

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
May 17, 2023

A regular meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, May 17, 2023, at 6:00 pm. **VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING.** Present were: Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce, Milo Martinez, Larry Spang (Chair). Staff: Patti Kelleher. Not present: Reed Cutting, Jamie Graham, Mark Meche, Mark Pattison.

149 Federal Street

Joseph Archambault submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint colors, siding removal and fencing – *continuation*

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant requested a continuance to May 7, 2023.

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to continue until the May 7, 2023 regular meeting. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Joyce, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

393 Essex Street– continuation

Old Fezziwig LLC submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new fence

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant requested a continuance to May 7, 2023.

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to continue to the May 7, 2023 regular meeting. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Joyce, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

275 Lafayette Street– continuation

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/12/22
- Photographs
- Drawings by Seger Architects

Dan Ricciarelli of Seger Architects and Chad Murphy of MD Property Development LLC were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Ricciarelli noted that the Commission met on site at the former chapel. The new building is proposed along Lafayette Street, it was reviewed by the ZBA, Site Plan Review by the Planning Board (PB) is next, along with the DRB because it's an entrance corridor project. The details will happen later with the DRB review, but they are currently seeking to discuss massing with the Commission.

Mr. Ricciarelli stated that many homes line this corridor, and the Great Fire of Salem stopped further down the street. The neighboring buildings are 1860's – 1910 buildings, with a Classic Revival on left and a Greek Revival on the right., of which they pulled many details and measured some of the datums, as well as the porches, brackets, and slender windows. There is a large porch at 271 Lafayette that they want to align with as well as with the corner of the building to the right. Parking will be at rear and driveway will be the left side. Mechanicals and associated screening will be located at the rear and will be reviewed by the Commission prior to their installation. The floor plans have symmetrical footprints with a central entry. Units 1 and 2 are upside down townhome with a garden level, and three flats above. The datum study allowed them to align some of the prominent features of large bracketed cornices, banding, top of porches, watertable, and dormers, but with a slightly higher ridge. A materials discussion is underway and they will hold off on colors until they can look at the two buildings together. Hardi

clapboard is being considered, aluminum clad wood windows by Jeldwin or Marvin, and 3-tab asphalt roof shingles to match the rear building. They want to match the larger clapboard exposure and have 8-10-inch-wide cornerboards. The center porch will have a balustrade, Boral railings and a central entrance.

They may cantilever the rear to increase the square footage, which is currently between 1,100 -1,200 SF. Dormers are proposed at all four sides for upper level with 4-inches to the weather at upper-level façade above the banding. They will add more details as the plan develops.

Mr. Joyce noted that the massing is the correct approach, as was looking to the neighboring buildings. Ms. Graham asked if the doors were the same on each side. Mr. Ricciarelli replied yes, depending upon the program.

Chair Spang asked if they completed a zoning review. Mr. Ricciarelli replied yes and noted that they suggested a porch over the driveway with a side entrance, but it wasn't approved, and it would have been too close to the property line.

Mr. Martinez noted that in this age many structures had the outward appearance of a single-family home. Having the 5 bays in different configurations is odd and even spacing would help. He noted that there was too much empty space on the third floor and suggested tightening the bays and adding a center window. He was less concerned with the side and rear façade and the fenestration. Mr. Joyce agreed.

Chair Spang noted that the overall building style is simple and seems more Federal or farmhouse, but it could be the current size of openings. The proposed doesn't celebrate the building features and it feels more McIntire District than Lafayette Street Historic District. He suggested adding a roof over the front porch to create a deck for the upper units. Mr. Ricciarelli replied that they may need to widen the porch with the center hallway to incorporate that. Chair Spang noted that the front door resembles a single family but enters a public space. He suggested a door style with more openness and late Victorian details rather than a craftsman style. He agreed that the gable is wide and could be tighter with straight walls and a small gable above. Mr. Ricciarelli noted that they were looking to mimic the gable at the rear chapel, which may make more sense when both buildings are reviewed together. Chair Spang noted that the center bay, with an entry porch, windows above, and a small dormer would provide vertical proportion like the building next door.

Ms. Graham stated that referencing the rear building isn't a strong argument, since it connects more with the neighboring buildings, which have smaller dormers that penetrate the roof and that should be articulated on a more appropriate scale. She suggested the other doors be different. Mr. Ricciarelli agreed to provide future renderings to see it at all sides of the new building.

