

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
June 21, 2023

A regular meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 6:00 pm.

VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING. Present were: Rebecca English, Jamie Graham, Mark Meche, Milo Martinez, Larry Spang (Chair). Staff: Patti Kelleher. Not present: Reed Cutting, Vijay Joyce, Mark Pattison.

266, 282, 282R and 286 Canal Street and 2 Kimball Road – 266 Canal Street Trust, Esther Realty Trust, JAB Trust requested a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish four (4) buildings older than 50 years

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/6/23
- Photographs

Attorney Joseph Correnti and Jacob Sneider of Correnti & Kolick LLP, David Seibert of BK Architects, and Chris Koeplin of Canal Street Station, LLC, were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Correnti stated that he is representing the applicant and developer, Canal Street Station, LLC, regarding the site commonly referred to as Bertini's, which encompasses over 13 acres of land including Rosie's Pond and four buildings. The project is currently before the Planning Board (PB), Conservation Commission (CC), they completed their review with the Design Review Board (DRB) where they received a positive recommendation, and they will continue to meet with the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA.) There have been several neighborhood meetings with the help of Councillor Cohen in Ward 5. 250 residential dwelling units are proposed in five buildings with commercial space along Canal Street. The current request is for a waiver to the demolition delay ordinance to remove four existing buildings.

Mr. Seibert located the four buildings on the property, a large warehouse and smaller outbuilding (266 Canal), Loring Motors (282 Canal), and Bertini's Restaurant (286 Canal.) There are no landmark structures in the area. Bertini's constructed in 1951, is unoccupied. It is a masonry structure that has been altered over the years to include wood details at its main entrances. The former Loring Motors building was a warehouse and service building converted into a multi-tenant retail space with rear storage, that has received signage and multi-storefront alterations. The warehouse along the Rail Trail is a bent steel frame structure with corrugated metal siding. The associated small outbuilding is unoccupied and may have been used as an industrial office. All four structures would be slated for demolition to make way for the proposed 5 structure development. The mixed-use residential and commercial building would be located at Kimball Road and Canal Street while the four residential buildings would run parallel to the Rail Trail. He added that architecturally and aesthetically lacking and they have no notable style. Loring Motors has an early automotive design, the warehouse has Butler style building vernacular, and the outbuilding is a wood frame structure.

Atty. Correnti stated that they will have their fifth meeting with the PB on July 5, 2023, they were referred to the DRB by the PB because Canal Street is along an entrance corridor and the DRB review resulted in a unanimous recommendation back to the PB as it relates to the architectural style of the new development and layout. They will meet with the CC for the second time on June 20, 2023, and will return to the CC in July, with the hopes of obtaining an Order of Conditions. They were very encouraged by the comments received by their engineering team at the end of last night's meeting. They will go before the ZBA in an hour to request a building height variance. They plan to exceed the maximum height of Building A by 7-feet and at Buildings C through E by approximately 10-feet. The primary reason for the height variance request is because the buildings will have parking at grade and to keep the buildings out of future flood conditions. They are also planning to conclude with the PB in July. Mr.

Koeplin noted that the ZBA approved a height variance in 2022. Atty. Correnti added that the previous plan for seven buildings proposal was consolidated to five, and the ZBA unanimously approved that earlier height variance request, and this request is for the updated plan.

Atty. Correnti stated that they've enjoyed working with and appreciated the continued support of Councillor Cohen at the neighborhood meetings he helped set up, and by his predecessor former Councillor Turiel. The project has been shaped and reshaped by the public process and through the input of various boards. The major component hasn't been seen by any private development in the city, the affordable housing aspect. The PB requests all housing developments to have 10% set aside at 60% AMI and this project is offering 20% at 60% AMI, totaling 50 affordable rental units, to help meet community needs. What remains will be market rate and workforce housing.

Chair Spang asked if the building or site had undergone hazardous materials testing. Atty. Correnti replied yes. Environmental studies are being done, the current owners have taken certain remedial steps and there is more to be done. Mr. Koeplin added that they've had geotechnical testing and there may be tanks under the building related to the prior auto, which isn't uncommon.

Mr. Meche noted that the 400 square-foot building is included in the inventory form for the 1977 warehouse and asked if it was of a similar era or older. Mr. Koeplin believed it was from 1931 and related to the construction of the train tracks. Mr. Meche noted that the warehouse is just past the 50-year mark as is Bertini's Restaurant.

