

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
August 3, 2022

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, August 3, 2022 at 6:00PM via **Zoom Virtual Meeting**. Present were: Larry Spang (Chair), Vijay Joyce, Mark Pattison, Mark Meche, Rebecca English, Jamie Graham. Staff: Patti Kelleher. Not present: Reed Cutting, Milo Martinez.

Brief Update on Virtual Meetings

Each city board has discretion over continuing to conduct virtual or in-person meetings. The Historical Commission meetings will remain virtual until further notice.

9 Hathorne Street—continued discussion

Greg Davis submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for building modifications.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/29/22
- Slideshow/photographs

Greg Davis was present to discuss ongoing issues with the project. The trim and window installation previously approved were discussed. The trim that was on home upon purchase—a simple 1x6 border and historic sill—is being finished at present on exterior. Mr. Davis noted that window is set back from the sill 2' and 5/8"; the angle will not be changed nor will the trim. Chair Spang lauded the appearance of the building having removed siding to reveal original clapboards. Mr. Davis noted that HVAC installer is seeking rough inspections. Vents on the roof can be left as-is or painted to match or moved to back of home with a flat cover. Mr. Davis expressed preference for keeping vents on roof. Bathroom windows on right side of home (facing home from street) had not been in use by previous owners; plywood blocked off windows to conceal shower. Mr. Davis covered this area with clapboards, though wanted to address potential need to place trim around former window locations. Ms. Kelleher noted that the present discussion was meant to concern window installation, paint, trim detail, and installation method. Outstanding issues for discussion on 8/17 meeting windows on the side of the house (alterations made), vents on roof (for potential discussion during present meeting), and AC units on back of house. Chair Spang noted that a site visit would be needed barring the availability of detailed drawings of the windows. Mr. Davis noted that cedar pine would be used for the sill replacement to match sill on house next door. Mr. Meche clarified that finish-grade clear cedar pine would be used as opposed to something like fence lumber, which Mr. Davis affirmed. Chair Spang noted that an in-person visit would be required for entire installation: i.e. window, surround, sill, trim, and so forth. Mr. Davis noted that the windows on the right side of the house did not have trim around them upon purchasing the home, and the intent would not be to add these elements as part of the present project. Chair Spang elicited comments from the Commission regarding replacing items in-kind as opposed to restoring more ornate elements of window and trim. Mr. Joyce confirmed that this was the present scope and intent of the applicant. Chair Spang wondered if such scope of the project was appropriate in terms of maintaining historic appearance of house. Ms. Graham expressed reservations about requiring the applicant to incorporate elements into the renovation which were not present at the time of purchase. Chair Spang and Mr. Meche were dubious that the roof vents were HVAC vents, and were open to continuing discussion of these elements to following meeting for increased clarification. Chair Spang asked if members were comfortable with proposal of flatstock casing window set and trimmed out to match existing conditions in cased opening. Ms. Graham confirmed that

these could be approved pending site visit. Mr. Joyce added that specifics were to include sill horns featured in photograph that extend beyond trim in the way of appropriateness. Mr. Davis affirmed that this could be achieved in the same dimensions as shown in photograph. Ms. Kelleher showed extension of sill beyond trim board (which were removed when past siding was installed). Mr. Joyce asked if thickness of sill was known, which Mr. Davis did not have. Chair Spang asked Mr. Davis to confirm what the roof vent pipes' functions were, though applicant noted that a vent would likely be installed on back of house. Mr. Davis clarified to Mr. Meche and Chair Spang that the pipes on the roof are new rather than existing.

VOTE: Mr. Meche motioned to accept applicant's proposal to recreate new windows in existing cased openings to match sills, subject to confirmation of mockup of one installed window in the field, including sill horns, pitch, in the style of next door house's details. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Joyce, Pattison, English, Meche, Spang (abstained) were in favor and the motion so carried.

