

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
October 19, 2022

A regular meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, October 19, 2022, at 6:00 pm. **VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING.** Present were: Jamie Graham, Milo Martinez, Mark Pattison, Larry Chair Spang. Staff: Patti Kelleher. Not present: Reed Cutting, Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce, Mark Meche.

Ms. Kelleher stated that since Mr. Cutting was absent from the previous meetings, he would not be able to participate in the review of the continued items. Due to the presence of a bare quorum of 4 members, Mr. Cutting left the meeting.

181 Marlborough Road

Frank Milo, Elaine Milo, Danielle Milo, William Craig Jr. submitted a Request to Waive Demolition Delay Ordinance to remove more than 50% of building roof

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/3/22
- Photographs

William Craig was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Craig stated that he would like to remove the existing second level of the home and construct a new second level and portion of a third level with dormers. His family resides in the property, and they want to create additional living space to grow their family. Zoning relief will be sought by the ZBA meeting tonight after the Historical Commission meeting. In 2019 they went before the ZBA and were approved but with Covid-19 they did not undertake the work and with the revised demolition delay ordinance, Historical Commission approval is now required. Chair Spang acknowledged that the Demolition Delay was voted in by City Council in 2021 which calls for Commission review for structures over 50-years-old. He asked if the applicants had recently priced the project and were still comfortable with the proposed scope of work given the costs of the current construction market. Mr. Craig replied that some material costs have reduced, and the project is close to the 2019 pricing. He added that the house was built by his wife's family in 1927 and the existing white vinyl siding on the house would remain in the new construction. Chair Spang noted that the Commission would have a 12-month delay if they went that route.

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

Mr. Martinez asked if the structure was listed in the National Register. Ms. Kelleher replied no, no survey had been conducted in this section of Salem.

Ms. Graham stated that there is nothing particularly historically significant that would warrant not approving the waiver. Mr. Martinez noted that the proposed design was respectful. Mr. Pattison noted that he was in favor of the proposed design.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to not find the building historically significant. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Ms. Kelleher stated that the demolition delay has been waived.

Request for Review – Proposed design guidelines for sidewalks and paving

Colleen Brewster, Co-Chair of Historic Salem, Inc.'s (HSI) Brick Coalition was present to discuss the draft guidelines.

Ms. Brewster stated that the revised document includes two visuals for reference. The draft still lists acceptable paving materials with a preference for use of a pervious base and advocating for consistent drainage, rather than the asphalt base Salem has been using. The biggest change was clarifying the multiple uses of the term "in-kind repair" so existing undesirable materials such as asphalt are not reinstalled.

Ms. Kelleher suggested adjustments to the language used and the Commission determining whether they are comfortable adding this document to the Design Guidelines. She noted that the old guidelines were very different, included a note about parking and that the new guidelines are not regulatory because paving is not within the Commission's purview so these would be guidelines only. The Commission liked the ADA notations and the benefits with the use of newer materials. Mr. Martinez noted that he felt comfortable adding the document to the guidelines with a tweaking of the language by Ms. Kelleher.

Public Comment:

Jane Arlander, 93 Federal Street. Asked why there are no guidelines to preserve the existing sidewalks. Chair Spang replied that there is a paragraph that addresses preservation and maintenance, but it would require the Salem Police Department to enforce keeping delivery trucks from parking on sidewalks damaging and sinking the curbs and sidewalks.

Jim Carria, 186 Federal Street. Asked if the city would cover the cost to replace the asphalt sidewalk outside his home with brick. Chair Spang replied no.

Ms. Kelleher suggested incorporating a sentence regarding all efforts and care being taken to protect the surfaces from damage. The Commission agreed, stated that they were unaware if guidance can be given to the city for the care of these surface, and noted that these guidelines would encourage the practice of installing and preserving the existing surfaces and that brick can be ADA accessible. The Commission agreed to incorporate notations on the installation of tactile warning strips around the historic districts and stated that the document would make a good addition to the guidelines.