Mr. Joyce asked if mouldings be selected at future meetings. Mr. Ricciarelli replied yes. He noted that they are considering two grey color options, double-hung windows, and more. Mr. Joyce noted that he was comfortable with the general massing.

Public Comment:

Ms. Kelleher stated that HSI's Brick Coalition submitted a letter regarding the brick sidewalks. The Commission has no jurisdiction over at-grade paving, but it can provide comments for the Site Plan Review and landscape discussion.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant is still in the early concept stage, and they are not seeking concept approval at this time. Mr. Ricciarelli agreed and noted that they will continue with the design.

Chair Spang stated that the massing works well with the neighboring homes, he appreciated including a porch, stairs are proposed but other homes have a raised first floor also. They can provide more input but it's not a historic recreation, so the design team is off to a good start.

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to continue to the June 7, 2023 regular meeting. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Joyce, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

178 Federal Street– continued from May 3, 2023 meeting

Daniel Gutierrez submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for electrical service upgrade

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/10/23
- Photographs

Daniel Gutierrez was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that he presented a proposal a few weeks ago, an electrical connection is near a downspout so they proposed to move it a few inches. The recommendation from the electrical company was made by someone without authorization, so he submitted a new application. The electric service runs to the corner of the house; however, they need to locate the downspout, and the Building Inspector said that the point of contact cannot be within 2-feet of a window. The electrician suggested placing it at the front of the rake board or attaching it at a 45- or 90-degree angle off the vertical pipe. They also cannot be near the existing gas line at grade either. The code requires a new grounding wire which can be painted to match the color of the house, and the meter needs to be replaced with one that has an external breaker. The box would be the XL-200 which is taller and was installed 5 houses down and was also approved by the Building Inspector. Chair Spang noted that the 4.5-inch-deep x 13-inches-wide x 29-inches-high dimensions are quite large. He asked if an upgrade to 200 amps was required. Mr. Gutierrez replied that they have to replace the box and with so many items being replaced, they felt it was best to upgrade it now. Chair Spang suggested moving the downspout only. Mr. Gutierrez replied that they want to tackle it now, the connection should be out reach of the window and the current location doesn't meet code.

Chair Spang noted that a location at the front of the house isn't ideal, but they also need to move the weather head, where the cable goes into the vertical tube. Mr. Gutierrez replied that the weather head would be turned 90 degrees to prevent water from entering from the drip loop.

Chair Spang suggested running the wiring tight to the cornice where it could be partially hidden. Mr. Gutierrez agreed and noted that it would leave enough of a gap to hide the edge of the pipe, while also be hidden by the downspout. He noted that while he did push back on the use of such a tall meter box, these were the only options.

Chair Spang asked if the downspout would pull the eye away from the connection point. Mr. Gutierrez replied that the lower cable is for cable and will remain in place.

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

Mr. Joyce asked if the meter box could be painted. Chair Spang replied yes.

Ms. Graham questioned the route of the future electrical vehicle (EV) would be added now. Mr. Gutierrez replied no. Chair Spang asked if the driveway was located on this side of the house. Mr. Gutierrez replied yes, the brick driveway is two vehicles wide.

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to approve as submitted, to paint all paintable surfaces to match the façade color. Graham suggested an amendment to include that this is not setting a precedent and the electric service previously existed in this location. Ms. Kelleher noted that language would be added to the certificate. Graham seconded the motion with the amendment that language be added to certificate that meter was already in existence and approval

was not precedent setting. Roll Call: Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Joyce, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

1 Harrington Court - continued from May 3, 2023 meeting

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/10/23
- Photographs

Mitchell Mangahas of Power Home Remodeling Group was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Mangahas stated that the following is proposed; to strip the shingles, install ½” plywood as needed to replace any rot, install 6-feet of ice and watershield with a breathable underlayment at the perimeter of new architectural shingles, wrap the fascia in a PVC aluminum, cap the porch soffit with vinyl, install an extruded aluminum 6 K gutter. The fascia would be cut on site and wrapped on site and the roof shingles would be the color Graphite/Black. The aluminum soffit would be hidden from view.