Public Comment:

Ms. Kelleher stated that she received a letter of support from the following:

Councillor Jeff Cohen, dated June 19, 2023, who was in support of the waiver of the demolition delay and the redevelopment of the property.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Meche stated that the warehouse was an obvious choice to demolish, Bertini's Restaurant is also nothing special in his opinion. He's never noticed the small building, and of the three, that would be the most historical. The applicants put forth a compelling argument, and if it is historical, he would lean towards the benefit gained by its removal. With this being a big ask, he suggested a site visit.

Chair Spang noted the slightly more historic quality of the small brick building, it doesn't appear to be terribly significant. Mr. Meche noted that the small building is referenced in the inventory form of the warehouse. Mr. Koeplin noted that the small structure has vinyl windows. Mr. Siebert noted that this building has undergone material changes over the years. Mr. Koeplin noted that the foundation is concrete. Chair Spang noted the utilitarian handrails and overhang. Mr. Meche noted that given its small size, it's unlikely that any historical events occurred.

Atty. Correnti noted the fourth structure, the automotive building, they are proposing to demolish. Chair Spang noted that the brick/masonry façade warehouse was in rough condition. Mr. Siebert noted that combination of T1-11 plywood and masonry. Mr. Meche questioned whether the building was reduced in size once the street was added and if the Canal Street façade was newer. Mr. Seibert did not believe it was. Mr. Meche requested the structural framing make-up. Mr. Siebert replied steel with a steel roof.

Ms. English had no concerns with the removal of the four structures.

VOTE: English made a motion that the four structures were not historically significant. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Martinez and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher noted that photographic documentation of the four exteriors including ¾ views is a typical requirement of demolition waivers.

119 Federal Street– *continuation*

Fred and Linda Lipton submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for fencing

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/22/23
- Photographs

Fred and Linda Lipton were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher noted that several Commission members attended the site visit. Chair Spang noted that some Commission members had thoughts on how to work with the existing fencing.

Mr. Lipton stated that the Commissions suggestions were incorporated into the design of the fencing that divides the two properties and they centered the gate to allow for a larger space of fence on either side, along with 60-degree lattice and thicker wood, that the carpenter would construct.

Mr. Martinez appreciated the scaled drawings being provided by the applicant. He had no issues with the proposed and matching details of the neighboring fence.

Mr. Meche noted that no site plans was provided, however, the new configuration would be located near the corner of the house and the first window and would project perpendicularly.

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

Ms. Lipton noted that with the addition of a second post, the fence would be shorter by approximately 1-foot. Mr. Meche clarified that by moving the post the fence configuration would become a L rather than a T, so the fence is horizontally shortened. Ms. Lipton noted that the fence would be moved to avoid hitting their window.

VOTE: Meche made a motion to accept the application as presented, with the fence to be located at the top of the driveway, between the corner and the window, and to shorten the adjacent fence, with the fence to match existing – Dove White and Grey. Martinez seconded the motion.
Roll Call: English, Meche, Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Martinez and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

259 Washington Street – *continuation*

259 Washington Street, LLC submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish a 1930 building

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/18/23
- Photographs

Michael Becker (owner) was present to discuss the project.

Chair Spang noted that he, Mr. Meche, and Ms. Kelleher made a site visit the previous week. Ms. Kelleher noted that the single-story brick building was constructed after the fire and in concert with the building next door. The decorative details on the iron fence is repeated throughout the building in the chimney, lattice at the front and rear porch, and window box, along with details on the porch roofs. The stairs are of a buff brick that matches the façade and windowsills, and the rear windows are believed to be original. Chair Spang added that the main body of the house has a low hipped roof with a decorative soffit and entablature, with a utilitarian rear ell with a flat roof. He noted that Mr. Becker wanted to incorporate the building into a new structure above, but determinations about the condition of the brick façade have led to a new proposal, to demolish the building and construct a new structure.

Mr. Becker noted that he spoke to his architect about continuing to incorporate the existing building and incorporating the Commission's comments but adding a new structure both next to and above it. Preliminary sketches were provided, he may eliminate the fourth floor and make the ground floor parking and greenspace only, but he is open to suggestions. Chair Spang asked if the upper floors would overhang the existing building or be on the same plane. Mr. Becker replied that there would be an overhang that extended closer to the sidewalk. The fence could be repurposed on either side and the perimeter.

Chair Spang asked about the existing side entry porch. Mr. Becker replied that it will be removed and recreated above the entry with similar angles, as a nod to the original building. The picture window at the front façade would become the new main entrance and the side entrance would be removed to allow for a new 2-car garage, and the two sections of fence toward the right would be repurposed. The rafter ends at the soffit would be recreated out of steel but would be higher than the existing roof. It's unknown at this time whether the structure would stop short of the new south-east front façade to make way for the parking space in the south-west corner.