**VOTE:** Ms. Graham made a motion to accept the final version of the Sidewalk & Paving design guidelines with language edits, including tactile warning strip language and that the Commission doesn't not have jurisdiction over sidewalks and paving. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Request for comment/support: Installation of new marker in Howard Street Cemetery

Andrew Carr (Stonecutter) and Rachel Meyer of Epoch Preservation were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Carr stated that using 17<sup>th</sup> century techniques, there is a possibility of cutting new gravestones for 3 historically significant missing graves, 2 in the Charter Street Burying Ground and 1 in the Howard Street Cemetery. At Howard Street, Epoch Preservation restored three graves in the African American section for Venus Chew, Prince Farmer, and Samuel Payne. A listing from the 1940's determined that the gravestone is for Patience Jointer was missing and she is presumed to have been buried to the right of her sister. The proposal is to replicate the sister's headstone design and epitaph so the history of her is not lost.

Chair Spang noted that the new stone will be a close replication to a previously restored headstone and asked if it was possible to know if this would be the appropriate plot for Patience Jinter. Mr. Carr replied that while they are not sure of the exact location, there could have been a family plot with her being placed relatively close by. Ms. Meyer noted that the names were listed in order and a small portion of a broken stone is in the area but there were no other identifying carvings or fragments, so the plot will never be 100% accurate. They are using the list and doing their best to honor those whose headstones are missing since there are no maps.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the Commission is being asked to provide a letter of support as they have done in the past and suggested including language noting the year that the new headstone was erected and that was placed in the expected location of where she was buried, or similar language. The previously proposed polished granite would have been too shiny so the Commission recommended a flamed or honed finish so the headstone would not resemble a new historic marker. Ms. Meyer noted that a small plaque is proposed in front of Samuel Payne's gravestone because the stone is cracked, and his last name is missing. Mr. Carr noted that Samuel Payne's proposed trapezoid marker could be redesigned. Letter forms and shape of the marble plaque were taken from designs at the Plymouth Burying Hill that he believed mimicked the top of the grave.

Ms. Graham asked if marble that closely resembled the existing would be used. Mr. Carr replied yes, and Ms. Meyer would oversee the setting of the new stone. Ms. Meyer noted that the new stone would look new and would not be weathered to match but would have the same tone and finish. Mr. Carr suggested a notation at the bottom indicating when the stone was recut. Mr. Martinez noted that the marble would weather on its own and agreed with incorporating a new dedication date on the bottom or back of the stone. Ms. Meyer stated that the neighboring headstone will remain at their current level of erosion if the consolidation is maintained, and the new headstone will weather to match what currently exists. Consolidation meaning that when marble weathers, the silicone leaches out of the stone because of the rain which creates a crumbly/sugary look to the stone surface. The way to stop that is to reintroduce silica to the stone to reharden the surface approximately every 30-years.

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

Chair Spang noted the concern of recreation vs. replacing, and he believed a reasonable job was done to document the existing conditions and replicate as best they can. Incorporating a plaque next to it or wording on the new stone would be acceptable.

Doreen Wade, United Salem. Suggested incorporating a plaque in the area that identifies that African Americans are buried in this part of the cemetery. Ms. Kelleher replied that the hope is to install one and grant funding is being sought for research by a historian to ensure the historical accuracy. Chair Spang was in support of continued research to one day incorporate that signage. Ms. Wade noted that her future interns will soon begin that research and offered to assist in the search for funding. Ms. Meyer noted that that type of signage is usually placed outside the cemetery, so the specific area is called out before entering.

Mr. Carr stated that new markers are proposed for missing headstones at the Charter Street Burying Ground for Capt. John Crowninshield, and his wife Anstiss Crowninshield. Captain Crowninshield was one of the wealthiest merchants in Salem and he constructed the mansion now on PEM property on Essex Street. Their graves are towards the east side of the cemetery and high-resolution images exist of their headstones, thanks to Salem photographer Frank Cousins, prior to their being damaged and encased in stones, which can be used to recut the stones. There was also a footstone for Anstiss Crowninshield, however the footstone for Capt. John Crowninshield exists and its measurements can be used to recreate a footstone for his wife.

Chair Spang asked if the old encasements would be removed given that they could be considered historic. Mr. Carr suggested they be relocated to the visitor's center rather than discarded, and he would not recommend inserting the

new stones into the casing, which are badly damaged. The new headstones should be set into the ground as they originally, because casings are usually a last resort and a practice that is no longer widely use by restores. Ms. Meyer added that the existing casing would continue to fail. Ms. Kelleher suggested adding that the originals were broken in the Great Salem fire of 1914. Mr. Carr suggested adding when it was broken, the restoration by descendants in 1918, and that it was lost and recut in 2022. The additional wording could be buried so the stone is kept at the same height or raised higher, so the wording is visible. Mr. Pattison agreed with placing the casing at the Visitor's Center. Mr. Carr suggesting adding language on what happens to headstone overtime.

