitor center parking where the camp structures currently exist, an amphitheater overlooking the water, representation for the Massachusetts tribe. They previously considered relocating one of the camp structures within the proposed plan and they settled on Option A for its placement at the entrance and out of the way of other structures. This would be the best position for future use as an exhibition space or for ticketing, although they haven't identified a long-term use for the structure. He noted that the intent is to phase the project, Phase 1: parking, entry infrastructure and village relocation, and Phase 2: Visitors Center and upper park development.

Cost Estimate for Reusing Camp Naumkeag Building

Mr. Genter noted that the total direct cost is estimated to be \$244,000 and the total construction cost estimate is \$369,660. The buildings are not in good condition and require foundation work for stabilization, selective interior partition demolition, roof replacement including repair or replacement of trusses, construction of new footings and foundation, adding hurricane tie downs for wind uplift, repair the existing wall framing, exterior enclosure repairs, painting and sanding/sealing wood flooring, electrical service upgrades, fire alarm and data upgrades. Mr. Genter noted the cost is associated with saving one building to make it into a seasonal open-air structure, including restoring the operable shutters and deteriorated clapboards to ensure the building remains weather tight.

Mr. Crounse noted that with the rough estimate and the structure not becoming an all season building dedicated to a desired city use, besides basement storage for maintenance purposes, the escalated costs no longer justify adding to the overall project cost at this time and the potential uses could be handed at the visitor's center. Mr. Genter noted that their estimate would be to make the structure usable and as an interpretive space for Camp Naumkeag and not for its use as a shed.

Mr. Crounse stated that the City has a "To Do List", and their consultant Public Archaeology Lab (PAL) will handle photographic documentation of the buildings on both sites. PAL will provide a proposal and schedule, although no start date has been determined. They will use information gathered for future interpretive purposes and noted that there is no timeline for the demolition of Camp Naumkeag. Chair Spang asked if the City was electing to proceed with demolition pending scheduling. Mr. Crounse noted that they will look at the buildings in their entirety, review health and safety, and make a determination.

Interpretive Signage

Mr. Kirchman stated that ConsultEcon was used to determine pedestrian traffic. Phase I: Area 1 will include approaching the site from the Willows, most of the pedestrian traffic will have a greeter at the trail head signage to tell them the hours of operations, what to expect, how much time is needed to explore, and why to venture further. Area 2: There will be the ticket threshold to explain site history, and an overview of the occupation on the location in broad terms. It would be an interim low expense interpretative intervention at the site. Area 3: Interpretation to the visitors with wayside signage to support the operation of live interpretation, with a history of settlement, so that the live people won't have to answer all questions. Area 1 & 3 would be permanent, Area 2 will move people to the new visitor's center which is part of Phase 2. Area 4: The Indigenous cultural representation is still being determined and they need to collaborate with the Massachusetts tribe, who don't want to be considered as a culture of the past or located next to the 1930's structures, they want location 2 and 4 to create intentional distance. Area 5: Wayside graphics to share the environmental history of the local indigenous flora and fauna on the north shore.

Business Plan

Mr. Crounse stated that the business plan was submitted and completed by ConsultEcon between July 2022 through June 2023. They specialize in strategic business advisory services for museums, visitor attractions and heritage tourism. The business plan includes a summary of project goals, evaluation of current and future sites, and visions for the future site, market evaluation, market analysis, analysis of current operations, business plan for the relocated Village, and its economic sustainability.

Current Operations

Operational from June through October. Hours: Saturday & Sunday from 12-4PM. The visitors will stay approximately 30 min, although many want to see the house from Hocus Pocus, while some explore the rest of the village on their own. Fiscal year 2022 attendance: 10,000 total visitors where 7,000 took the self-guided tour and 3,000 during October events. Fiscal year 2023 attendance: 16,200 total visitors, 12,200 took the self-guided tour and 4,000 during October events.

Operating Opportunities at Relocated Site

To expand the operating season from April to Thanksgiving weekend, 7 day per week operations from the summer through October, weekends in Spring and November, increased ticket pricing, increase length of visitor stay, host larger events, significantly increase attendance (targeting 28,000 or more annually), and earned revenues from ticket sales and retail.

