

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
October 20, 2021

A special meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, October 20, 2021, at 6:00 pm. **VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING**. Present were: Milo Martinez, Mark Meche, Stacey Norkun, Mark Pattison, and Larry Spang. Not present: Reed Cutting, Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce

Request for consultation - NSCDC Project at 334 Peabody Street, 47 Leavitt Street, and 38 Palmer Street

David Valecillos of Northshore CDC was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Valecillos stated that only 2 of the three lots will have structures on them, the third lot will be a parking lot. The MOA requires that they update the Commission on proposed changes. Color changes are proposed at a couple of facades at the two buildings, the north and west elevation at 47 Leavitt, on the corner of Leavitt and Congress Streets, and the east and west facades of the 334 Peabody Street building. The color of the proposed exterior cladding at 47 Leavitt Street has changed from brown to either a Slate Ebony or Silver Grey with an Aquamarine color canopy, and the material on one façade changed to fiber cement. The second structure has two street frontages, along Peabody and Ward Streets, whose façade colors have also changed from brown to a Siberian Larch and Aquamarine access panels.

Mr. Martinez requested clarification on the project review. Ms. Kelleher replied that there was an existing building on Leavitt Street that the CDC proposed to remove and build the new structure. The use of state and federal funding required MHC review and MHC entered into an agreement with the Northshore CDC through an MOA, which stated that any changes need to be vetted through the Salem Historical Commission. The presentation is a follow up for the proposed changes.

Mr. Martinez stated that the original brownish/red color is more in keeping with the colors in this neighborhood. Mr. Valecillos replied that the since the colors were first approved there are now material and color limitations.

Mr. Pattison asked if less glass was being proposed on the first floor and if metal grating was not being used. Mr. Valecillos replied that the original images were only 30% developed and the proposed is the completed design. The addition of the plantings at the first-floor level is to conceal the parking and they did receive a support letter from Commission in 2017.

Ms. Norkun noted that the awnings above windows have also changed, and she is also not in favor of the proposed design of the building. Ms. Kelleher stated that the Commission at the time expressed comments about design when initially proposed but that period is over, and the applicant is now looking to change the colors and materiality on one side and only seeking comments on those changes. Ms. Norkun suggested the new colors are too modern for the neighborhood. Mr. Meche stated that while the details have evolved, he is neutral on the proposed color selection, and he would be bothered if they tried to make it look historical.

Mr. Valecillos stated that the Zoning Board requested they not use the color white so on Peabody and Ward Street they proposed a tan color, Trespa: Siberian Large and secondary color Trespa: Aquamarine. Mr. Martinez replied that while the color change isn't substantial, the accent façade broke up the building

while the new façade is homogenous. Chair Spang noted that the facades would be highlighted with panelized wood-like strips, a pre-painted phenolic resin panel.

Mr. Meche noted his preference for the metal awnings in the previous iteration. Mr. Valecillos replied that the design changed with the incorporation of passive housed design and noted that 19 off-street parking spaces will be located at grade. Mr. Meche noted his support of the passive house design. Mr. Valecillos noted that the Northshore CDC has completed 19 buildings using historic tax credit and they would appreciate the support of the Commission.

Ms. Kelleher stated that while some Commission members preferred the reddish/tan color and they would like to see a similar color, but they could support the project and reference a change in the proposed color in their motion. Mr. Valecillos noted that due to long lead times, shipping delays and supply chains concerns they placed their order 2 weeks prior because they felt they would receive Commission support.

Mr. Martinez asked if the cement panels can be painted. Mr. Valecillos replied that they come pre-painted, and the darker panel is more of a dark brown than it is grey. He agreed to provide samples in the Planning Department.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve the color change to the facades of the 334 Peabody and Ward Streets building. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Norkun, Meche, Spang in favor and the motion so carried.**

Mr. Valecillos presented an image of the Slate Ebony panel and informed the Commission that the existing structure next to this site is a deep purple so the dark color won't be as much of a contrast.

**VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to continue the 47 Leavitt Street review to the next regular meeting, November 3, 2021. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Norkun, Meche, Spang in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 122 Derby Street

Robert Burkinshaw submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to rebuild addition

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/20/21
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant requested a continuation since drawings are not ready.

**VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion continue to the next regular meeting, November 3, 2021. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Norkun, Meche, Spang in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 374 Essex Street— continuation

Emma and James Sullivan submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace gutters

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/20/21

- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher stated that the owner wasn't available tonight but spoke about removing the first course of slate and reworking the roofline so the overhang doesn't project as much. He is concerned about the weather turning cold and the deterioration of gutters. The contractor will not create a drawing until they know it's a viable project and they can fix the gutter at the same time. Chair Spang replied that the Commission requires a drawing to refer to. The applicant likes the moulding hitting the roof and would like to have that seen rather than the existing half-round gutters. There will be installation issues and the site visit determined although Duragutter is a well-made product that would provide a historically correct gutter, there is no mechanism to secure it. Mr. Pattison suggested eliminating the cornice below and padding out the new system to install the gutter or pulling back one layer of slate and integrating the gutter to hide it. Mr. Meche noted that he would need to eliminate the cornice which is eliminating the historic element. Chair Spang noted that he is not sure it's worth all this trouble because that would move the drip edge would move closer to the house. Ms. Kelleher agreed to notify the owner that the Commission will be unable to decide without a drawing.

Mr. Meche argued against taking off the moulding to solve the gutter concerns and suggested using snow guards to help with excessive runoff since gutters aren't always essential. Ms. Kelleher noted attending recent symposiums and seminars showing that gutters are critical to address building damage caused by increasing intensity of storms, and the need to find a solution that protects the roof and historic building. Mr. Meche noted that integrated gutters are problematic because they fail and they allow water to flow inside the house rather than outside.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to continue to the November 3, 2021 meeting. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Norkun, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 4 Andover Street - continuation

Karen Garvey Beck and George Beck submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for fence color

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/5/21
- Photographs
- Paint chips

Karen Garvey Beck was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Beck stated that the Commission recently approved the color change for the house. she is now seeking to address the color of the property fence. At some point, an earlier spindle fence was removed and an inappropriate picket fence was installed. They want to re-install the original style spindle fence later this winter. In the meantime, they would like to paint the picket fence to match the house trim color, Sturgis Grey. They hope to salvage some of the posts, review old photographs, and replicate the previous fence starting this winter.

Ms. Meche noted his concern with repainting then throwing it out, and suggested the applicant submit an application in the spring for the new fence and paint color. Ms. Norkun supported want the existing fence to match what they've done with the house, keeping the exiting fence until the new fence design was ready to install, and painting the existing fence Sturgis Grey until then.

Mr. Pattison asked if there were photos of the original fence. Mr. Martinez noted that the early fence had thin spindles. Ms. Kelleher noted that the current fence was approved in 2011.

Public comment:

John Carr, 7 River Street. stated that he has lived to the north of this property since 1973 and the inventory form accurately reflects what was the original fence design. He was shocked to hear of the Commission approving the existing fence. He was in favor of the plans to restore the fence and paint it Sturgis Gray because the brown color is not appropriate.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Norkun, Spang were in favor. Meche not in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 9 Warren Street

Joshua Jarvis and Erin Young submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fence

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/27/21
- Photographs

Joshua Jarvis was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Jarvis stated that they want to remove a chain-link fence installed in the late 1980's/early 1990's and install a cedar fence on the southern property line. A tree was removed in the neighbor's yard and some of the chain-link fence was cut out and the fence is more visible from Broad Street not Warren Street. It would be unpainted and left to weather, with caps on top of the posts, and installed by JC Fence. Chair Spang noted that the fence panel spans from post to post and the cap would not be continuous.

Ms. Kelleher noted that there is already a solid fence in the yard and agreed that the new fence would be slightly visible through the yard to 9 Warren and it is similar in style to fencing already in the area.

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

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

#### 35 Chestnut Street

Matthew Eapen and Julia Lippman submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for new egress door and stair

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/24/21
- Photographs
- Drawings by Pitman & Wardley

Julia Lippman, Matthew Eapen, owners, and Peter Pitman of Pitman and Wardley Associates were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Pitman stated that the single-family home has with one useable means of egress at the front entrance and the owners want to convert a side window into a door with a minimal landing, and stairs to both the front and rear yard. The proposed stair would be very similar to a secondary entrance at the neighboring house but would be more transparent due to the railing only being on the side of the landing and not at the back. They have minimal options for exiting the house, and the rear bulkhead isn't a legal means of egress since its interior door is less than 6-feet-high. The design would include a wood railing, treads and decking in Ipe with mahogany stain and painted flat trim. The door would have SDL divided lites with a thin frame kept as tight to the masonry opening as possible. Bikes and strollers could be stored below the landing.