Ms. Meyer noted that the Broad Street Cemetery is famously known as being an encampment during the Great Salem fire, but it is not known whether the cemeteries at Charter Street and Howard Street were also used.

Chair Spang asked if the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) would provide any comment. Ms. Kelleher replied that MHC were supportive of a replacement headstone at the Howard Street Cemetery but required the descendants conduct archaeological work around the headstone prior to excavating for the new headstone and she was unsure if the same would be requested for these 3 plots, but they were supportive of the effort to honor the history. Ms. Meyer noted that the cemeteries are municipal properties are not state property. It is okay to do stone conservation work, find objects, photograph, and mark them as grave goods and put them back. If MHC requires an archaeologist one can be found.

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

**VOTE: Ms. Graham made a motion to approve a letter of support to replace gravestones at the Charter Street Burying Ground and Howard Street Cemetery. Mr. Martinez amended the motion to include dedication dates for all three headstones. Ms. Graham accepted the amendment. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

### 20 Hathorne Street– continuation

Ruthy LLC submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint colors

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/2/22
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant requested a continuance to the next regular meeting.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the next Regular meeting. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

### 3 Federal Court – continuation

Skomurski Development submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate building and carriage house

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/6/22
- Photographs
- Drawings by Seger Architects

Julia Mooradian of Seger Architects and Joe Skomurski (Owner) were present to discuss the project.

Chair Spang stated that several Commission members made a site visit last week and walked the site with Dan Ricciarelli of Seger Architects and the owner, Joe Skomurski. They discussed the proposed new construction at the rear of the building, removing a chimney, and the selection of a paint colors.

Ms. Mooradian stated that the change from their previous design include changing the roof of the addition from a gable to a shed roof, adding an interior stair for basement access, and to remove the bulkhead from the side of the house. The front deck now only serves the adjacent door. The rear addition incorporates a new kitchen, and the windows are double-hung but are shorter and placed higher on the façade to accommodate the kitchen counter height with cabinetry above.

Mr. Pattison expressed concern that the small windows are out of scale and suggested half sash windows. Chair Spang asked if the two sets of proposed windows were different. Ms. Mooradian replied that the windows will match. Ms. Kelleher noted that the window are true divided lite double-hung windows. Ms. Mooradian stated that the existing door and landing would shift to an existing window opening opposite the proposed addition, the existing door opening would be in-filled with clapboards which was previously approved, and a new doorway would be located to the opposite site of the building, so the new addition would not have a door. The roof between the existing house and the addition is proposed and would create a covered porch.

Chair Spang noted that despite the work proposed, historically appropriate details are not being installed. The pediment at the top feels applied. Mr. Pattison agreed and noted that the details resemble flat modern applications. Chair Spang agreed with the modern feel of some of the rear appendages, noted the lack of proportions for an eave. Mr. Pattison suggested taking advantage of the projecting roofline by setting the doorway back to obtain more depth because it doesn't feel like the rest of the property. Chair Spang noted that often rear appendages begin to look utilitarian when compared to the main body of the house, but the lack of proportions for the eave, resemble a modern Colonial and created a window in a big wall.

Mr. Skomurski stated that there will be a staircase on the left side, the new windows will match the existing which he felt would be more fitting than casement windows. They could enlarge the windows and increase the width of the corner boards, but he has concerns about the interior cabinets and stairway. Chair Spang stated that two double-hung windows joined together may not be appropriate. Mr. Skomurski replied that the windows could be separated. He noted that the pediment and trim is original to the house and there is another door in that area that is not visible from the street. Originally an occupant would have to go out the front door and around the house to gain access to the yard and the new door will provide direct access.

Mr. Pattison reiterated he concern that the small double-hung windows were inappropriate due to the proportions of the side of the shed dormer and suggested installing a half sash. Ms. Graham noted that one single window also would feel odd. Mr. Martinez suggested one single 4 over 3 picture window with lites closer together that are a closer match to the original windows, like on 124 Derby Street.