21 Washington Square North—continuation

David Corriveau submitted an application on behalf of owners Nicholas Careau and Melissa Spadafore to replace asphalt garage roof with synthetic slate shingles

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/27/22
- Slideshow/photographs

Nicholas Careau and Melissa Spadafore submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace garage roof. David Corriveau was present on behalf of the applicants as the project contractor. Slate roof would be replaced with composite slate-like material to match dimensions and colors of existing slate. Copper caps would be taken off and reused. Roof is rotted in the substructure. The goal would be to rip everything off, install ice and water shield, and replace roof with composite material. A couple colors of the slate would be used. Ms. Kelleher noted that the house had a slate roof in 2017-18 and underwent restoration with architectural shingles. At the time of this restoration, the garage did not undergo work. Chair Spang asked if the date of construction of garage was known. Ms. Kelleher estimated circa 1920s, not original to the property which dates to 1830s. A photograph of proposed shingles was shown. Chair Spang asked if this material had been approved in the past. Ms. Kelleher noted that a synthetic slate shingle had not been reviewed and approved in the past, though a synthetic wood shingle shake had been on Federal Street. Mr. Joyce noted that the material in question was made of rubber. Mr. Meche established that the structure can be seen from Washington Square as well as Williams Street. Mr. Joyce noted that the material is visually very close to architectural slate and preferred seeing the synthetic slate shingle placed for a visual inspection during an onsite visit. Mr. Meche inquired as to the present state of the roof shingles, which Mr. Corriveau noted yields leaks in the garage. Mr. Meche noted that the shingles removed may be salvaged for future use. Mr. Corriveau noted that work will commence pending approval from the Commission and stated that this product is one-third of the cost of slate. Mr. Corriveau noted that samples could be procured for inspection by the Commission. Mr. Meche remarked that this material is no less artificial than asphalt; looks better; unclear as to whether this is a "greener" option; and should be piloted somewhere, such as on this property. Ms. Kelleher noted that new Commission guidelines identify synthetic slate as a common replacement material which may be appropriate on a case-by-case basis. Chair Spang noted that the structure in

question and its location would pose ideal conditions for a synthetic slate shingle application. Chair Spang proposed that Ms. Kelleher be provided with samples of the material. Mr. Corriveau noted that dark and light “Arendale” colors would be used in alternating fashion. Mr. Corriveau did not recommend only using one color because of the appearance of artifice. Chair Spang proposed installing a quick mockup, though Mr. Corriveau noted that only a small sample could be procured until approval was gained to place order to cover the roof. Moynihan Lumber or Building Center would be used as supplier. Mr. Corriveau noted that samples could be placed on back of roof for inspection by the Commission. Mr. Joyce, Mr. Meche, and Ms. Graham volunteered to verify application of samples on a site visit.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce motioned to approve the application subject to verification of samples by Commissioners Meche, Joyce and Graham. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Joyce, Pattison, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

143 Derby Street—continuation

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/30/22
- Photographs
- Elevations plans and drawings by SV Designs

Mr. Basso was present. Project was approved by ZBA. Different developer and architect had previously proposed project on this site which had issues such as parking and discontinuity with fabric of neighborhood. Property location is on corner of Derby and Daniels Street. Parking was moved to Derby Street based on neighboring abutters’ concerns. Eclectic architecture in neighborhood was spoken to; a mix of Colonial, Victorian, Italianate, and commercial buildings. Desire for fitting in was articulated. Views from Derby Street and storefront of existing historic property were shown. A four-story brick building exists on other side of intersection. Parking lot was shown where buildings are intended to be built. The intended structures are flat-roof, multi-family-type buildings. More views of surrounding neighborhood were shown, as well as from the parking lot. A single-story addition was shown on existing building. Mr. Basso noted that parking lot is out of step with neighborhood at present. An historic atlas view was shown to demonstrate buildings had previously existed on the intended site. A site layout plan was shown showing objectives to: convert existing retail/apartment to unit; add new second floor addition over existing; add new addition behind Building A, identified as 4 Car Carport with Residential Unit over; add Building B to the right of Building A which showed three units (3 stories/30’) with garages adjacent to each. A site materials plan was also shown. An urban rowhouse-type feel was the intention, according to Mr. Basso. Parking and areas for planting were shown behind the property. A utility bumpout was available on a utilities plan. A section through Derby Street was shown (from north view). Natural cedar siding was planned for the addition on Building A. Building B was shown to have bay scheme for windows to complement rhythm and spacing of buildings. The approach was to utilize respectful and contextual detailing rather than to simply copy existing similar properties. Exterior building materials were shown for Building A, including architectural asphalt roof shingles; composite trim; Hardie Plank Lap siding, smooth with 4” exposure; in arctic white color; natural eastern white cedar shingle siding; clad double hung windows with simulated divided lite and historic sill. Mr. Basso offered to procure a muntin profile of the grill at a later meeting.