Mr. Meche asked if the landing level at the side is the same as at the main entry. Mr. Pitman replied that the top step will be 6-7-inches below the threshold and finished floor of the house. Mr. Meche noted that the drawing looks over scaled. Mr. Pitman replied that the new door would match the threshold of the existing front door. He inherited the drawings and is requesting only conditional approve and can submit amended drawings.

Mr. Pattison asked how far the stairs would project from the exterior wall. Mr. Pitman replied 4-feet with 4x4 newel posts painted white. Mr. Pattison requested the driveway width. Mr. Pitman replied approximately 10-12 feet wide. The stairs extend over the existing granite, and they will return the granite so that it ends at the house.

Public comment:

Christopher Patzke, 224 Lafayette Street, stated that he lived in the property's carriage house until this spring, asked that they consider the ample front door and rear bulkhead for access. He noted that the owner recently renovated and that would have been the time to include a new egress door. He suggested modifying the kitchen addition to include a door in the kitchen nook. The neighbor's side door is original to the home. There are several steps down the rear yard that hasn't been addressed or been resolved with the proposed addition. This addition will block views to the cottage at the rear of the property. The owners installed a low rear gate at the end of the driveway that did not receive approval. Parking is a concern, and this would eliminate a parking space and the rental unit has no parking, and no longer having driveway use for 2 vehicles would negatively impact the cottage tenant and potential staff.

Catherine Miller, 15 Warren Street, asked if there would be disruption on Warren Street from the construction of the stair. Mr. Pitman replied that there is a rear access gate and a curb cut, construction will be minimal, it won't be a burden on the neighborhood, and would be completed within 2 weeks.

Helen Sides, 36 Broad Street, stated that as the architect of the previously mentioned renovation, she doesn't support reconfiguring the newly finished kitchen. She supports the consideration of the new stair and asked if they investigated using granite steps and an iron railing to scale it down and make it blend

better with the surroundings. Mr. Pitman replied no, they wanted to keep the look light and follow suit of their neighbor, Liz Padjen. He noted that the stair width would remain 4-feet-wide even with cast iron railing. Ms. Sides suggested that the iron would disappear visually rather than painted millwork.

Annie Harris, 28 Chestnut Street, stated that she disagreed with Christopher Patzke's earlier statement, noting that she is the mother of the owner and has personal experience that the rear access into the home is difficult, awkward, and narrow to navigate with interior steps and low height doors. This would be a wonderful addition to access the house and there are many homes in the neighborhood with similar side entrances that are small and wood, so you become accustomed to seeing them.

Mr. Meche stated that the Commission doesn't have preview over parking unless something is removed to allow it and they don't want to make it harder for people to park. The view to the cottage is already blocked by the vehicles in the driveway and this will allow easy access to the home.

Mr. Pattison suggested determining a rear exit configuration since he is not in support of altering these properties this much. Mr. Pitman replied that the rear door is not 6'-8" high which is not code complaint, and the finished floor is approximately 3-feet above grade which is just above the top of the rear door. Upon entering the rear door, a person must go down steps to gain some headroom, and the only way to gain headroom is to sacrifice the kitchen nook, which is next to the party wall. It is a challenge to navigate, not code complaint, and pre-existing non-compliant issue sometimes don't get fixed.

Mr. Pattison suggested shifting the kitchen to open up space in the outside corner and allow for a new rear door. Ms. Lippman noted that the floors aren't level and the kitchen nook is higher to create headroom for the bulkhead entry below. Mr. Pitman added that the ceiling height in kitchen 9-feet-high.