Mr. Meche was pleased to see some of their comments from the site visit incorporated into the preliminary design, and asked if a continuance was desired until the proposed design is more fleshed out or to start the demolition delay clock. Mr. Becker replied that while the proposed design is preliminary, he's seeking feedback on details to preserve or good changes to make.

Mr. Meche stated that he is not supportive of the addition being 10-feet in front of the front of the house, fire code prohibits the structure from coming within 10-feet of a neighboring property line and not the building. Mr. Becker believed the structure could be within 5-feet with a fully sprinklered building. Mr. Meche suggested building up to the property lines if keeping the existing building in B5 zone and he can achieve fire separation due to proximity using either inset balconies or fire shutters. Mr. Becker replied that at 65 Federal Street they used fire-rated windows and 23 Federal Street they used a fire curtain sprinkler head for deluge protection at a cost and he would prefer more outdoor space via inset balconies. The lot is asymmetrical and he may adjust the footprint for an easier construction. Mr. Meche stated that the proposed design would need to be improved before he could support a waiver of the demolition delay.

Ms. Kelleher stated that if the Commission was supportive, a letter could be sent to the Zoning Board of Appeals in support of zoning relief, to allow for the preservation of an historic building. Mr. Becker noted that the only relief he would seek is for parking. The existing building parking can be onsite or offsite, so he may not need relief for it if he is able to obtain a couple off-site parking spaces. Mr. Meche encouraged the preparation of floor plans.

Mr. Martinez requested the thoughts of those Commission members present at the site visit. Chair Spang noted that it is a uniquely historic building due to its location, structure, and builder/contractor. HSI provided a letter about the history of the builder in the city. The building doesn't fit any of the typical periods or styles found in Salem; however, much care and attention were paid to the building when constructed. On site, Mr. Becker raised concern with cracked brick, which he didn't believe looked substantive or raise any structural concerns, because the cracking appeared to be caused by expansion and contraction. Mr. Becker also raised concern about adding the

new structure above. Chair Spang stated that the repetitive details unify the site, and since the building is occupied, they cannot speak to the existence or preservation of any interior details. He found it difficult to say that the structure is not historically significant due to the quality of the building and its builder, but there is a lot to be said for trying to save the building. He appreciated the applicant responding to their comments while on site, but the new scheme will fundamentally change the existing building and not achieve their preservation goals.

Chair Spang asked if this structure could be moved to another lot in Salem that would allow him to develop it as he likes in keeping with the new neighboring buildings. Mr. Becker replied that he will investigate that.

Mr. Meche stated that while he's driven by many times, he's never noticed the building and after taking this closer look at it, it is a funky jewel that has a lot of detail and charm. It is in good condition; he believed the cracked brick was due to freeze thaw cycles. He suggested moving the structure closer to the sidewalk with a rear overhang. Chair Spang reiterated modifications that would result in a loss of historic resources. While Mr. Becker noted his experience moving other buildings, he asked if the Commission had experience regarding what moving a brick building would entail. Chair Spang suggested contacting a house mover to determine what it would take and if it was feasible. Mr. Meche suggested investigating building around it first, because moving the existing structure may not be the first or best preservation strategy, unless it is essential. He noted the relocation of the church to the corner of Federal and North Street for the construction of the new courthouse. Mr. Meche agreed that the structure is historic and preferably preserved.

Mr. Martinez stated that the structure, with the repetition of this classic motif and every decision is informed by this pentagon. This sort of Craftsman design is very rare in Salem and is similar to what Frank Lloyd Wright (FLW) would have designed. He suggested two structures in Manchester, NH be studied for this repetitive motif and cohesive design. FLW would have designed the carports to be part of the overall design, and they would have an openness not an enclosed garage, rather than an obtrusive façade that doesn't fit the Craftsman style. Much of that is lost in the preliminary design and the repetitive Usonian motif can be studied by an architect to determine how to incorporate that motif into the entire building. He agreed that it would be difficult to say the building was not historically significant. Ms. Graham agreed, she walks by each day, believes it to be noticeable, and would be sad to see it go. She agreed with other comments and noted that regarding the scale, she understands the desire to use the property and add density, but this building would not support that while maintaining its character, and she had no suggestions. Ms. English agreed that the structure is historically significant and should be preserved, although she appreciates the applicant's willingness to incorporate it into the design, but it would get lost in the dimensions of the proposed design. The existing roof shape complements the property and removing it to build over it swallows up the building.

Mr. Becker asked if a pyramid style hip roof on the new building would help. Chair Spang suggested a continuance and noted that the goal of the demolition delay is to give the applicant time to work through alternatives to prevent the loss of a historic resource, but the Commissioners shouldn't provide immediate input. Mr. Becker requested any conceptual ideas or building elements to remain incorporated and noted that the downtown renewal guidelines state that buildings should go up to the sidewalk. He wanted to make this the best project it can be, and he is not opposed to relocating the structure to another site.