Views from the west, south, and east were shown of Building A's present conditions. Views from the west, south, and east were shown of Building B as well as intended exterior building walls including TPO roofing; composite trim; Hardie plan lap siding smooth w/5" exposure in a light mist color; Hardie shingle (boothbay blue), straight edge panel 5" exposure color; clad double hung windows with simulated divided lites and historic sill; matte white PVC railing system with colonial profile; 1x4 shadow board on 1x10 fascia; 5/4x6 flatstock corner boards; 1x3 shadow board on 1x8 fascia board; 5/4x5 flatstock casing; and 5/4x8 flatstock skirt board. Detailed profiles were shown as well as samples of intended materials (e.g. natural cedar shingle siding). Product exterior details were also shown for colonial entry doors, carriage-style garage doors, Victorian entry doors, and a bay window panel detail; as well as Hunter Green and Deep Indigo color swatches. A Victorian style was intended for the new construction in terms of window units and style. A Colonial style was intended for the addition on the existing building. A birds eye view of the property was also shown.

Chair Spang asked if the fence locations could be shown on site plan. A picket fence with plantings was shown at patio of existing building, and cedar board (4' tall) fence was shown to the right of the new building construction. Railing fences were also shown on roof decks of new building. Mr. Meche noted that fencing was not shown in west elevation drawing, which Mr. Basso noted was done for clarity. Mr. Meche asked if the new units were townhouses or flats, which Mr. Basso specified townhouses. Mr. Basso noted that first floor would house extra bedroom and bathroom; second floor would be main living area; and third floor would be guestroom and/or office and/or bathrooms. Chair Spang confirmed that the ZBA has approved the project. Mr. Meche questioned if a variance or special permit was granted from ZBA, to which Mr. Basso noted that the project had exceeded density. Ms. Kelleher noted that having two buildings on the lot likely necessitated a variance. Chair Spang noted that more detailed drawings would likely be necessary in the approval process, such as for the bay window panel detail for which an image of a separate property/project was shown. Mr. Joyce asked about height of building; specifically as to whether the proposed building matched or would exceed heights of neighboring buildings on Derby. Mr. Basso noted that the desire would be to reach the maximum zoning height allowed; approximately 35'. Chair Spang noted that the composite drawing showed 30', which Mr. Basso noted was correct and approved by ZBA. Mr. Meche asked if the first floor was in the floodplain, which Mr. Basso said no. Mr. Meche asked if driveway was at existing curb cut, which Mr. Basso noted would be a new curb cut/driveway. Mr. Meche was not keen on the patios in front of the new construction, opting rather to see front doors. Mr. Meche also expressed preference to see new structure decoupled from the existing property. Mr. Meche wanted to see alterations made to the Unit 1's placement/orientation on the corner of Derby and Daniel Streets. Mr. Joyce expressed preference to see a clearer welcome/entrance on the Derby side of the new building. Mr. Meche asked if roof decks could be seen from street and would prefer to see cable railing. Mr. Joyce lauded the project for using the forms and shapes from the surrounding area to inform new building construction: i.e. matching heights, not copying but creating similar typology of existing structures, etc.