Mr. Patzke questioned whether everything should have been brought up to code during the previous kitchen renovation since walls were removed to the studs.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Kelleher suggested a site visit. Chair Spang suggested the new area be staked out.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the November 3, 2021 meeting. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Pattison, Meche, Spang, Norkun were in favor and the motion so carried.**

### 11 Orne Square

Pamela Coffin submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for rear entrance

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/27/21
- Photographs
- Drawing by Helen Sides Architect

Pam Coffin, owner, and Helen Sides, Architect, 36 Broad Street, were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Sides stated that the purpose of the addition is to add a more substantial back entry, mudroom, and pantry. The addition would be 14-foot-wide x 10-foot-deep, one-story hip roofed structure with a covered entry, painted the same color as the existing home, with fiberglass clapboard shingles that have been approved elsewhere on Orne Square. The addition would be set back from the building corner to reduce its visibility, although it would be mostly visible from Endicott Street. A small railing is proposed with a turned post and no pickets are proposed since the railing is only 30" from grade like other railings in the area and will save space on the entry deck. This project will also be reviewed by the ZBA.

Mr. Pattison noted that other stairs in this area aren't as wide. Ms. Sides replied that they wanted to make it more inviting and spacious when carrying things in and out of the house.

Ms. Norkun requested clarification on its visibility. Ms. Sides replied that it's mostly visible from the private courtyard. Ms. Kelleher added that the corner is minimally visible from the street and most of the structure will be shielded. Ms. Norkun asked how far away from the corner it would be placed. Ms. Sides replied at least 1-foot and they are framing a window in the dining room, so the porch is elongated because of the new window. Ms. Kelleher noted that the new window is visible from Winthrop Street. Ms. Sides noted that the structure would be painted a color that is similar to the stucco, and many have original slate roofs.

Ms. Norkun stated that since the railing, post, and post caps will be visible from the street they should look similar to the railings and posts on the front façade. Mr. Pattison agreed and Ms. Sides concurred.

Mr. Meche noted that the entrances have paneling. Ms. Sides replied that they originally designed it with paneling which is more expensive. The Commission discussed the use of applied panels around the door. Ms. Sides didn't recommend the use of applied paneling for longevity. Ms. Norkun supported a clapboard façade and noted a clapboard structure at 2 Orne Square.

Ms. Pam Coffin, Orne Square, agreed with all comments made by Ms. Sides.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she received an e-mail from a resident asking if this project needs review by the Orne Square Neighborhood Association. Ms. Coffin replied yes but they wanted it to be reviewed with the Commission first.

Ms. Sides requested previously approved roof shingle manufacturers because they want a shingle with heft that is similar to the existing slate roof. Chair Spang suggested they use a light grey shingle.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion approve concept in general with final plans and details to be submitted for review and approval by the Commission after ZBA approval. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattinson, Martinez, Norkun, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

### 21 Flint Street

David Kaytes and Janna Koretz submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for side entrance addition

### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/5/21

- Photographs
- Drawings by Helen Sides Architect

David Kaytes, owner, and Helen Sides, Architect, 35 Broad Street was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Sides stated that the applicant wants to expand their living space and add a new side addition that will be minimally visible due to a 6-foot-high board fence that will block most of the view. The existing 2-story rear addition will have a new first-floor porch entry. The servant stair at back corner will be removed to allow for usable space and more sunlight. The roof of the porch would be visible over the fence. They will replicate some of the details from the existing house and pour a small foundation with brick veneer, as well as a new rear bulkhead. Vertical boards will be placed at the rear entry façade. They will need the length of the landing to open and close the egress door. They are also seeking approval of a window change on the second floor where the stair was located to a single glazed, 2/2, with shutters, painted to match the house.

Ms. Meche noted that the inclusion of the eave detail similar to the house is good.

Ms. Norkun asked if the new railing would match the porch. Ms. Sides replied that it has not been designed. Mr. Kaytes added that the fence at property line will be repaired and/or replicated in kind. Ms. Sides clarified that the new roof will be flat not pitched as portrayed in the elevations.

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

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve as submitted, with a new second floor window to match existing wood 2/2 windows, a flat roof, handrails to be similar to what is shown on the back porch, and painted to match the existing house. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Norkun, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 5R Broad Street / Broad Street Cemetery

The City of Salem submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install commemorative marker

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/5/21
- Photographs

Evan O'Brien, of The Boston Tea Party Ships & Museum, was present to discuss the project.