Ms. Kelleher stated that several months prior MHC asked the Commission to make a determination on whether Pioneer Village was eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and they found the Village to be eligible. The Mayor and project team are in support of the property being listed, and the City has operated as if Pioneer Village was eligible since the conception of this project, including its relocation. The City has followed the Secretary of Interior Standards, would keep the village in current orientation, would move as many buildings as possible to the other site, and keep the buildings intact and not dismantling them when possible. The City is supportive of maintaining the National Register eligibility despite the potential flooding impacts and they are currently seeking a proposal from a qualified preservation consultant to continue the nomination process.

Project Schedule

Mr. Crounse noted that originally, they hoped to complete the village relocation by 2026, and they would have liked that to have been the goal, but the 18-month demo delay may make that not possible. They currently want Phase 1 to occur before 2026 and will meet with MHC and other entities and boards to discuss next steps. They will provide an updated schedule.

Chair Spang stated that the business plan does not include capital investment costs and he asked if that will that happen off the books, since no operational expenditures were included. He noted that the report speaks more towards goals and opportunities and asked if they would use the business to support capital costs for construction. Mr. Crounse replied no, Phase 1 will not be supported by Pioneer Village, signature parks fund, and other grants and funding sources. They will pursue other funding for Phase 2.

Chair Spang asked if the overall budget for the project was provided. Mr. Crounse replied that the current budget requires updating and moving more or all of the structures means that the relocation budget will change. The original budget from 2020 for Phase 1 included relocation and had some overlap, now there is a separate relocation budget, and it is even older. The project team will provide an updated budget. Mr. Genter stated that the early budget may not have been included in early presentations. Mr. Crounse noted that they will include the Camp Naumkeag building in their new budget. Chair Spang stated that they cannot anticipate Phase 2 visitor center numbers. Mr. Genter replied that that information hasn't been shared with the Commission.

Chair Spang requested the plan for the existing Pioneer Village site and asked if anything had been presented about how to leave that site. Mr. Genter replied that the thought has shifted overtime, the more they can move the better, they will move 5 historic cottages, ticket booth, dugouts, the wigwam is in poor condition, but they can retain pieces and possibly reconstruct part of it within the visitors center rather than rebuilt it entirely. He noted that the visitor's center is now a maintenance shed that would not be moved.

Chair Spang noted that no plans for what would happen to the landscape at the original Village site have been presented. Mr. Crounse noted that Elizabeth Peterson has ideas that are still being discussed, such as some demarcation to note what was once there and where it is now, or as classroom space.

Board Questions

Mr. Joyce noted that future maintenance and upkeep at the new site was not included, and he asked if that would be the city's responsibility. Mr. Crounse replied that it would fall under the city's capital Pioneer Village budget under Parks & Rec., that funds would come from and a request for funds above and beyond what would be made to the City Council. Sometimes they must wait for the expert to have availability in their schedule before work can be completed. Chair Spang clarified that the relocated structures would be maintained like any other city building and

that is not part of the current business plan. Mr. Crounse stated that the current budget will need to change based on the new location. Ms. Kelleher noted that Elizabeth Peterson is spearheading this project but wasn't available to attend tonight's meeting.

Mr. Meche asked whether project proponents don't want to save the camp because it will require funds they don't have to spend. He noted that in an earlier presentation there was some conversation about incorporating Camp Naumkeag history onto the site and he asked if the camp history would be erased by this relocation. Mr. Kirchman replied that there is no intent to erase the camp or history of the site before the camp. There is a large interest in interpreting the broadest sense of the history of the site from the first settlement of the site to the fresh air tuberculosis camp, to the current camp. Mr. Meche asked if the entire camp would go away. Mr. Crounse replied that that is the current intent based on the cost and structures report. Chair Spang asked if there was a schedule for demolition at this time. Mr. Crounse replied no and estimated that if photo documentation and report was completed by PAL by end of 2023, demolition could be scheduled for the spring of 2024, but anything could change between now and then. Mr. Genter asked if given their condition whether the city would try to demolish them sooner rather than later. Mr. Crounse replied that they will review the safety concerns outlined in PAL's before making that determination.

