

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
July 20, 2022

A regular meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, July 20, 2022, at 6:00 pm. **VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING.** Present were: Jamie Graham, Milo Martinez, Mark Meche, Vijay Joyce, Mark Pattison, Larry Spang. Staff: Patti Kelleher. Not present: Reed Cutting, Rebecca English.

262 Lafayette Street Unit 2– continuation

Justine Klosky submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/26/22
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant asked to withdraw without prejudice.

**VOTE: Martinez made a motion to approve withdrawal without prejudice. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Joyce, Meche, Pattison, Graham, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

St. Peter's Church- continuation

St. Peter's Church requested a review of Community Preservation Act funded project

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: n/a
- Photographs

Bill Yuhas was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Yuhas stated that a sketch and material descriptions were provided after the Commission's site visit. The 3 over 6 window sits in the granite opening and will have wood trim to match the existing church windows above. They estimate that the window is 4'-3/4" wide x 3'-9" high, but the contractor will confirm all dimensions prior to fabrication. The replacement frame will be fabricated with composite wood for longevity and with simulated divided lites with a hand painted finished. The original paint color is difficult to determine, so Forest Green paint color is proposed. The existing heavy iron rails would be removed, and the new window will eliminate the need for a storm window.

Chair Spang asked if the windows were at grade. Mr. Yuhas replied yes since the existing windows are in bad shape the goal to provide a custom-made window to match the original windows as closely as possible.

Mr. Pattison asked if the 8 over 8 configuration was original. Mr. Yuhas replied no, it was an Andersen window that may have been installed in the 1950's. The previous replacement window was not an in-kind match the original design. Mr. Pattison asked if the window moulding/casing profile could be replicated with an interior beaded edge at interior of molding rather than a sharp edge with a flat sill. Mr. Yuhas replied that the grooved area is weathered but they can measure a window frame in better condition to use in their final design.

Mr. Meche asked if the SHC was being asked for design recommendations or to support the application only. Ms. Kelleher replied that CPA funding requires the applicant adhere to Secretary of Interior Standards so the SHC must review the proposed detail, since the SHC will be the holder of the Preservation Restriction as part of the comment.

The applicant can be asked to find a more appropriate detail. Mr. Meche appreciated the intent and wanting to recreate what existed, and although the applicant is on the right path, the accuracy is unknown.

Mr. Joyce suggested including language in their recommendation stating that the trim detail should match existing. Mr. Pattison raised concerns with the use of an inaccurate 1950's detail.

Mr. Yuhas stated that flat trim on other windows has a cove moulding and many of the windows were covered with plexiglass for protection. He suggested removing the Plexiglas on a window in better shape that hasn't been exposed to the weather to determine a more accurate detail. He noted that they will also restore the stained glass and window frames, and suggested an alternate window manufacturer, such as Marvin Wood Ultimate and applying custom trim to match the church.

Chair Spang agreed that more investigation is needed to determine the final details. Mr. Yuhas noted that an okay is needed to move forward, and he can return with a refined trim detail.

Chair Spang requested information on exactly where this window is located within the stone opening that may have a caulked joint at the perimeter. Mr. Yuhas replied that the joint is presently filled with cement, the window is set in deep into the opening and that position within the opening will be replicated. He will provide head, jamb, sill, and mullion details and noted that they may have put the window on cement to raise it up away from the grade, but they will continue to use crushed stone at grade to reduce splashing from rain.

Mr. Joyce suggested matching the existing paint color where the plexiglass is removed rather than using Forest Green.

Mr. Martinez suggested deputizing a Commission member to work with the application. Mr. Meche, Mr. Pattison, and Mr. Joyce agreed to work with the applicant.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE: Martinez made a motion to approve the concept with final details to be reviewed by the sub-committee. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Martinez, Meche, Pattison, Graham, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

***Due to an issue with public hearing notifications, the following applications will be continued to the next meeting of the Historical Commission on August 3, 2022.***

Ms. Kelleher noted that the staff in charge of posting did not post the agenda in time.

#### 21 Washington Square North

Nicholas Careau and Melissa Spadafore submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace garage roof

Ms. Kelleher stated that this application is for a garage where the applicant is proposing to install an composite slate roof that resembles slate.

#### 90 Federal Street

Francis Flaherty submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace roof

Ms. Kelleher stated that this applicant is proposing to remove existing slate and install asphalt shingles on the fourth side of the roof, and the remaining three sides of the roof were already replaced with asphalt.

143 Derby Street

Stefano Basso, SV Design submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate house and construct new free-standing building

Ms. Kelleher stated that Captain Dusty's has a new proposal to present.

Other Business:

- a. Meeting Minutes;

Continued to the following meeting.

- b. Other:

Ms. Kelleher stated that HSI doing their preservation awards and asked if any Commission members would like to review the applications. Mr. Joyce agreed to assist in their review.