*Ms. Norkun recused herself as a direct abutter.*

Chair Spang noted that an approval by everyone was required due to only 4 members being eligible to vote.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the proposal from The Boston Tea Party is for a plaque to honor a person buried in the cemetery who participated in the tea party event.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the idea was to conditionally approve the installation of this marker. 2023 will be the 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the event and they are seeking to install markers at all of the burial sites of



participants. The plaque depicts an 1840's lithograph image of the Boston Tea Party, it made of brass, 6-inches in diameter and will be placed into the ground. The plaque is weather resistant and can be easily replaced if lost. The marker would be placed at the gravesite of Reverend John Price.

Chair Spang asked about the holes shown in the mounting post. Mr. O'Brien replied that the original design included a Tea Party Museum sign below which they removed to return the focus to the participants and not the organization.

Chair Spang asked if it was known whether this person had ever done anything that would be considered as controversial, which would result in requests to have commemorative plaque removed. Mr. O'Brien replied that John Prince was a reverend and didn't own slaves, and he believed that no one would find him controversial.

Public comment:

Catherine Miller, 15 Warren Street, questioned the appropriateness of a 19<sup>th</sup> century image being portrayed now that we are in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Mr. O'Brien replied that they've discussed the appropriateness of utilizing that image. The event is complex and frocked with controversy, and while there are many inappropriate images, they believed that this one by Currier and Ives was considered to be mostly historically accurate for its symbolism. He noted that a new image may be considered but it can't be created in time for the anniversary.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Meche noted that the proposed font is heavy/bold, and that it's not large which is good since it may be taken, and he is curious about what the new image would be. He stated that there is no risk that isn't reversible. Mr. Martinez agreed. Mr. O'Brien noted that only one has been taken but it was later recovered. They have extra markers if one goes missing.

Ms. Meche asked why they selected a round plaque. Mr. O'Brien replied that they wanted to use a design shape that is different than the other elements around it.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve as presented. Mr. Meche seconded the motion.**

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

*Ms. Norkun returned to the meeting at this time.*

**Request to extend Certificate of Appropriateness for 20 Beckford Street**

Ms. Kelleher stated that the owner is requesting an extension of the certificate for a door hood at the rear of the house.

**VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion extend the Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Norkun, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**  
**Vote on Commission Chair and Vice Chair**

Ms. Kelleher stated that the role of Vice Chair is vacant.

Mr. Pattison nominated Mr. Meche for Vice Chair. Mr. Meche declined.

Mr. Martinez nominated Mr. Joyce, who was not present but was contacted and accepted the nomination.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to appoint Vijay Joyce as Vice Chair. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Norkun, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.**

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to reappoint Larry Spang as Chair. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Norkun, Meche were in favor, Spang abstained, and the motion so carried.**

**Other Business:**

Chair Spang asked if there would be a quorum for the special meeting to review the draft of the Design Guidelines. Ms. Kelleher replied yes and noted that the draft will not be available until Friday, October 22<sup>nd</sup>, and they should consider how long to keep public comment open.

Ms. Kelleher stated that MHC is doing their next round of survey and planning grants, which is how the Design Guidelines Update was funded and there is a 50/50 match. The Commission should let her know if there are any planning projects they would like the City to pursue by the next meeting since the applications are due by November 15, 2021. Chair Spang asked if the grant money could be used for feasibility studies and suggested the Winter Island barracks building. Mr. Meche suggested shoring it up as they did with the jailkeepers house at the Salem Jail years ago.

Mr. Meche noted that the Salem Diner is listed in the National Register and asked what the Commission's role is in moving it. Ms. Kelleher replied that it's owned by the state, but MHC may become involved if SSU is disposing of property. The Commission's role is to provide comment, advocate, and support the preservation of the resource. If its new location is not visible to the public it will lose its context within Salem. She is unsure if its current placement is the original location, but diners are designed to be portable so relocation would not destroy its historic integrity.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the City is seeking to rebuild the seawall on Columbus Avenue, which is a contributing resource in the Willows National Register District. MHC found an adverse effect to the proposal to demolish the rubble stone faced wall and construct a simple concrete wall. She will keep the Commission up to date on the project.

**Adjournment**

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:45PM

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Preservation Planner