Ms. Tyler-Lewis stated that she is intrigued by the idea of relocating the structure, given the unusual style and the assertion of Mr. Audet's unique and forceful personality, which should be sustained through history, but could do the same on another site. Mr. Becker stated that he learned of the builder at the previous meeting, and he does not want to be the person who obliterates it if there is an alternative that suits the same attempt.

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

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to continue to the July 5, 2023. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Martinez and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

149 Federal Street – continuation

Joseph Archambault submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint color, siding removal and fencing

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/20/23
- Photographs

Joseph and Kathy Archambault were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher stated that applicants have been meeting with Commissioner Joyce regarding fencing options like the board fence at 384 Essex Street, while she suggested duplicating the fence at the rear of their property along the street. The removal of the shingle siding would allow them to restore the clapboards beneath. There was a fence along the street in 2016 which was removed, and the posts remain in place.

Siding

Chair Spang asked if they confirmed that clapboards existed below the shingles. Mr. Archambault replied yes, when replacing missing shingles, and the smaller areas appear to be in good condition. Chair Spang asked if the request to remove a large area of shingles or all the shingles. Mr. Archambault suggested starting with the removal of the front shingles only. Ms. Archambault added that if significant restoration is required, they would request to cover the front with new shingles.

Paint Colors

Ms. Archambault stated that they will return for approval of paint colors once they've determined the condition of the clapboard façade.

Chair Spang stated that the request is for the removal of shingles around the entire house and restore or repair the underlying clapboards. Phase 1 would be to remove the shingles on the front of the house and the front dormer on all sides. Phase 2 would be the removal of shingles on the remaining façades.

Mr. Meche was in support of the proposed restoration and removal of the clapboards. Ms. English agreed.

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

Chair Spang stated that when siding is removed the applicant may expose various moulding sizes that should be repaired or replaced to match. The front entry hood and enclosure is expected to remain, and any proposed changes should result in the applicant returning to the Commission. He noted that some older homes have shortened clapboards, 4-feet with overlapped scarf joints as opposed to today's longer clapboards with butt joints, which could mean more effort regarding the facade restoration.

Mr. Martinez suggested tying the vote to the refurbishment of the rear entrance that is still outstanding. Ms. Kelleher noted that several years ago the applicant requested a redesign of the rear entry porch that was simpler than what was approved. She was unsure of the legality of connecting the two approvals. It has been left natural, but the applicant proposed to paint it to match but has never been satisfied. Chair Spang noted that the rear entry porch is now in violation for not being built as approved. Ms. Archambault replied that it was constructed during the COVID pandemic, but they weren't present for what exists currently is the end result. Other than adding a railing, they had no other plans to modify the rear porch.

Mr. Meche noted that the porch has three steps which requires a guardrails. The lattice below appears to be plastic, so while it's not far from being finished it does not look good. Mr. Martinez noted that Commissioner Joyce spent a lot of time with the applicants on the design that was not constructed with new columns and a new roof. If the completion of that design is not being proposed the applicant should return with a new proposal before the Commission can agree to paint it as-is, because he would agree that it is currently in violation. Ms. Kelleher stated that the previous enclosed entry would be removed and replaced with an open porch with a new roof in keeping with the roof of the previous porch, but currently there is an open stoop to the rear entry.

Ms. Archambault stated that without the roof natural light is able to enter the rear hallway, which they now prefer, and the rear entry step remains in its natural finish. They wanted to paint the house and the new entry, but the shingles were curled, and even after replacing so many shingles the paint color didn't look good, so they stopped and came up with this new plan. They intend to restore the entire house, landscaping, fencing, and driveway.

Chair Spang stated that projects where not aspects of them are completed or stop and start are concerning, but the completion should be consistent with the approval, rather than changes as the project moves along. He suggested continuing the clapboard discussion until the porch design is modified making it historically consistent, and to ensure that the project is completed.

Mr. Meche that while the violation needs to be addressed, greenlighting the shingles makes sense and doesn't relieve them of their obligation to complete the previous work. Chair Spang raised concerns about having a similar situation at the front façade, where the shingles are removed, more work is needed than anticipated, and a patchwork condition remains. He suggested project be completed prior to returning with additional requests. Ms. Archambault replied that her husband and children did the initial painting, but they would hire a company to complete the new work in its entirety.