Chair Spang suggested a continuance, noted that the inset door space feels odd and deep, and suggested creating a more welcoming vestibule. Ms. Graham agreed. Mr. Pattison noted that a recessed door could create a porch area and would be more inviting and antique detail. Mr. Skomurski replied that they can move the door out somewhat but not beyond the side door. Chair Spang suggested 4-feet to create a more historical looking porch and interior vestibule. Mr. Skomurski noted that the door in question is not visible from the street. Ms. Graham noted that the proposed roof extension would be visible. Mr. Skomurski suggested eliminating the roof extension, restoring the door in place to retain the history, and agreed to fine tune the design. Ms. Graham noted that 291 Essex Street has a similar window to the one discussed.

Ms. Mooradian stated that paint colors were also discussed at site visit also. The proposed color is Hale Navy HC-154 by Benjamin Moore. The Board was in favor of the color.

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

**VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve Benjamin Moore - Hale Navy HC-154 and white trim to match existing. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Ms. Mooradian stated that the removal of the chimney was also discussed on site. It was added in the 1900's, was not connected to any fireplaces, and went to the basement for a furnace only. The roof would be patched with roof shingles to match.

Mr. Pattison stated that the house would benefit from the removal of the chimney.

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

**VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve removing the chimney. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Ms. Kelleher stated that at the previous meeting the Commission approve a 3-tab roof and window replacement as a Certificate of Non-applicability.

Ms. Mooradian stated that the client would like to use IKO architectural roof shingles in Charcoal Grey, since he believes they are a better-quality product than the previously approved shingle. Ms. Kelleher noted that the application was advertised as a building renovation but the roofing was not specifically advertised originally. She hesitated to approve changing the roof from the architectural roof shingle submittal to a new shingle. It would require a new application to be advertised for 2 weeks and would need not be reviewed until November 16<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Mooradian replied that they will keep the currently approved roof shingle.

Ms. Mooradian stated that the side door and landing were a later addition, that they want to remove and infill the wall with matching clapboards. The Commission found not issues with its removal.

Public Comment:

Jane Arlander, 93 Federal Street. Asked if the window shutter adjacent to the removed door would be replaced.

Mr. Skomurki replied yes and noted that there are extra shutters in the basement.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE: Ms. Graham made a motion to approve infilling the door and removing the landing. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

7 Lynn Street– continuation

Mark O’Donald submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace roof with Permalock system

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/14/22
- Photographs
- Permalock roofing brochure

Kyle Keegan of East Coast Metal Roofing (ECMR - Contractor) and Mark O’Donald (Owner) were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Keegan stated that they are proposing to remove the existing asphalt roof and install the Permalock roofing system. He provided addresses of several other project locations and a product sample.

Ms. Graham noted her concern with the matte finish eliminating the sheen, which did make it look less like metal. Mr. Martinez noted that the finish looked too flat, solid, had no sheen, and asked which and noted that he hasn’t seen any previous installations of this roof. Mr. Keegan stated that Tudor Brown is proposed. Mr. Martinez noted that he will review the sample again, he encouraged trying a new product on a historic building to provide more options for applicants. Ms. Graham noted her nervousness over the highly visible location and disagreed with this property, near a visible intersection becoming a metal roof example in Salem. Chair Spang noted that he was in favor of this being a metal roof example but that the Commissioners need to see it.

Ms. Kelleher noted that some appear more like slate, but others have been less successful. She noted that the Tudor Brown is a darker brown/grey color. Mr. Keegan stated that Black would have a sheen and browns appear dull and resemble stone.

Chair Spang asked if the house color would change. *Mr. O’Donald had a poor connection and was not able to respond.*

Mr. Martinez asked if there were good examples of true brown slates roof. Ms. Kelleher replied that grey slate is typically found in Salem, some were darker depending upon where they were quarried, however. She noted that the Commission could request grey.

Chair Spang noted the bare quorum meaning all members must be in favor. Mr. Pattison noted his hesitancy and needing to see an example in person. Ms. Kelleher reviewed the old guidelines and noted that brown wasn’t a standard option. Most were grey, rarer colors were green and purple. Mr. Pattison noted the steep roof would make the roof less visible. Mr. Keegan noted that 21 Barr Street has slate grey roof. Ms. Kelleher noted that the sample is against the fence at the back of the driveway. Mr. Keegan added that additional colors can be provided on site for the Commission members to review.

**VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting. Ms. Graham seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

16 Kosciusko Street– continuation

Sam Clarke submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for Gutters

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/15/22

- Photographs

Sam Clarke was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Clarke stated that he previously proposed installing fiberglass gutters, but the installation would require adding 3/4-inch-thick PVC over the existing fascia to bring the gutter further away from the roofline and capture more water. He presented a mock-up drawing. He also noted that his consideration for Duragutter, but has no preference given the \$400 difference in price between them. He presented Google images from 2005 showing gutters on the house that were removed prior to his purchasing the home and indicated that this would be a reinstallation at the low and high roof with multiple downspouts. He noted his preference for placing the far-left downspout on the outside of the house to avoid the deck railing. He noted that the low roof has a bulkhead next to it and the downspout can be directed to grade at the same location. He noted that Duragutter was installed at the Inn at Lafayette Street and the owner proposed 1 single downspout in the interior corner, onto the low roof, and into a second downspout at the lower roof for less visibility but that might cause overflows. If accepted, he requested to paint that central downspout Newburyport Blue to blend into the façade color. He proposed two options, 1A: 1 downspout in the middle and 1B: 2 downspouts at outside edges. The Duragutter didn't propose an added fascia piece, but that representative also hasn't been visited the site. He noted that the Duragutter price was \$3,700 and Fiberglass is \$4,100, and both including installation.

Chair Spang noted that the house next to the library on Essex Street installed Duragutter and it looks good. Mr. Clarke replied that he hasn't seen fiberglass gutters in person but agreed that Duragutter looked good.

Chair Spang stated that he would be happier with not installing a downspout at the end of the left-side corner board, and suggested installing 2, one on the right and one in the middle with no downspout on the left. He also suggested installing a splashguard above the low roof to prevent overflow and agreed with painting the center downspout Newburyport Blue to match the house. Ms. Clarke agreed since the side faces the National Park site.

Ms. Graham noted her concern with proper flashing existing at the low roof to properly handle any overflowing from the gutter and noted that she was in favor of installing a splashguard. Mr. Clarke replied that he will ensure that he will correct anything not properly installed. Ms. Graham requested a Duragutter sample. Mr. Clarke replied that the representative only provided images and suggested their most popular gutter profile, the Ogee wood edge.

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

Mr. Clarke noted that the Duragutter is sold by the company and there is an installer in the area, while the fiberglass system is both the creator and installer. Chair Spang suggested an approval that included an additional fascia for use with either gutter system.

Ms. Kelleher noted that 23 Warren Street also used the Duragutter and noticed a significant difference in the new gutter capturing additional water than the wood gutters that were removed. She also noted that the 374 Essex Street is the address of the other Duragutter.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve Duragutter or fiberglass gutter as show on drawings with center downspout and a right downspout, the addition of an additional piece of fascia to extent the gutter to capture the water. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

245 Lafayette Street Unit 2G

Mark and Linda Simard submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to Replace windows and doors

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/4/22
- Photographs
- Renewal by Anderson brochure

Stephen Balsamo (Renewal by Andersen) was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Balsamo stated that the owner is proposing to replace 2 windows and 1 patio door at 1 unit in the building. The new door and window would be white to match existing windows, and the patio door would be a triple unit to replace like for like. The current window style is a gliding double, with a 1 to 1 ratio. The window is composite, a wood and PVC blend, with a minimalist look, and matte finish, with PVC trim to surround the patio doors.

Ms. Graham asked why the application wasn't submitted as a Certificate of Non-Applicability. Ms. Kelleher replied that the replacement is not in-kind because it is a switch from vinyl to fiber composite. She also required additional information to determine the similarities and whether the replacement could be processed in that way in the future.

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

**VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve as presented. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

186 Federal Street

Denise Carria submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to garage

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/4/22
- Photographs

Jim Carria was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Carria proposed the construction of a patio cover behind the garage that would not be visible from the street. Ms. Kelleher noted that the new patio would be 14-feet x 14-feet and centered behind the garage that is approximately 19.4-feet x 19.4-feet, so there may be a slight view of the patio and canopy. Chair Spang noted that the edge would sit 2.5-feet from each edge of the garage. Mr. Martinez asked if the patio would be above grade with a foundation or at grade below. Mr. Carria replied that the roof will be 12-feet-high against the garage and 8-feet-high at the bottom of the slope. Ms. Kelleher noted that Bridge Street is not in the district so views of changes from this street are not within the Commissions jurisdiction. Mr. Carria noted that the concrete slab is already poured, and he wasn't visible from the street when standing at that corner of the slab. Chair Spang requested a mock-up with a 2x4 be installed at the corner to confirm the lack of visibility.