Public Comment:

Chair Spang reiterated to the public that the Commission has no legal jurisdiction to vote given the demolition delay has passed as of today. Discussions between the Building Inspector and City Solicitor determined that the relocation of the Pioneer Village buildings is not considered demolition, so a demolition delay waiver is not required.

Christopher Patzke, Lafayette Street. Salem residents deserve more from their government than unnecessary meetings in a remote fashion, it's ironic and a deliberate move that the demolition delay clock runs out today, which is despicable and says a lot about the project, leadership, and this Commission. He challenged the demolition delay opinion, since the ordinance is clear that the removal is part of demolition, and Salem's former mayor stated in the Project Notification Form (PNF) that demolition was part of the project, and he's willing to get a coalition to litigate. No alternate plans have been presented to keep the site intact and in situ, which is the intent of the demolition delay. There has been no response to the violation of preservation standards. The Secretary of the Interior Standards has not been replaced by flood mitigation standards as what has been deceptively presented, in fact the flood mitigation has been wholesale ignored. There has been no review of the seawall at Pioneer Village, which was built lower than the previous seawall, and this project was built on that lie. The interpretation plan is vague at best, with no interpretation for the built environment, including architecture and landscape, no discussion of period significance, period of interpretation. He reiterated that the project violates the prohibition on creating a false narrative on the sense of development by destroying the Camp Naumkeag cultural landscape and putting Pioneer Village into the Camp Naumkeag cultural landscape, which is problematic for the interpretation of Fort Lee. The project has been presented as adding to the interpretation of all three historic places, which is either gross ignorance of preservation standards or a clear deception, and he personally feels that it is both. This project will not improve the history of either site, it will destroy the integrity of all three, which is despicable and shameful. The operations analysis is a joke, Pioneer Village has been neglected for years but the business plan relies on drastically different than what currently exists. He remains the proponent for the National Register nomination, and he has no agreement to release the appeal. MHC has instructed the Keeper to work with him specifically and he has received no communication from the City in this regard. He asked how often the practice of the Historical Commission to have a proponent dictate what materials should be submitted for review by the Commission. He asked how often a proponent is allowed to purposely misrepresent and dictate how the Secretary of the Interior Standards and Guidelines, flood mitigation guidelines, and precedence are interpreted and applied to the projects they bring before

the Commission. The entire situation is shameful, and all involved should be ashamed of themselves, the City, the Commission, and the project team. Their actions are disgusting and there are a lot of angry people in Salem right now.

Chair Spang stated that this is a unique project, condition and situation, and he doesn't see a way to address Mr. Patzke's two questions, although he understands his consistent concerns about the project and appreciates the input.

Beth Anne Cornell. School committee member who supported the plan to relocate the Pioneer Village to Camp Naumkeag and hopes the Commission does the same. The move will give the Salem YMCA the ability to lease more space at Forest River Park and provide a more robust summer camp experience for the most vulnerable Salem public school students, low-income, immigrant children, and English language learners. The YMCA provides financial assistance to ensure every child has access to a camp experience, regardless of economic status. She hopes the City of Salem will continue to support these efforts to enrich the lives of children swimming lessons, sports, playgrounds, and clean beaches, and the Pioneer Village space could allow the YMCA to expand their programming and promote environmental stewardship, sustainability, and possibly extending that into the school year. The Camp site can't provide the backdrop for transformative experience Salem children have at the current Harbor Quest site right now. The children also deserve permanent bathrooms rather than the temporary tents and spaces designed for them rather than the temporary toilet rooms that the YMCA has made do with the past couple of years. Regarding the relocation, there have been references to Colonial Revival movement of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. As a graduate degree in American Studies and a teacher of history at Wentworth for 20-years, and she cautioned the Colonial Revival movement which saw the creation of these types of sites, was not completely benign. The revival sought to romanticize the "Pioneer Experience," which was for a Protestant Anglican that embraces nationalism, nativism, and an ideal of a shared American origin story. This effort fueled by White Americans negative reactions to the influx of French-Canadian, Eastern and Southern European immigrants to the U.S. at the beginning of the 20th century. In their view, these professed descendants of first New Englanders felt threatened by the political and cultural standing of the new immigrants. Out of respect of those immigrants that made Salem their home at this time, she cautioned invoking Colonial Revivalism as an argument for protecting Salem's history, particularly if doing so diminishes the experience of contemporary Salemites, in this case Salem children, many of whom are Black, Brown, and immigrants, who would have embodied the threats to nativism and Americanism that the Colonial Revivalism sought to suppress.