9 Hawthorne: Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant removed vinyl siding, Mr. Martinez and Mr. Joyce reviewed the paint colors and that work has been completed. The owner is restoring paneling below the bay windows, but he didn't recreate some decorative window elements that were exposed you could see the ghost of/areas of missing paint that were removed with the siding was installed. She had a conversation with him and his response that that he could only install simple trim based on his budget but will try to add some of the missing brackets instead. Chair Spang replied that he thought that would have been reviewed by the Commission before he began the new work. Ms. Kelleher noted that applicant isn't required to install elements that were removed prior to the work they wish to start and now that it's been removed, there are no longer signs of the missing details to replicate. The applicant replicated the simple window moulding from the side of the house instead. Chair Spang presented photos he took several weeks earlier with the outline of what mouldings were previously in place, and the applicant said he would replicate the simple trim around the window which was consistent with what they spoke about at the meeting. Chair Spang noted that the Commission thought the proposed design was a replacement of what was there, where a more elaborate detail, that matches the house next door. Mr. Martinez asked if conditions were applied to the applicant's approval. Ms. Kelleher noted that the wording on the certificate does not specify to replicate trim on building next door or any details discovered during construction. Mr. Martinez believed that specifics were needed.

Chair Spang felt that the Commission should have reviewed the details. Mr. Meche agreed with Chair Spang regarding the Commission's intent, they approved picture rail moulding as a treatment to install where it existed, but other areas of trim weren't removed originally, and the Commission may not be able to compel an applicant to reinstall details that have been missing for years. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission didn't have power to request removal of vinyl siding that the applicant originally wanted to paint, but the applicant agreed to remove and restore the façade. Ms. Kelleher believed applicant should restore the details of the front windows that had details that weren't apparent. Chair Spang replied that since it wasn't specifically called out, there needs to be a Commission decision when there is a difference in the intent vs. what was discovered during construction. Ms. Kelleher noted that how unfortunate it is to lose the ghosts of the previously removed trim on buildings. Chair Spang suggested asking the applicant to return and state his case to the Commission.

Mr. Joyce noted that band moulding will be installed, and the Commission wanted to review it. Ms. Kelleher replied that it may already be installed. Three certificates were provided: 1) Remove vinyl siding and trim, to paint, 2) replace the windows with Harvey Majesty with a final determination of color, trim details, and installation

method to be approved by the Commission prior to installation, and 3) to shorten a rear window. Chair Spang noted that the windows were approved so the applicant could place the order and once the siding was removed the details would be reviewed and the applicant may have been asked to provide details. Mr. Joyce remembered the window trim being discussed but there was no release to allow the installation. Mr. Pattison didn't believe the Commission can force the application to install what was revealed in the shadows that were exposed. Ms. Kelleher stated that she adds plans to the certificate to trace the design intent. Ms. Graham noted that photographic evidence of structure makes the case for what details to restore, the details surround the front window should be replicated, but she's also torn. Mr. Pattison agreed. Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant was filling in voids at the bay and it is unknown how the windowsills have been modified.

Mr. Meche suggested that for future applications, the details lost could be identified for the next applicant to use as a goal for future restoration. Chair Spang noted that a Google image from 2020 shows details that were lost before the applicant applied for a certificate. Ms. Kelleher noted that the window shutters also weren't mentioned in previous discussions. Ms. Graham asked if historic photos are referenced when a window replacement was proposed. Chair Spang replied that trim details would have been reviewed and details requested. Ms. Meche noted that no one was deputized to review the details and the Commission is entitled to follow-up on that. Informal discussions are okay with homeowners, but developers should provide more details. Ms. Graham requested elevation drawings. Ms. Kelleher noted that no architect associated with this project which many be part of the problem when it comes to details. Ms. Graham raised concerns with replicating details eating into the developer's profit. Mr. Meche suggested the applicant may have been convinced that removal the vinyl would be more attractive to a prospective homeowner.

Ms. Kelleher to send Certificate #2 to the applicant and request that he attend the next meeting since SHC approval was required prior to window installation. Chair Spang agreed and requested to the applicant explain how the project progressed. Ms. Kelleher noted the importance of encouraging the removal of vinyl, but once it's removed the Commission should be notified to review the exposed site conditions since the siding can hide details that can be recreated. Mr. Meche noted that the Commission was aiming to match the building next door and the window details may not be finalized. Chair Spang stated that a long step forward was taken with the removal of the vinyl siding.

Executive Session: To review and comment on proposal received by and for the Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance for the disposition of Salem State University South Campus at 8, 11, 20-32 Harrison Road and 262 Loring Avenue because an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the public body.

Roll call vote to adjourn to Executive Session. Chair will determine whether Open Session will or will not reconvene at the conclusion of the Executive Session.

VOTE: Martinez motion to move to executive session and to not reconvene the regular meeting. Seconded by: Pattison. Roll Call: Joyce, Martinez, Meche, Pattison, Graham, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

The executive session began at 7:15PM

The executive session began at 7:50PM

Adjournment

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to adjourn executive session. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Martinez, Meche, Pattison, Graham, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted, Patti Kelleher Preservation Planner