Mr. Meche noted that the Hardee factory recently burned down in terms of Mr. Basso's efforts in seeking materials moving forward. A recent construction project was shown to demonstrate 5" clapboards intended for use at new Derby/Daniels Street construction.

Chair Spang noted that an eclectic mix of fences/fencing exist on Derby Street, including a 6' privacy fence, modern pickets, low fences with scalloping, etc. Chair Spang advised continued work and consideration of harmonizing between these properties' outward presence to the streetscapes that they will face, mainly in terms of location and content of yards/enclosed spaces behind fences. Mr. Basso was

amenable to altering the façade of Building B to place a door on the Derby Street-facing side to match other properties. Chair Spang requested street-level perspectives moving forward in the design process. Mr. Joyce requested section cuts to see depth of built-up layers such as panels under windows, knowing how far out cornices come, to offer sense of shadow lines from streetscape. Regarding dormers on new addition off Captain Dusty's building, Mr. Joyce proposed reducing mass to make less top-heavy from the street. The size of the structure takes over and is not subordinate to main house; which would not be historically appropriate. Further, Mr. Joyce proposed reducing to one window from the two shown in proposal drawings.

Ms. Graham questioned the approval process moving forward, if details would be approved in intervals. Chair Spang noted that Mr. Joyce was seeking more of a design development set of drawings. Ms. Graham noted that schematic-level considerations/proposed revisions should be prioritized for the sake of expediting the review and approval process; i.e. discussing if the patio terraces are to be removed (facing Daniels Street) prior to discussing more intricate details of the project.

Public comment:

Nina Faden, 27 Daniels St, liked the overall design, and had also spoken at ZBA meeting. Commission members gave voice to a lot of residents' feelings about the design. Many properties either have a fair amount of space to the door or their front door right on the sidewalk; noted it would be strange to walk down Daniels and suddenly see privacy fences. Expressed interest in knowing more about siding choices and window materials, as most neighboring properties are wood or brick. Overall, Ms. Faden complimented the project as quite nice.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce motioned to continue the application to the August 17 meeting. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Joyce, Pattison, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

7 Botts Court

Genevieve Sinha submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install chimney cap.

Ms. Kelleher reported that this request was issued a Certificate of Appropriateness under the minor change category after notification was sent to abutters and no objections were received. and was removed from the agenda.

90 Federal Street—continuation

Francis Flaherty submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace roof.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/23/22
- Photographs

Francis Flaherty was present as owner and spoke on behalf of co-applicant Cary Francis Cabot. The slate which was saved and repaired in 2019 had not been maintained and consequently led to water damage issues. At present 80% of roof is architectural shingle; past repairs have cost nearly \$6,000. Water

damage in front of home is occurring due to failing roof. The applicants would like to continue architectural shingle to front of house given that slate is failing and does not work. Ms. Kelleher noted that applicants received a CofA in 2018 to replace slate on side and rear roof slopes. Chair Spang noted that present application is to continue this work over the top of the roof and two dormers. Ms. Kelleher showed images featuring slate versus CertainTeed shingles. Mr. Meche questioned how the slate is performing on front door porch; which Ms. Flaherty noted was also replaced with architectural shingles.

Public comment:

David Hart, 104 Federal St, commended the owners for continuing front façade work. Asphalt shingles had been taken off years ago which enhances appearance of front façade. Existing slate roof is very prominent visually from both Federal St and Federal Ct. Noted the long-lasting features of slate roofs. Mr. Hart noted having done repairs to own home/roof in 1984 and worked with slate at significant cost. Advocated taking another look at continued use of existing slate.

David Sullivan, address unknown, expressed preference for maintaining slate or appearance of slate on roof.