Cindy Jerzylo, 17 Bayview Avenue. Noted that Camp Naumkeag is on City land, and she asked if Phase 1 area below the playground was on Willow Park or City land. Mr. Meche believed both were not part of tidal park land. Mr. Genter understanding was that both are City parcels. Ms. Kelleher agreed neither is part of the Willows Park. Ms. Jerzylo raised concerns with parking spaces, of which she counted only 7, and noted that vehicles park along Memorial Drive when The Willows is full. She asked if bathrooms will be provided. She asked whether the historic Fort Lee site, where many vagrants encampments are located, will be cleaned up, and noted that the site is being ignored and should be looked at first before the city spends money on another project that they will not take care of. Chair Spang also questioned the parking and toilet rooms. Mr. Genter replied that the Visitor's Center will have toilets and noted the parking recommendation in the business plan to try to possibly double the parking plan. They anticipate off-site parking being utilized and people walking to the Village and noted that the closest parking lot is frequently full or there is one on the opposite side of Fort Lee. He noted that their intent was to rely on that parking lot or the school parking lot, although they recognize that it is an issue during high season. Chair Spang requested their interim toilet room strategy since the visitor center is in Phase 2. Mr. Genter replied that temporary facilities will be located on site until the visitor's center is built. Ms. Kelleher added that Fort Lee is an underappreciated historic site, it has been part of the conversation for the new Village to incorporate and highlight its history. She noted that the City has not been successful in obtaining funding to restore Fort Lee to date but they

will continue to pursue funding sources. She highlighted all of the work the neighborhood and Boy Scouts have done to try and restore the historic site.

Deb L'Horty, 36 Barr Street. A 6th generation resident in Salem. She has enjoyed her visits to Pioneer Village for years and was disappointed to see a storage shed next to historic buildings, is terrible and embarrassing. Mr. Crounse replied that the shed was leased to the YMCA and questions about its use should be directed to Parks & Recreation. Both parties have added a barrier between the two spaces, but he agreed that the two structures are next to each other.

Jessica Herbert, 70 Webb Street. The February e-mail answered some of her questions regarding the demolition delay process. No budget for keeping the Village in situ was provided and she asked if one would be provided. Mr. Genter replied that they have not been asked to provide a budget for keeping the village in the current location. Ms. Herbert noted that that's one of the parts of demolition delay, or moving, or demolishing the structures. She believed that should have needed to prove they couldn't keep the structures in place. She asked how much of the consultant budget had been spent to date, noting that during Margaret Wood's presentation in February, the amount spent was believed to have been \$200,000. She noted that the operating budget didn't determine whether the project, which has been in the works for over 3-years, would be viable or profitable. She noted that Elizabeth Peterson discussed putting a classroom on the site for the YMCA and with water mitigation being a concern she questioned how building on the Pioneer Village campus would be achievable. Parking is a huge problem and one strategy to be developed would be improving visitor experience by their willingness to walk the distance, to provide parking at far off sites, using ride shared services, bikes, or a possible shuttle service. The business plan stated that there will be no physical constraints to impede visitors to the Village such as major construction, while at the same time there will be construction of 120 units of housing at Fort Lee Terrace, the wind turbine campus at the same time, providing significant traffic and construction delays on nearby streets. She wished they had more time to look at it, but it appears to be fair accompli. To spend this kind of money, more investigation should have been completed and presented for public review. This should have occurred during the 18-month demolition delay period and there should have been deadlines for reports early on. There are too many loose ends, and they don't know if it will be profitable or an improvement.

Frank Kulik. Works various jobs for the city and was an Assessor for 27-years. He believes in representative government, and he doesn't see it happening. He only sees a small portion of the city making a determination on the oldest living history museum in the country. Pioneer Village has been part of his life since he was child, and he has seen it prosper. In 1994 they brought a shallop and beached it on the site which was a wonderful experience. There is no room for growth at the camp site, and there is ledge on one side so early settlers wouldn't have been interested in a location like that. Pioneer Village is closer to what they would have looked for when they stopped. Christopher Patzke website, Saving Our Heritage. Many citizens have roots at the village, it is a great place but looks as though the City isn't taking care of it or marketing it property like Plymouth Plantation. He urged the Commission to look at the site and be advocates for history. This is more than a cold move; this has emotional aspects to it and memories that mean something, especially when lost, and he would hate to see the village leave.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the following comment letters were received:

- Historic Salem, Inc. (HSI) dated July 17, 2023. HSI questioned the business plan, whether the same strategies can be used at the current location, and whether the city considered using funding for the relocation to invest in the current site. They asked if the city would use tax exempt bond which will require an MHC review, the city has reached out to MHC, which to date has declined to consult on the project. The city is waiting to submit a

new PNF, until it was determined that all the buildings would be relocated from Pioneer Village. Not that that is the case, the PNF will be updated and resubmitted to MHC. They asked if the City would commit to not demolishing any structures until all determinations have been made or an alternative plan has been proposed.

- Donna Seger, Salem State University. Questioned the historical rationale for the new site location and whether it was more appropriate to keep the structures at the original site. She asked if there was a plan to connect the new site to Fort Lee or Fort Pickering, which she will provide a future comment letter on. She asked if there were any credentialed historians consulting on the project, including recognized scholars of Native American history and culture, 17th century Atlantic World and/or American Revolution. She asked if they would include the Colonial Revival movement and who was in charge of Salem heritage. Since the Commission voted to recommend Pioneer Village for inclusion on the National Register, she asked what the implications are for the project with a proposal to remove the structures, given the environmental threats if criteria to meet.
- Email from Christopher Patzke regarding the violations to Sec. of Interior Standards that were brought up previously and during public comment.

Board Discussion

Chair Spang stated that it was disappointing that there has been marginal input from the City in the past 18 months, they've received minimal information as the public has expressed wanting to hear more but they've continued to be ignored. There is no plan for what will happen to Forest River Park once the structures are relocated, although a comment from School Committee member was received tonight regarding providing additional recreational space for Salem students. Questions regarding future use are something they ask of other projects they review. The Camp Naumkeag site hasn't received much new details, the visitor's center was estimated at \$1M but they should use one a second buildings (estimated at \$350-400K) as the restrooms, which could serve both purposes and be more interesting, but that still hasn't been considered. He noted that the proponents aren't making decisions, so the Commission should speak with the new administration. The evolution of the presentations has been piecemeal, episodic, and incomplete. Mr. Meche and Mr. Joyce agreed.

Mr. Joyce noted that there has been minimal creative thought by the City which has been creative with its history in the past. Preserving as much as possible should be the main concern and this project still needs a lot of thought. The Commission has done what it can with demolition delay and finding the Village eligible for listing in the National Register. Chair Spang noted that the primary reason to consider moving the village is to protect the historic resources from flooding which is an important consideration since it is a vulnerable site. The storms have already caused damage, there should be a way to preserve and protect, but many pieces haven't been addressed, including interpretation or what will be left at the site. Camp Naumkeag hasn't been further thought through or how to repurpose the site and its robust history.

Mr. Martinez stated that the proposed stretch of the timeline is a disappointment since the goal was 2026 for Salem 400th anniversary. They don't have funding secured for phase 2 yet and with no plan for betterment this is the worst-case scenario. He noted that round 2 funding not being secured is not ideal. Mr. Crounse replied that funding is in place for Phase 1, which includes moving the structures. The demolition delay and 18 months of work has eaten into that money for design so there will be additional grant funds needed to meet the costs, however, estimates were done previously, and some funding was in place prior to that. Mr. Martinez was pleased to hear there is some funding in place.