Mr. Meche noted that everyone is still discovering more about the house and what exists at the rear isn't code complaint and will need to be addressed, but in good faith the Commission should allow the front shingles to be removed. Regarding the rear porch, either they should be completed as approved, or a new proposal should be approved. Chair Spang added that the commercial grade lattice below the porch is not something the Commission would typically approve, they would prefer a square lattice or slat boards, but without an application only minimal advice can be given without notifying the public. He suggested the applicants return to confirm the proposed paint colors, and to submit a new application for the rear entry, and the fence discussion be continued.

VOTE: English made a motion to approve the removal of the shingles and to continue the fence discussion until the July 19, 2023 meeting. Graham seconded the motion.

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

Meche suggested that only the shingles should be removed, and all trim should be carefully removed. Chair Spang noted that the shingle removal will include the three sides of the dormer and any trim shall be repaired or maintained.

Mr. Archambault requested clarification on the rear entry, whether the lattice should be replaced with squares and a guardrail added to the steps. Ms. Kelleher presented the previously approved porch redesign with an overhang, extended porch, and columns. Chair Spang noted that things can change with a project, but applicants should return to the Commission and present their desired modifications. Code compliance and a handrail that goes down to grade has not been installed. Documentation is needed to make sure the Commission is comfortable with either what was built or with the proposed modifications. Mr. Meche noted that a railing may be required on both sides of the stair.

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

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant was not present and suggested a continuation to the next regular meeting.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to continue to the July 5, 2023 regular meeting. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Martinez and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

12 Carpenter Street- continuation

William Grover submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for solar panels

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/1/23
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant is still trying to find a way to not install conduit over the roof, so they have requested a continuation to the July 5, 2023 meeting.

VOTE: Graham made a motion to continue to the July 5, 2023 regular meeting. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Martinez and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

1 Harrington Court- continuation

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/10/23
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant was requesting approval to wrap some of their trim and a material sample was requested as well as photographs from other buildings that received the same treatment. The contractor was not able to provide anything for tonight's meeting and requested a continuance to the July 5, 2023 meeting.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to continue to the July 5, 2023 regular meeting. Graham seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Martinez and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

15 Cambridge Street- continuation

Jonathan Collins and Kristelle Lavallo submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for an EV charging station (after the face)

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicants were not able to attend tonight's meeting. They were not able to find anyone to design a screening box, so they are proposing to paint the box in its current location. She read an e-mail from the applicant stating the proposed paint color would match the façade color and an earlier e-mail with the opinion of a contractor who felt that painting would be the best option rather than constructing a box that would create more of an obstruction.

Ms. Tyler-Lewis noted that the charging station was covered with a sheet of plastic during a rainstorm indicating a concern about rain infiltration, making the boxed-out option a better choice. Chair Spang raised concern with where the paint would stop given the presence of operational buttons and the cord.

Ms. Graham asked if the applicant considered moving it. Chair Spang replied that the applicant felt that was an unmanageable option given that the current location works best with pulling into the driveway and charging the vehicle at this rear left corner. Moving it to the side of the house would stretch the cord across the stairs and create a hazard. Ms. Kelleher noted that the lot is small, and the street is narrow. As a two-family the first-floor owners would need to access the stairs making moving it a challenge. Painting over the unsightly black box would improve it.

Ms. Graham raised concerns with a precedent being set and applicants claiming to be unaware of the rules to place charging stations anywhere. This would have been a good case study for how best to integrate it while allowing the historic character to be maintained. Chair Spang stated that the boxed-out method is an efficient way to do it with minimal costs, particularly if they are having issues with water infiltration. With the applicants expecting a child in July their focus is elsewhere, but they can be held in violation, continued, have them return in September to discuss the matter, or agree to paint it.

Mr. Martinez noted that the applicants weren't receptive to their idea in earlier conversations and painting is not the solution since the function buttons would need to be unpainted and their current box is not meant to be painted. The applicants have had zero interest in working with the Commission to reach a resolution. He suggested continuing to hold the applicant in violation.

Mr. Meche stated that more of them will be added to the historic districts, and he doesn't see them as permanent, despite them not looking appropriate on historic homes. He would have argued for approving if it wasn't in violation, but with more care, such as installing it over the junction box to conceal the conduit rather than constructing a box around it which would call more attention to it. Their next vehicle may not require a charging station so they shouldn't be considered permanent. It may be in place for 5-10 years, but the Commission needs to find a way to comfortably allow them to exist within their historic culture-scape, for good reason. The applicants have behaved badly, but he can continue the discussion or continue the violations, given that the applicants don't show up to the meetings.