Ms. Flaherty expressed appreciation for Mr. Hart's comments though noted that continued work with slate had already been attempted. Ms. Flaherty also noted having consulted with neighbors and found that many had replaced slate with architectural shingles. Mr. Meche noted that if slate are not cracking and falling away, another culprit is likely responsible for water leaking and damage issues. Ms. Flaherty responded that pieces of slate *are* cracking and falling away from roof. Ms. Graham asked if a report was available indicating where leaking was occurring. Ms. Flaherty noted that issues were in the flashing and that third-floor bedrooms had experienced water damage.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce motioned to continue the application to August 17 meeting in order to conduct site visit in the interim. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Joyce, Pattison, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

90 Federal Street

Francis Flaherty submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace gutters.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/23/22
- Photographs

Ms. Flaherty proposed installing square rather than round downspouts and using aluminum rather than wood due to prohibitive pricing. Ms. Kelleher noted that K-style aluminum would be used. Ms. Kelleher exhibited photos of existing conditions which showed a variety of gutters at property, making it difficult to determine if building originally had gutters. Mr. Joyce wanted to focus in on integrated gutters which were surmised to be in a state of disrepair prior to Flaherty's ownership. The ends of the gutters should be incorporated into the cornice and are not at present, Mr. Joyce pointed out. Mr. Meche noted that wood gutters are not ideal. Chair Spang proposed a site visit to look at both gutters and roofing. Mr. Joyce also wanted to see ongoing water damage and leaks to clearly determine source of issues.

VOTE: Ms. English motioned to continue the application to August 17 meeting in order to conduct site visit in the interim. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Joyce, Pattison, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

82 Derby Street

Michael Shea submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness regarding paint colors.

Documents & Exhibits:

- Application: 7/11/22
- Photographs
- Paint chips

Mr. Shea was present on the call. The applicant recently purchased and desired to paint building given that appearance is in need of refreshing. Ms. Kelleher could not find record in file of existing colors other than antique white and beige. The proposed colors were Benjamin Moore “Templeton Gray” for body and Benjamin Moore “Simply White” for the trim. Chair Spang questioned if the material was brick, which Mr. Shea noted was brick on the main building and clapboards on rear ell. Brick had been painted by previous owner. Chair Spang speculated that moisture was driving through the paint and pushing sections of paint off the building. Chair Spang noted that paint removal from brick was precarious and could result in damaging the brick. Ms. Kelleher questioned what constitutes the trim on this particular structure. Chair Spang noted that any features other than brick would likely constitute trim on the property. Mr. Joyce proposed two avenues: the first would be a Federal color scheme, though brick building would not have been painted in this era. Second route would be if this was painted, it would have been done in the late Victorian era which offered more of a wide-open palette and set of options. Mr. Joyce did not find the main body color inappropriate but proposed an off white color rather than the proposed Simply White. Mr. Shea was amenable to painting entire structure in one color. Mr. Joyce noted that the main property and the ell addition could be painted in different colors, if the applicant so desired. Mr. Meche noted that colors should be considered in the context of the “Laundry” sign affixed to the property. Ms. Graham clarified that the “Laundry” sign is black at present. Ms. Graham questioned if the intent would be to paint the door the same color as the body of the house, which Mr. Shea confirmed (i.e. gray in color with white trim). Mr. Meche clarified that the door in question is aluminum, which Mr. Shea confirmed (i.e. aluminum with glass). Ms. Graham agreed with Mr. Joyce that seeing the paint applied in-person with swatches would be preferable. Ms. Graham proposed keeping with the colors presented, or perhaps one step lighter than the gray proposed. Mr. Shea noted that three residential units and one commercial space feature in the property in response to Mr. Meche’s inquiry. Chair Spang did not mind altering to darker hue and expressed favor as to altering clapboard portion. Mr. Meche noted that many applicants use an accent color on the door. Mr. Joyce was also a fan of altering the color of the door, as well as painting the main building and rear ell different colors. Mr. Joyce wanted to see swatches in-person rather than discussing paint colors on a virtual platform. Mr. Joyce and Ms. Graham volunteered to work with Mr. Shea onsite to refine color selection.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce motioned to continue the application to allow time for Commission members to advise applicant on paint colors. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Joyce, Pattison, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

394 Essex Street

Aaron Samuel Ross submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace siding.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant had submitted an additional request and both applications were advertised for the August 17, 2022 meeting.