Ms. Tyler-Lewis agreed that the threat of flooding can't be minimized given the toll of storms in recent years, but it doesn't seem sustainable to preserve Pioneer Village on site. What makes the village special is more than the sum of the buildings and they created a transition into the past which is more remarkable because of the setting. She

asked about how much for that unique natural landscape would be recreated at the new site. There were references to screening, but it would have been nice to see landscaping design that captures the feel of the old site, compared to the current plan that was achieved overtime. Mr. Kirchman noted that the original built site was in an open field and the current growth was overtime. He encouraged everyone to review the RFP.

Chair Spang suggested the Commission craft a letter to the mayor with the concerns of the Commission and the public, and to either schedule a meeting with the mayor or invite the mayor to a Commission meeting. The Commission agreed.

1 Forrester Street

Joshua and Jennifer MacGregor requested to amend Certificate of Appropriateness for new fencing

Mr. Martinez recused himself at an abutter.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/28/23
- Photographs

Joshua MacGregor was present to discuss the project.

Mr. MacGregor suggested installing the fence style of another house or a paneled privacy fence, since the quotes received for what they wanted to do were from \$53 - \$80,000, and more than they can spend. He quoted a fence like the Narbonne House and the Derby House with open pickets and concealed posts, which was reasonable, and the gate would remain in the same location.

Chair Spang asked whether the quote was generic or an exact match. Mr. MacGregor replied that they sent photos of both fences when they requested prices.

Mr. Joyce requested fence details. Mr. MacGregor replied that the proposed is a cedar fence painted to match the color of the house. Mr. Joyce requested that they ensure the posts are hidden, matching the picket spacing, details, and noted the visibility of the hardware at the gate. Mr. MacGregor welcomed a consultation with someone from the Commission to confirm details. Mr. Joyce agreed to consult.

Ms. Kelleher noted the new Design Guidelines list the proposed fence as an appropriate fence style. Chair Spang agreed and noted that this fence would be at the rear of the property and not prominent where a more ornate fence would be appropriate. Mr. Joyce agreed.

Public Comment:

Christopher Patzke. Clarified that the baseball field at Pioneer Village was a pre-existing condition on the 1921 plan. He forward a lot of information regarding the seawall between Pioneer Village and the ocean that was built 18-inches lower than the previous seawall using \$1.2M in public funds grant, when the mayor is quoted in the Salem News stating that it would be higher and offer more protection, after she asked FEMA to change the flood maps. In order to be real about Pioneer Village, the facts should be respected and listened to. He added that the house at 1 Forrester Street is beautiful, and the fence will make a nice addition.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to approve the amendment with the new design to match the side yard of the Derby House, painted to match the trim color, and Mr. Joyce to review the details. Tyler-Lewis seconded.

Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, Tyler-Lewis, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Martinez rejoined the meeting.

Other Business:

Ms. Kelleher to coordinate a site visit to 57 Warren Street.

Ms. Kelleher to coordinate a site visit at 1 Pickering Street to review the brick wall. The owner wants to explore an alternative rather than rebuilding the monumental wall, which a car recently hit and caused even more damage, and \$250,000 was the cheapest estimate received. She felt a consultation with the Commission was best to let the applicant know what the Commission would be open to seeing prior to investing in drawings. Chair Spang considered leaving the wall in place until the construction market stabilizes but raised concerns with the Building Departments thoughts it given its proximity to the sidewalk. In his opinion, its removal and being replaced by a fence would be unfortunate. Ms. Kelleher noted the applicant's willingness to salvage part of the wall and raised concerns about what threshold would be appropriate. Chair Spang requested historic photos or documentation of what existed prior to the construction of the brick wall.

Mr. Meche noted his appreciation for Chair Spang and Ms. Tyler-Lewis' eloquent comments related to Pioneer Village. Chair Spang appreciated the Colonial Revival comments made by public commenter, Beth Anne Cornell. Ms. Kelleher noted that several members of the Massachusetts Tribe were present at the tonight's meeting.

Adjournment

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

The meeting ended at 9:05PM

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen Brewster
Historical Commission Clerk