Ms. Graham reiterated using this as a good case study for how to integrate charging stations in a way that does respect the historic character. The request to do that after the fact has gone nowhere, so she would agree with Mr. Martinez and put the matter into violation.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she recently saw a charging station installed on Chestnut Street and has made attempts to contact the property owner and request that an application be submitted, but they have yet to respond. She agreed that more of them will be seen and the one on Chestnut Street is smaller so there are some options for boxes to conceal them. Ms. Graham suggested seeing what historic district commissions in other communities have approved and provided several style boxes that the Commission would approve. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Design Guidelines have a section related to EV charging stations and stated that they should be placed at the rear or away from the street and screened. She reached out to other Historical Commissions within the state, and no one had any guidance to offer. Cambridge has larger properties, many with garages.

Mr. Meche stated that the applicant's layout is a hardship to a certain extent and asked if an outlet installed in the same location would require Commission approval. EV chargers can be upgraded, and some come with multiple voltages, so a plug-in charger could be used if their power levels match.

Ms. Kelleher noted that this is an example of electrical permit applications being approved without flagging the historical commission review, but she is now being flagged for all electrical permits within a historic district. Mr. Meche stated that the applicant did receive an electrical permit which they could argue for making this mistake. Mr. Martinez stated that historic districts have existed for 40+ years and residents have known to seek out the approval of historical commissions for approvals, however, the flagging system is new. Just because it wasn't flagged, doesn't mean that the Commission has to approve the installation when applicants came before the Commission for items when no flagging system was in place. Chair Spang agreed and noted that it's an easy fix to conceal it and suggested sending a violation notice, given the Commissions patience over the past 6+ months.

Ms. Tyler-Lewis noted that she sent an article to Ms. Kelleher from Fine Home Building Magazine, with detailed plans on constructing an electric meter cover and notes on how to make it blend into an existing façade. She agreed that the existing condition should be treated as a violation. Ms. English agreed and noted that painting the charging station is not the answer.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to consider the existing condition a violation and for the City to proceed with violation procedures and to deny the application to paint the existing charging station. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Tyler-Lewis, Graham, Martinez and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the application would need to restore the existing condition or provide a new application that mitigates the work they undertook with a screening solution.

6 Kosciusko Street

Scott Coughlin submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for new vent

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/25/23
- Photographs

Mr. and Mrs. Scott Coughlin was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Coughlin stated that they want to install a gas fireplace in their living room. There may not be enough room to vent it off the side of the house, so they are requesting to vent it out the rear, which faces the National Park Service property along Derby Street.

Mr. Meche asked if it can vent straight out without needing a rise. Mr. Coughlin replied that there is a small rise and it can not be vented down. Ms. Coughlin noted that the stove is small and the height is close to that of the windowsill. Mr. Coughlin noted that the landscaping conceals the area compared to the current photo that was provided in May of 2023.

Chair Spang and Mr. Meche raised concerns with adding a gas fired stove given recent concerns. Ms. Coughlin replied that it would be used for heat, not cooking. Their house was constructed in 1701, and at one point there was a freestanding heat stove when they purchased the home, but it was vented out the chimney which was an unsafe condition they would like to avoid. Chair Spang requested details on the Astro Cap and whether it can be painted. Mr. Coughlin noted that the cap would be 11-inches in diameter, and it can be painted in a brown high-heat paint to blend with the facade.

Mr. Martinez asked why the vent wasn't proposed to be installed on the southern façade, between the houses. Mr. Coughlin replied that it does not meet code and would be too close to the neighboring house. Mr. Martinez requested the location of the existing chimney. Mr. Coughlin replied that it is hidden in the photo, behind the tree. Mr. Meche asked where they learned venting through a chimney did not meet code requirements. Mr. Coughlin

replied from the current Salem Building Inspector. He noted that a Boston Building Inspector stated that venting through the chimney would be safe but suggested it be vented out the rear. Chair Spang suggested a specific distance from operable windows may be the concern and possibly having little to no lot line. Mr. Martinez requested clarification on whether venting through a chimney was possible, and on using a dual venting configuration. Mr. Coughlin noted that their existing chimney was also too small. Ms. Coughlin noted that the chimney is also not lined. Chair Spang asked if the chimney is used to vent their heater. Mr. Coughlin replied yes.

Mr. Coughlin presented the half cylindrical Astro cap with a heat guard. Mr. Meche asked how high off the ground the vent would be located. Mr. Coughlin replied 44-inches above grade, to the bottom of the vent.

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

VOTE: English made a motion to approve as submitted. Martinez seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Meche requested the applicant let the Commission know if the vent will be any higher than the bottom lite of the window, where it would be in full view from the park.

Mr. Coughlin asked if the Commission only had concerns with what occurs on Kosciusko Street or only what faces Kosciusko Street. Ms. Kelleher replied that one side of Kosciusko Street is within the Commission's jurisdiction and only this side of the street is within the historic district.