15 Beckford Street

Robert and Lorraine Salter submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install rear shed and fence.

Documents & Exhibits:

- Application: 7/14/22
- Photographs

Mr. Salter was on the call and noted the need to contain two dogs in backyard upon having recently purchased the home. The applicant added the need to build containment fence along driveway/parking area, as well as a shed to house lawn maintenance items. Ms. Kelleher raised the issue of visibility from public way, which Mr. Salter noted would be minimal. 14' by 8' deep shed was proposed by applicant, double windows facing parking area, double doors on one side, single door on other. An Eastern shed was proposed, specifically the Chateau. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Chateau has a shallower roof. Mr. Salter noted having moved the doors to another side so as to avoid interfering with parking. Mr. Salter proposed a concrete-footed aluminum fence. Chair Spang highlighted the need to confirm visibility of fence, especially modern styles that do not appear historic. Ms. Kelleher noted that the edge of the shed could be seen from Beckford Street. Mr. Joyce clarified that one would need to go through the fence to get to the shed. Mr. Salter noted that an easement exists to share driveway with 17 Beckford. Mr. Meche clarified that other sides of the property are already fenced, which Mr. Salter confirmed. Ms. Kelleher demonstrated that the fence could not be seen from Beckford Street, though may be visible from Federal Street albeit vegetation and existing fences may serve as screens at present. Mr. Meche demonstrated that only existing fencing could be seen from Federal Street by way of Google Earth streetviews; and was of the mind that the applicant's request regarding the fence qualified for a Certificate of Non-Applicability.

Discussion shifted to the proposed shed. Chair Spang mentioned a similar application for a shed on Orne Square that had used an Aspen style with a more pronounced roofline than the Chateau, which was shallower as Ms. Kelleher had already pointed out. Only the corner would be seen, not the gable side. Chair Spang proposed that the applicant consider an Aspen style rather than a Chateau, which Mr. Salter was amenable to pending inspection of price difference.

Public comment:

David Sullivan, co-associate owner of 113 Federal Street, who owns shed abutting proposed shed at 15 Beckford. 2/3 of Federal shed can be seen from Beckford. Expressed logistical and vista concerns about seeing shed placed in close proximity to their shed.

A letter was shown from Robert Lindeman of 113B Federal Street addressing concerns, such as the setback of the proposed shed, lack of clarity regarding the height of the proposed shed, allowing ample space between the sheds to carry out maintenance, as well as the potential need for a small fence between the two sheds to contain pets. An additional email was shown from Michael Williamson at 13 Beckford Street expressing full support of the project.

Ms. Kelleher noted the zoning requirement that a shed must be set back from the property 5'. Chair Spang noted that shed sitting on the asphalt would be worth checking with installers to ensure a proper look of the shed once installed. Mr. Meche and Mr. Salter established that floor joists and decking would feature as part of the shed. Mr. Salter noted that the double doors would be facing neighbors at 17 Beckford. Chair Spang confirmed that color and roof materials would match the house; the roof being black asphalt. Mr. Joyce questioned if the door and trim of shed would also match the house, which Mr. Salter confirmed (door being black, trim being white). Mr. Joyce noted that a darker color could be used to call it out, which Mr. Salter noted would be deferred to his wife.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce motioned to approve the application of the Aspen shed having trim and paint color to match existing house; all materials to match existing house. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Joyce, Pattison, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

358 Essex Street U1

Josiah Fisk submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fence and change fence color.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/19/22
- Photographs

Mr. Fisk was present on the call and noted that two units are at property—Unit 1 (left) is Ryan Juckett and Unit 2 (right) is Mr. Fisk. Installer had done well with fencing on Unit 1 side of property but not in front of property by Unit 2. Mr. Fisk had been cited with a violation from the Historic Commission as a result. In the interim, the other property unit had changed hands. Mr. Fisk noted that the intent would be to place fences on left and right of property to match previous conditions, i.e. a 1976 image was shown revealing two sections of fencing at Unit 1 and full fence at Unit 2. A mockup was shown revealing intended look of fencing with Unit 2; black fencing proposed. Adjacent fence at 360 Essex was shown, with intent to match construction: capped rail, width and spacing of pickets, framing members being horizontal in cross section rather than vertical. Existing conditions and proposed new fence location of Unit 1 were shown. Chair Spang clarified that new post to match exiting post on other side of house would be installed, as well as fencing; i.e. Unit 2's fencing would match Unit 1's. Mr. Fisk noted that Unit 2's fencing would likely not be as great of a height. Mr. Fisk estimated that the fencing on Unit 1 side is likely 4'. Chair Spang clarified that new fencing would feature on Unit 1 side that was parallel to the curb (35 or 40' back, Mr. Fisk noted); and tops of both fences will not align because the property line fencing is going up a hill which is actually a retaining wall. Chair Spang noted that the proposed fence would need a post which may affect its appearance adjacent to neighbor's fence. Ms. Kelleher noted that the proposed location was set back from the sidewalk quite far. The retaining wall would be about half the height of

the fence/gate at its proposed install location. A site visit was proposed in order to inspect and better visualize proposed fence in relation to existing fencing and retaining wall.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce motioned to continue the application to the next meeting. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Joyce, Pattison, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

1 Pickering Street

Joseph Locke submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for building and fence restoration and renovation.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/13/22
- Photographs
- Elevations and site plan by Flow Design Inc.

Both the owner Mr. Locke and contractor Leonardo Alves were present on the call. Mr. Locke grew up in house and expressed desire to return house to previous stature following a period of neglect, i.e. fixing deficiencies, brick walls surrounding house which have started to crumble, outdoor parts of the home that are rotting, updating and maintaining style in which house was originally made. Mr. Alves noted the intent to keep the height of the brick fence. One change on the Warren Street side is to attempt to mimic what is on the Pickering Street side to allow new entrance/access to house. Plans showed intent to remove and dispose of existing gate prior to restoration to new appearance; as well as to remove and salvage bricks from fence for reuse if possible. Mr. Alves also proposed eliminating window above front door which is placed in between shower and toilet. Ms. Kelleher noted that the window in question is visible from Warren Street. Chair Spang clarified that the intent is to create a more decorative wall with a more formal entrance on Warren Street. Mr. Meche noted a disparity between existing Pickering Street side entrance and the drawing as shown; and questioned what the intent exactly is. Mr. Alves noted his understanding that the intent would be to mimic or replicate the Pickering Street fence. Mr. Meche proposed a site visit to better understand the intent and the property itself. Mr. Alves asked for Commission's guidance on capping the brick walls, pointing out that rotted wood exists as a cap in several portions of existing wall; whereas molded concrete caps on Broad Street have shown more durability. Mr. Alves also questioned who was responsible for replacing bricks on the sidewalk along Pickering Street, which were shown to be pressing upwards against the property owner's existing brick wall. Ms. Kelleher noted that homeowners would likely be welcome to undertake repairs in place of the City.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Meche motioned to continue the application to the next meeting to allow time to conduct a site visit. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Joyce, Pattison, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

Columbus Avenue Seawall letter was made available to Commission members to look at.

MHC submitted a letter of support to the City for the Old Town Hall in advance of upcoming meeting before the Access Committee.

Meeting Minutes

VOTE: Ms. English motioned to approve minutes for the May 5 and May 18 meetings. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Joyce, Pattison, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

September 7, 2022 Meeting Date Change

Ms. Kelleher proposed moving September 7 meeting to September 14. Commission members were amenable to this alteration.

Adjournment

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting adjourned at 10:16PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Dan Graham, Historical Commission Clerk