Ms. Kelleher noted that she informed the company that the Commission doesn’t typically allow wood to be wrapped in PVC trim or aluminum soffits, because they don’t fall within the Historical Commission Design Guidelines. Mr. Mangahas noted that he did not currently have photos of previous renovations for the Commission’s review.

Chair Spang raised concerns with the Commission’s jurisdiction over Bridge Street. Ms. Kelleher noted that Bridge Street is not named in the district or in their jurisdiction. Chair Spang added that jurisdiction is only from Flint Street and there is no view on the north within the Commission’s jurisdiction.

Mr. Mangahas stated that they would reroof above the bay window, install a GAF Timberline HDZ architectural roof shingle with anti-fungal treatment. Their company has a partnership with GAF on the installation of that shingle only. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission does not typically approve this specific shingle due to the angled cut and dimensionality.

Mr. Joyce asked if all of the items must be completed together. Mr. Mangahas replied yes.

Mr. Joyce stated that the roof is prominent, and the angled cuts would be highly visible. Asphalt shingles replicate wood shingle which are straight cut rather than having angled cuts. Chair Spang noted that Graphite has a more unified texture and less variation and asked if another GAF product could be used. Mr. Mangahas replied no, it must be this line. Chair Spang requested local addresses be submitted of the Graphite color is use for the Commission to see in person.

Chair Spang asked for the purpose of the fascia wrap. Mr. Mangahas replied to keep the wood below maintenance free and get ahead of wood rot. Chair Spang noted that the Commission typically wants to highlight fascia and fabrics. Mr. Joyce was not in favor of covering the original moulding which adds character to the home and noted that a faux wood grain PVC is not acceptable, and there is no current damage to cover over. Chair Spang agreed. Mr. Mangahas replied that older homes may have plank boards which they typically go over, but the trim would be replaced to pad it out and then wrapped in metal. Chair Spang requested local addresses of the product in use for the Commission to see in person.

Chair Spang asked if gutters and downspouts would be installed if the other items were not. Mr. Mangahas replied no, their installation would be contingent on adding the fascia wrap. Ms. Kelleher requested the additional products

be submitted. Mr. Joyce agreed that more information is needed and suggested a continuance. Mr. Mangahas stated that he will also submit photos of the available package for context.

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

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to continue to the June 7, 2023 regular meeting. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Joyce, Martinez and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

24 Chestnut Street– continued from May 3, 2023 meeting

Nathan Ritsko submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new skylight

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/18/23
- Photographs
- Drawings by Pitman and Wardley

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant requested a continuance to May 7, 2023.

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to continue to the May 7, 2023 regular meeting. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Joyce, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Tyler-Lewis left the meeting at this time.

15 Warren Street– continued from May 3, 2023 meeting

Catherine Miller submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new door

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/17/23
- Photographs

Catherine Miller was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Miller stated that between 2007 and 2014 they've made numerous renovations. They added granite walls and rear fencing, the chimney work was recently approved by the Commission, but they now want to replace their circa 1954 front entry door. The door is approximately 6-feet-8-inches-high x 2-foot-8-inches wide. They wanted to restore it but there is a chase on either side of it at the interior. They've repainted the door, and added weatherstripping, but it's not historic and the glass lites are out of proportion. She proposed a Simpson solid wood door Model 255, to be painted black, with rubbed bronze hardware. The door does not have lites but Simpson would customize it and install 3 lites at the top. The new lites would be Sea Spray to match, SDL so there is a piece of material between the two layers of glass. The oil rubbed bronze is called Modern and is by M-Tech. It would have a proper mortis set, a deadbolt to match and a mail slot with hidden screw attachments. The mailbox slot may not fit at the bottom of the door, so she suggested it be mounted in the panel of the door.

Chair Spang requested more information about the lites proposed at the top panel. Ms. Miller replied that they have 6 over 6 windows so 3 lites across would work better than 4.

Mr. Joyce asked why a 5-panel door was proposed and not 4. Ms. Miller replied that they didn't feel a craftsman style door was appropriate. A cross style door is Greek Revival, but the door is narrow, and they don't have space for a wider door. Mr. Joyce noted that the door style proposed is appropriate to that era and suggested a 6-panel

door with two top lites. Ms. Miller replied that they want the mail slot in the lower part of the door and middle and vertical mail slots are hard to find. She noted that the date on their house plaque is 1850.

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

Mr. Joyce requested that the three lites be orientated rather than horizontal.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to approve as submitted with the custom lites to be taller than they are wide. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: Graham, Martinez, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

10 Flint Street

Erin Wise submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new fence

Ms. Kelleher stated that the application was determined to be an in-kind change, using a Certificate of Non-Applicability, and did not require review.

12 Carpenter Street

William Grover submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for solar panels

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/1/23
- Photographs

William Grover (owner) and Jason Goodwin of Sunrun were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Goodwin stated that they are proposing to install 17 solar panels on the south facing roof. The panels would be black, and the equipment would be mounted next to the meter on the opposite side of the house, which isn't a concern because the Owner owns both sides of the house. The panels are 2-inches thick and would sit 4-inches off the roof.

Chair Spang asked why the entire roof would not receive solar panels. Mr. Goodwin replied that the utility company only allows a system based on the previous year's coverage, to make the bill zero. The panels will be installed where there is the most sunlight and with the rear vent pipe in the way that may be why the panels are installed near the front. He noted that two systems can't be installed on the same roof even if it's two units, although the owner could gift any overages to the other unit. The utility companies don't want to end up owing owners' money.

Chair Spang asked if a large conduit would extend over the roof. Mr. Goodwin replied that they will try to go through the attic, but there is no attic, they would install a conduit on the roof. Mr. Grover added that they will work out a way to get the conduit to the north side. The attic in the middle of the house is finished, but there is no access to the gable ends. If they can't go through the roof they could route the conduit across the back of the house to the north side and then down. Chair Spang suggested a continuation to determine the routing issue or to consider the panels by themselves. Mr. Goodwin agreed that there were too many unknowns with running a conduit in an unknown route and noted his preference with a continuance.

Mr. Grover suggested an approval on the panel locations and the quantity. Chair Spang raised concerns with the panels being placed in a different configuration or on the opposite side of the house. Mr. Grover noted the ice dam situation and a large tree that blocks the sun in the morning and early afternoon. Mr. Goodwin noted that moving the panels would mean a new design and production.

Chair Spang asked if the roof was newer. Mr. Grover replied that it was replaced within the past 5 years. Mr. Joyce noted that he was not in favor of the high contrast of a light roof to dark panels, but that's not enough for him to say no to installing the panels. Chair Spang noted that the state guidance is to encourage their installation in historic districts and to tweak the design but not prevent their installation. Ms. Kelleher noted that the guidelines could be defied if the Commission felt it was appropriate and agreed that the SHC guidelines do encourage their installation with suggestions. Mr. Goodwin noted that the solar panels are black with a silver grid, since there is a worldwide shortage on all black solar panels. The model proposed is Vikrum 375 model.

Ms. Kelleher asked if this model has this been installed in Salem or Beverly. Mr. Goodwin replied that they just started using these solar panels 2 months ago because they can no longer get black on black. He agreed to provide addresses for local installations on the North Shore.

The Commission discussed the potential conduit routes. Chair Spang noted that a view of the disconnect and meter would be hidden by the brick wall. Mr. Goodwin noted that since this road is a one-way street, the meter won't be highly visible, and the pine tree will also block the view. Chair Spang requested photographs or drawings of the proposed equipment and noted that like an electrical box, must be several 3-feet away from windows. Mr. Goodwin noted that the inverter is preferred to be at the exterior for emergencies and accessible in the event of a fire. The shut off would be located next to the meter.

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

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to continue to the June 7, 2023 regular meeting. Martinez seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Grover made another request for an approval on panel location and quantity. Ms. Graham raised concerns with setting a precedent for this type of solar panel and suggested waiting for supply chain issues to clear up. Mr. Goodwin replied that it could be years. Chair Spang noted that people will still want to install them even if they aren't black on black and his concern is with the light colored roof because there is no configuration that will make it blend in. Mr. Martinez noted that he had no concern with the grid. Mr. Grover noted that if National Grid approves more panels they will add them and the next new roof could be darker. Mr. Goodwin stated that there are some situations where the new code must be followed and a reroof is required.

Ms. English arrived at this time.

1 Forrester Street – continuation

Joshua MacGregor submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new shed

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/31/23
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher suggested moving the application to later in the agenda for the following reasons, Mr. Martinez was an abutter and would abstain, Ms. Tyler-Lewis had not listened to the recording, and Ms. English would join the meeting later in the evening.

Mr. Martinez recused himself as an abutter.

Ms. English joined the meeting.

Joshua MacGregor was present to discuss the project.

Chair Spang noted that the applicant was leaning toward the Aspen model from Eastern Shed Company. Mr. MacGregor replied that the Aspen would be acceptable rather than the Chateau he originally requested. His concern was with the window since he can build a façade on the shed to match the house. A 30-inch-wide x 40-inch-high window size is an option along with the smallest double doors available. The shed will be a workshop and he preferred a window lite configuration that matched the house. Mr. Joyce noted that the shed windows would be vinyl and suggested a simulated divided lite (SDL) mullions, single pane windows since the shed will not be heated, or to order the shed without windows and add simple Brosco wood windows that the owner can frame himself. Mr. MacGregor suggested using the standard shed windows to simplify this installation. Mr. Joyce requested making the window panes taller than they are wide. Mr. MacGregor noted that he selected a window that matched the house. Chair Spang suggested clapboard siding rather than vinyl.

Ms. Tyler-Lewis rejoined the meeting.

Chair Spang suggested a less modern 6-panel door. Mr. MacGregor noted his preference for tongue & groove style doors. Mr. Joyce noted that both the doors and windows can be customized. Chair Spang suggested a continuance for the applicant to determine the details and pricing. Ms. Kelleher provided recent shed approvals and their conditions for the Commission's consideration, such as; windows and door installed on non-visible sides and roof overhang options. Specifics for this application could relate to SDL windows, appropriate grid orientation, and the door design, and the applicant could return if he is not able to incorporate those design elements, or Commission members could be appointed to work with the applicant. Mr. MacGregor raised concerns with limited options related to the Aspen shed, and agreed to use single pane Brosco windows if necessary and would request tongue and groove entry doors, which would be a close match to the plank doors on the house. He asked if the hardware on the Aspen shed would be sufficient. Chair Spang suggested barn doors to match in a 4 over 4 configuration and double-hung window trimmed to match the barn. Mr. Joyce volunteered to review the shed.

Public Comment:

Mr. Martinez suggested placing the windows on the north façade where they would not be visible from the street. Mr. MacGregor believed the neighboring cherry tree would obscure too much natural light and that would limit him to building out storage at the entrance rather than the sides of the shed.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. English raised concerns with no painting color or specification being provided. Mr. MacGregor replied that the shed would be painted to match the color of the house.

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to approve the Aspen style shed by Eastern Shed Company, with small windows, a double-door entry, to match the existing barn structure, with clapboard siding and cornerboards, painted to match the house, with details to be reviewed by Commissioner Joyce,. English seconded the motion.
Roll Call: Tyler-Lewis abstained due to missing half the presentation, Graham, Joyce, English, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Review of work completed at 122 Derby Street (Ye Olde Pepper Companie)

Ms. Kelleher stated that the building underwent significant renovations including a side addition.

Robert Burkinshaw and Jacqueline Burkinshaw (daughter) were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Burkinshaw stated that the project is nearly complete although Ms. Kelleher had a question regarding an A/C line that was installed without Commission review and approval. He presented before photographs of two window units, a later addition of a rooftop unit with pipes running down to the side of the building next to the window, and

the current configuration of a new exterior pipe with a 90-degree turn. The unit was existing which is why he did not seek an approval to reconnect it in a different configuration. It was the only line they couldn't run inside, because of the second-floor layout. They can rotate it 90-degrees, so it runs down the interior corner and over toward the window; however, they remodeled the interior 4-years ago and would rather not rip out walls to install the line on the interior. They painted the new pipe to conceal it as best as possible. Ms. Burkinshaw added that contractor moved the rooftop condensers toward the roof peak to conceal them street view, and they weren't able to take apart the double roof (new roof over the old framing) due to structural instability concerns for the condenser unit.

Ms. English stated that the reconfigured piping would be less intrusive. Ms. Kelleher noted that the contractor spoke to her about placing the condenser in a location not visible from the street but she wasn't aware that the change would include an exterior line set. Her suggestion was this modified configuration making the piping less visible, and since the system hasn't been charged they can modify the route. Mr. Burkinshaw noted that the new A/C unit will be routed to their store to keep it cool.

Mr. Joyce agreed with the reconfiguration.

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

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to amend the certificate to allow for an exterior run for a condenser unit and to change the orientation, so it runs horizontally to the interior corner and then up. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Joyce, Martinez, English, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Vote to issue second violation notice for 20 Hathorne Street

Ms. Kelleher stated that the building was painted white without Commission approval and the applicant did not return with an alternative color scheme, several windows have been replaced also without approval. They have not responded to her requests to return to the Commission, or the first violation notice mailed to them in April 2023 which required a meeting with the Commission within 30-days. She requested to issue a second violation notice. The old Design Guidelines provided a guide for addressing violation notices, where it states that after 15-days of not responding it becomes an enforcement issue.

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to issue a second violation notice and to work with the City Solicitor. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Joyce, Martinez, English, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher noted that she spoke with the owner/manager several months ago, who said he would submit something but did not.

Vote to accept preservation restriction for 86 Essex Street/50 Washington Square as a condition of Community Preservation Act funding

Ms. Kelleher stated that as a historic resource, the property owner must agree to a preservation restriction that is held by the Salem Historical Commission. In order to have a preservation restriction that they hold, the Commission must vote on it. This property is the Philips School, on the corner of Salem Common received CPA funding for restoration work. Chair Spang asked how long the preservation restriction would be held. Ms. Kelleher replied in perpetuity.

Mr. Martinez asked if the Philips School was part of the Salem Common Historic District. Ms. Kelleher replied yes, but it is a requirement of the CPA to ensure public benefit, and even if located in a historic district there is no

special consideration for an LHD property. The preservation restriction is more enforceable and will allow for review of areas of the building that aren't visible from a public way, such as the rear of the building, which is not visible from Salem Common, therefore, no changes can be made without Commission approval.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to accept the preservation restriction. English seconded the motion.

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

Other Business:

a. Meeting Minutes;

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to approve the January 4, 2023 regular meeting minutes. English seconded.

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

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to approve the January 18, 2023 regular meeting minutes. English seconded.

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

Review of February 1, 2023 meeting minutes were carried over to the next regular meeting.

b. Violations;

c. Correspondence

d. Other:

Ms. Kelleher asked if the Commission members have prior knowledge of reviewing and approving window boxes because a homeowner would like to install them. Chair Spang replied no, and if they are temporary they would not need to be reviewed. He noted that house on the corner of Broad and Summer Streets has them. Ms. Kelleher noted a home on Botts Court but she wanted to confirm that the Commission had not reviewed them. Chair Spang suggested that the installation of plastic window boxes would be cause for concern. The Commission agreed. Ms. Kelleher to confirm with Jane Guy, the previous Commission staff person.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the proposed El Centro building, on the corner of New Derby and Lafayette Streets, will be discussed at the next Commission meeting. They requested a Demolition Delay waiver and are still within the waiting period, however, they are required to complete a Section 106 review. She and HSI representatives met with the CDC the previous week to discuss the process. She will discuss the demolition of a historic resource and request comments at the next Commission meeting. Chair Spang requested the time remaining on their demolition delay waiver. Ms. Kelleher believed the 18-month delay has 6 months remaining. Significant permitting will be requested, triggering a review by the National Park Service and Massachusetts Historical Commission, because they are seeking state funding and meeting Chapter 91 requirements.

Mr. Martinez stated that on the old Salem Laundry Building on Derby Street, the Commission approved a 2-tone blue, however, a portion of the façade has been painted grey. The applicant should return to seek approval or paint it in the approved colors to match the rest of the building.

Mr. Martinez asked if Mark Pattison's commission expired. Ms. Kelleher replied that Mr. Pattison took a 6-month hiatus, and his membership doesn't expire until June 2024. Mr. Cutting's membership expired in March 2023 with the Mayoral change. There is a call for new members in either Derby Street or Lafayette Street neighborhood and

she will confirm whether a lawyer is required with Ch. 40C. She noted that Ms. English is the realtor, Mr. Joyce is a member of local historical society, and Mr. Pattison is a carpenter. She noted that there will be a new Mayor as of 1-week from today.

Ms. English asked about joining the HSI Preservation Awards Committee. Ms. Kelleher replied that Chair Spang and Ms. English were interested in joining and the meetings could be hybrid.

Adjournment

VOTE: Joyce made a motion to adjourn. English seconded the motion.

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

The meeting ended at 9:15PM

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen Brewster
Clerk