15 Chestnut Street

Peter Gordon submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to rebuild foundation

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/2/23
- Photographs

Brendan Murray (mason) and Peter Gordon (owner) were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Murray stated that the rear left corner of the house has settled and requires rebuilding and they've provided an engineering report to that effect. They will try to raise the house slightly, to its original level. Part of the reason for the failure is due to an inadequate foundation, which will be replaced. He noted that the foundation terminated halfway down the side of the house, which they would like to extend to the front corner making it contiguous, which was a suggestion to the applicant in a previous application.

Mr. Meche clarified that the new foundation would extend up to the first floor and across the façade of the house. Ms. Kelleher noted that the wall in question was along the driveway. Mr. Murray stated that they would eliminate the wood clapboards along the lower portion of the façade and to install a new higher foundation and to approve the appearance of the wall. The brick would extend approximately 3-feet above grade. Chair Spang asked if that new condition would turn the corner and run along the rear of the façade. Mr. Murray replied that the new foundation would terminate at the rear left corner, at the gate.

Chair Spang asked if a similar windowsill at the basement window would be installed. Mr. Murray replied the windowsill would be integrated with the new brick foundation wall and the masonry joints would be toothed, to look as if it was original.

Mr. Meche suggested the back left corner was an addition and the reason for the difference in foundations. Chair Spang suggested that utilitarian portions of homes often have the least useful foundation. He asked if the new brick would be painted to match or if the paint would be removed from the existing brick. Mr. Murray replied that existing paint, which is detrimental to the brick, and from their discussions the intention was to remove the paint and expose the brick, allowing it to breathe. They would also use reclaimed brick to closely match the existing.

Mr. Gordon stated that they came before the Commission in October 2022 for painting approval and the current approach was suggested at the meeting because of the discontinuity along the driveway. The white watertable would extend to the back corner, the paint would be removed from the front half of the house for a natural look. The window would be reinstalled, after it has been restored by the Window Woman, and the window frame would be restored in-kind or kept. Chair Spang noted that the window in the existing brick foundation was recessed into the opening rather than sitting proud of the wall surface like the window surrounded by clapboards. Mr. Gordon noted that he can make sure the window placement match, and noted the window towards the rear is 3 over 6 and is operable and the 6 over 6 towards the front is one large window that is not operable, but they would reuse the structure. Chair Spang had no concern with the two windows not being identical. Mr. Gordon noted the variety of windows throughout the house and on each floor.

Mr. Meche stated that foundation wise something should be done to the rear corner, the foundation could go up to approximately the window sill, there is a clear vertical joint, and that line should be preserved to make it clear that the rear area was an addition. That would be consistent with the National Park Service guidelines in terms of records of changes made to the building. He asked if the new brick would turn the corner. Mr. Murray replied that the new work would go to the end and the rear is not visible, and there are windows and a rear porch to work around. Chair Spang suggested the brick extend to the back so from the street it appears to turn the corner. Mr. Gordon replied that the brick would end at the corner post. Mr. Meche requested the make-up of the foundation below the cornerboard. Chair Spang suggested the cornerboard stop above the brick to match the front corner of the house and looks as if it turns the corner. Chair Spang and Mr. Meche discussed the structure of the house. Mr. Murray stated that they can achieve the wrap around brick configuration. Mr. Meche raised concerns about possibly needing to cut the wood post to achieve the look of wrap around brick.

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

Mr. Meche stated that he is looking to see a vertical joint between the old and new brick foundation walls and his preference for the brick to be at the level of the windowsill. Chair Spang noted that he is okay with the general concept as proposed and appreciated Mr. Meche's thoughts. Ms. English was okay with the proposal but felt Mr. Meche's suggestion to continue the vertical delineation was a good idea. Mr. Gordon had no issue with making that modification.

VOTE: English made a motion to approve as proposed and to continue the vertical delineation between the existing and new foundation wall. Meche seconded the motion.

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

186 Federal Street

Denise Carria submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for new fencing

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/25/23
- Photographs

Jim Carria was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Carria presented two additions he should have applied for initially to enclose the fencing along the rear corner and end of the driveway next to the existing garage. Northeastern Fence will install two gates that match the design of the fencing above the new stone wall. At the rear corner, three or four posts would be placed on top of the stone wall, with a fence height that matches the neighboring new rear fence, creating a tiered fence. Mr. Meche and Chair Spang praised the newly completed work.

Mr. Martinez requested a site plan. Ms. Kelleher replied that one was provided and can be a condition of the approval.