Mr. Carria stated that he would like to remove the hollow core door on the side of the garage and install a solid wood door, painted green to match the garage doors or white. He noted that he is also considering a new flat steel panel insulated replacement side door. Chair Spang remembered reviewing this opening, which was covered in plywood. They thought a solid door was behind it, but replacing it would require the submission of a new application.

Mr. Carria asked if installing a freestanding tent canopy with wood sides and a metal roof would require an application and Commission review. Ms. Kelleher replied that the intent behind a structure like that would be considered temporary, such as an umbrella or pop-up tent, but a freestanding structure would also require Commission approval since the intent would be for it to be installed for a full season.

The Commission agreed to a site visit to be set up next Tuesday before the next regular meeting.

Mr. Carria confirmed that the corner of new pavement would be the corner of the structure.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

**Request for letter of support – Salem Willows Phase II FY23 Application**

Ms. Kelleher stated that the City plans to submit a new application for CPA funds for Phase IIA of Salem Willows. Phase I is the hillside renovation towards Fort Lee. The City wants to restore landscape near the new pier, install new pathways, landscape features, a bio-retention basin, trees, and to remove a significant amount of asphalt. The City is seeking a support letter. The project has been reviewed by MHC, which has requested an archeological review and consideration of possible impacts to underground or historic resources. A consultant will be hired to review the plans as the project proceeds to ensure so changes are historically appropriate. City staff drafted a letter of support that she and Chair Spang can finalize, and it includes language for a consultant for a study. She noted that there is a gap in grant funding that would be filled by the CPA to fund the study or additional work. She also noted that buildings/structure at the Willows will not be addressed during this phase. Chair Spang questioned if the City owned the pavilion in the lower right of the site plan and hoped the historic preservation consultant could provide input on the history of the building. Ms. Kelleher suggested the letter of support include a suggestion for the history and restoration of the other buildings at The Willows also be addressed.

Mr. Martinez noted that the Phase 1 work with the pervious paving at the parking lot looks good.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to provide a letter of support to the CPA for the Phase II study and construction funds with final language to be finalized by Chair Spang and city staff. Ms. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Other Business:

- a. Meeting Minutes;

Continued to next regular meeting.

- b. Violations;
- c. Correspondence
- d. Other:

Comment letters:

Ms. Kelleher stated that the Lee Fort Terrace submitted an Expanded Environmental Notification Form (ENF) to MHC, who found the project unlikely to affect any Historical or Archeological Resources.

Ms. Kelleher stated that a comment letter had been requested for El Centro, the Northshore CDC project on the corner of Lafayette and New Derby Streets that came in for the demolition delay waiver. The proposal is to demolish the existing building and construct a new health center and age-restricted housing. An ENF form was sent to MHC who found that the removal of the building would be an adverse effect. The project will return to the Salem Historical Commission (SHC) for review. Like the Columbus Avenue seawall rebuilding, several conditions may be applied, including a review with the SHC to ensure that the new design is appropriate. MHC can require review due to the use of federal or state funding and permitting and the applicant must state what the adverse effect would be. She noted that the Northshore Home Consortium is distributing the funding.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she is expecting an update on Pioneer Village / Camp Naumkeag projects before the end of the year. A city resident has nominated Pioneer Village for the National Register and specified that he was doing this because “the Salem Historical Commission would not.” He used much of the information in the PAL inventory form in his National Register nomination and included 1970’s photos, but most of the submission is not new information. She will distribute the application to the Commission for their review. She noted that the demolition delay is in effect until June 2023 and the City is still addressing the comments, working with a structural engineer, encouraging an MHC review, etc.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the CPC has one representative from the Commission and Mr. Pattison would like to end his term and is requesting someone replace him. She will reach out to absent Commission members.

#### Adjournment

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting ended at 9:45PM

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen Brewster  
Clerk