Mr. Martinez asked how the new side fence section would connect with the existing post. Mr. Carria replied that the existing post is cemented into the ground and the new posts will be on top of the wall. There will be a straight run of fencing to cover over the existing corner post and the new side fence will match the height of the rear fence. Mr. Martinez noted that the fence was panelized. Chair Spang noted that the posts would be behind the fence panel and the panel run would be continuous. Mr. Meche preferred the new side fence match the existing fence closer to Federal Street due to its visibility and suggested that next section of fence either match the height of the lower rear fence, match the height of the top of the upper stone retaining wall at the driveway, or match the height of the upper fence at the driveway. Chair Spang requested the height of the lower retaining wall. Mr. Carria estimated 18-inches high. Mr. Meche estimated 2-feet.

Mr. Martinez asked if the new upper fence at the garage would match the upper fence at the opposite side of the house. Mr. Carria replied yes.

Ms. Graham noted that more information is provided when approving such a change, including a site plan, elevation with details to confirm the height and other dimensions, number of posts, location of fencing, for clarity. Mr. Carria replied that the new sections of fence and gate would match the design of the ones recently installed. Chair Spang agreed with Ms. Graham. Mr. Martinez stated that the description of the fence should be on file, and he would be comfortable deputizing Commission members to review the site plan and details. Chair Spang agreed and requested the fence builder provide construction plans and details. Mr. Carria agreed to reach out to Northeast Fence.

Mr. Meche stated that his reasoning for duplicating the upper fence is because once in place the lower fence will no longer be visible. Mr. Carria noted that he will request a change in fence type to match that of the upper wall and a revised quote. He noted that the upper fence was to be painted white as agreed upon in the initial fence application, so the new lower fence would also be painted white. Ms. Tyler-Lewis requested clarification on whether the double gate next to the garage would match the batten style upper fence. Mr. Carria replied yes. Ms. Kelleher noted that the double gate will be placed behind the stair to the residence and bisect the garage. Mr. Carria agreed.

Mr. Meche noted that proposed installation of the canopy behind the garage.

Chair Spang asked if the new gate would be aligned with the back corner of the deck. Mr. Carria agreed and noted that the new gate would fall between the door and window of the garage and it will be operable to push snow off the driveway.

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

VOTE: Meche made a motion to approve the new batten fences at the upper driveway to match the upper fence, a double gate to resemble fence panels added between the garage and deck, height of right-side fence between the

existing rear fence to be roughly aligned with upper retaining wall, new fence and be painted white, and for Commissioners to review site plan and other details.

Martinez amended the motion to include the applicant providing fence details and to match the new fence details approved on June 27, 2022, and for details to be approved by Commission members prior to installation. Martinez seconded the motion.

Mr. Carria noted that the fence installation company is calling the fence on the driveway a Colonial double driveway gate with 3/4-inch spacing, 2x4 framing, and 4-feet-high x 12-feet-wide. Mr. Meche stated that the picket spacing needs to match the existing fence.

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

315-317 Essex Street

Lois Ferraresso submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for window boxes

Ms. Kelleher reported that this application was reviewed and approved under minor change category. The public hearing has been cancelled.

Other Business:

a. Meeting Minutes;

VOTE: English made a motion to approve the March 15, 2023 regular meeting minutes. Meche seconded.

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

VOTE: English made a motion to approve the April 5, 2023 regular meeting minutes. Meche seconded.

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

b. Violations;

c. Correspondence

d. Other:

Ms. Kelleher stated that the City of Salem will make a presentation on the Camp Naumkeag/Pioneer Village project to the Commission in July and the city is trying to provide the information requested by the Commission such as an interpretative plan, business plan, how the buildings will be moved from Pioneer Village, options to salvage one of the Camp Naumkeag buildings, and how Camp Naumkeag would be interpreted. Chair Spang noted that the demo delay expires on July 19, 2023. Mr. Meche noted that moving is not considered demolition, so the Commission has no voice. Chair Spang considered the future update is a courtesy call since the Commission has no jurisdiction. Ms. Kelleher noted that the city has expended a lot of staff, consultant time, and budget to address the concerns of the Commission, but they are still committed to moving forward. Mr. Martinez noted that the Commission would still provide a letter of recommendation. Chair Spang agreed.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the city's old permitting records have been digitized and she provided a link to the Commission earlier that day and new records are added as permits are issued. The permits can be searched by the property address, and the old records are lumped together but new permits are individual documents. Mr. Martinez suggested the inclusion of a date column to organize the permits, without having to select each individual document to determine each date of issuance.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she used the portal to review 119 Federal Street regarding the other fencing on the property where she found approvals from 2009 and 2010 with image of an empty yard with no fencing.

Adjournment

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

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

The meeting ended at 9:30PM

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner