

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES

January 4, 2017, 2017

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, January 4, 2017, 2016 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Kathryn Harper, Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, David Hart, Joanne McCrea, Larry Spang and Jane Turiel.

14-16 Hodges Court - continuation

Michael Becker submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the property, including alterations to windows, fencing and retaining wall.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: October 3, 2016
- Photographs
- Elevation drawings
- Landscape drawings submitted 12/15/16

The applicant Mike Becker was present.

The Commission discussed the revised landscape drawings submitted by the applicant.

Mr. Becker stated that he preferred to use holly, which is already present on his property, and beach grass since it grows high.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the abutter on Herbert Street has asked for specific dimensions on the distance between the applicant's proposed parking area and her property boundary. She also asked if additional trees could be planted as a buffer and to retain soil.

Ms. Herbert asked if there any physical barriers are proposed for the parking area to ensure that cars stay on the paved area.

Mr. Becker replied that he intended to add a curbing.

Mr. Cutting recommended that curbing be a requirement of the plan.

Mr. Spang asked for the dimensions of the grass area behind the retaining wall on Derby Street.

Mr. Becker replied he was not sure about the exact dimensions but that it was less than 7 feet but more than 2 feet.

Ms. Bellin expressed her confusion with the landscape drawing's lack of dimensional information.

Ms. Herbert suggested that the applicant stake out the parking area on the site to allow Commission members to conduct individual site visits.

Mr. Spang asked for specific information about Plan L2. He asked if the site will be flat between Derby Street side and other sides of lots. He also asked if there will be a grade change between the retaining wall and the interior lot.

Mr. Becker replied in the negative, stating that lot will be a "geo-blend" of the site, which has existing elevation changes. He stated that he did not know the change in elevation between the retaining wall and the interior grade.

Mr. Spang recommended the Commission consider the height of the fence from the Derby Street sidewalk, which will be roughly 6' high.

Mr. Becker noted that he would not be changing the existing height of fence.

Ms. Herbert asked for clarification on the retaining wall on Hodges Court as shown on Plan L3 and asked whether a return would be added.

Ms. Herbert asked if the fence will have a return and Ms. Harper asked for the dimensions of the return.

Mr. Becker replied that he did not plan to include returns on either the fence or the retaining wall.

Ms. Herbert asked if it was possible to place a tree in the same location as the existing tree.

Mr. Becker replied that he did not plan to place a tree in that location as it would block the view of harbor from the house.

There was no additional public comment.

Ms. Bellin asked for clarification on Plans L2 and L3.

Mr. Spang noted that one was an elevation and one was a cut-through.

Ms. Harper asked for confirmation that the planting plan is to remain the same as proposed.

Mr. Becker replied that he would like to retain the plan as proposed.

Mr. Spang noted that this is the 4<sup>th</sup> time the Commission has met to discuss the plan. The last time the Commission asked for a plan from a landscape architect. He expressed concern that the next meeting would be a repeat of the same discussion with a number of questions.

Mr. Becker replied that he will need an extension while he pursues a landscape architect to design the plan. He will report back to Commission by the next meeting on the amount of time needed for the continuation.

Mr. Hart expressed concern about the visual impact of a car parked in what is essentially the front yard of the property.

Ms. Harper questioned whether the windows as shown are correct.

The Commission discussed the proposed vent pipe.

Ms. Herbert asked for clarification on the vent pipe.

Mr. Becker replied that it will be gray to match the color of the slate roof. He stated that he will try to keep it below the ridgeline but it will need to meet code. The specific dimensions will be similar to the existing pipe.

There was no public comment

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the request to install a vent pipe. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue the request to alter existing fence and windows to the Commission's next meeting with proviso that applicant may request additional time. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

13 Warren Street

Ryan Guilmartin submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement and rear porch changes.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: November 14, 2016
- Photographs
- Quote from Marvin Windows (Quote #7SUAQK2)

The applicant Ryan Guilmartin was present.

Mr. Guilmartin presented his application for new windows, noting that removal of the vinyl siding revealed that the window sills had been cut. There are 19 windows to be replaced

Ms. Kelleher noted that the existing windows vary in material and configuration.

Ms. Herbert suggested that the applicant consider Pella Architect Series window, which were used at 53 Summer Street.

Ms. Bellin asked whether spacers should be bronze as approved by the Commission in the past.

Mr. Hart noted that the Form B for the property from 1967 showed 2/2 configuration. He also noted that the windows were replaced in 1996 and are already in need of replacement. He asked for clarification on the rear elevation and whether an additional window would be added.

Mr. Guilmartin expressed confusion about how the AC unit should be screened and stated that he would like a simpler rear entrance than approved.

The Commission agreed that they had already approved the simpler porch with no posts or roof.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

**VOTE: Ms. Turiel made a motion to approve the installation of new 2/2 double glazed windows with bronze spacers with the option to use either Marvin or Pella windows.**

Mr. Hart asked for clarification on whether the applicant intended to reconstruct the window sills to replicate historic dimensions.

Ms. Harper asked if the replacement Marvin or Pella windows include sills and if so, would they match the original dimensions of the sills.

Mr. Guilmartin replied that he was not sure whether windows came with specific sills to match. If not, he will ask contractor to rebuild to match.

Ms. Harper asked if it was necessary to incur the extra cost for thicker sills.

Mr. Hart stated that he believed window sills should match original dimensions.

Mr. Hart asked contractor Richard (Stretch) Stevens, who was in the audience, for his opinion on the sills.

Mr. Stevens replied that he believed one could get windows without casings and the contractor could then build a new window frame with mahogany and rebuild casing and sills. This would allow the window to be customized to replicate original dimensions.

Mr. Hart requested an amendment to the motion to add a condition that sills be rebuilt.

**VOTE:** All were in favor of the amended motion, and the motion so carried.

24 Winter Street

Peter N. Lutts submitted an application to install a new roof deck.

Documents & Exhibits

- Applications: December 16, 2016
- Drawings by Seger Architects
- Photographs

*Mr. Cutting recused himself and left the table to sit in the audience.*

Peter Lutts and his architect Dan Ricciarelli were present.

Mr. Ricciarelli presented the application. The proposed roof deck will be visible from both Winter Street and Oliver Street. There is an existing door accessing the rear roof, which indicates that there may have been a deck there previously. The applicant is proposing a 42" high railing. House is brick with brownstone and deck will be clad with wood around pressure treated decking.

Mr. Lutts noted that he can currently walk out onto the roof, except the roof is sloped.

Ms. Herbert asked for clarification on color of posts.

Mr. Ricciarelli stated that posts would be stained to match brownstone color.

Ms. Hebert noted that Commission has approved 3 roof decks in the recent past - 99-101 Federal Street, the house at the corner of Federal and Carpenter Streets, and the house at the corner of Summer and Broad Streets. This proposal would be the most visible of the projects.

Mr. Spang asked for clarification on the existing cornice and the slope.

Mr. Ricciarelli stated that he expected a 1/4" slope.

Mr. Spang noted that a significant build out was proposed for the decking.

Mr. Ricciarelli stated that the railings will be set back at least a couple of feet from the cornice and wall edge. The deck will be 20 x 20.

Mr. Spang asked if deck could be pulled back to edge of main house.

Mr. Ricciarelli expressed concern that the resulting deck would be too small.

Mr. Lutts asked if the Commission could take into consideration that it appears a deck was previously located on the roof.

Ms. Herbert responded that it was unclear what was there and whether it was legal. She expressed concern about the use of the deck.

Mr. Lutts stated that it would get limited use from the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor room and would add value to the house.

Ms. Herbert asked whether Mr. Ricciarelli had considered a solid paneled railing as was approved for a roof deck on Federal Street.

Mr. Spang asked whether it would be more appropriate to build a traditional Federal-style railing instead of trying to make railing disappear.

Mr. Ricciarelli expressed concern that the rail height may make it difficult to achieve a traditional appearing railing.

Mr. Spang expressed concern about the finish of the decking and stated that it looked rough.

Ben Sherman, 6 Oliver Street, expressed concern about roof deck and potential for noise from parties. Also concerned about privacy and potential for safety concerns.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Christina Harrington, 19 Winter Street, expressed concern about the number of people who may attend parties at the house, especially due to the limited parking on Winter Street.

Mr. Spang noted that previous roof deck requests have prompted concerns about privacy and noise. The Commission has worked with applicants to make changes to respond to concerns, including reducing size and location of deck.

Mr. Lutts replied that he would be amenable to reducing size of deck.

Mr. Ricciarelli expressed concern that neighbors have windows overlooking deck that limit privacy already.

Mr. Hart asked whether the proposed deck is legal and whether it was legal for owner to stand on the roof.

Mr. Ricciarelli noted that zoning approval is required as a structure. If evidence that original existed, then will not need special permit. If there is no evidence, then would need zoning approval.

Mr. Lutts asked if the Commission was be amendable to roof deck.

Mr. Hart stated that would he would want revised drawing that more accurately show details.

The Commission agreed.

Mr. Spang stated that he would be amendable to working with applicant to identify an appropriate design, especially concerning decking height.

All commission members agreed that they would be amenable to plan.

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue the hearing for two weeks. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 11 Orne Square

Pamela S. Coffin submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a vent pipe.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Applications: December 19, 2016

- Photographs

The applicant's contractor Richard Stevens was present.

Mr. Stevens identified the approximate location of proposed vent, stating that it will be approximately 15' high and centered on the 26' wide wall. The vent pipe will be 7" diameter, with 8" projection.

Ms. Herbert asked if pipe can be painted.

Mr. Stevens replied that pipe could be painted with high heat paint but he expressed concerned that color choices may be limited. He noted that the 20,000 BTU furnace may allow for low heat paint.

Mr. Spang asked if the pipe could be run vertically.

Mr. Stevens replied that windows were located above and would require pipe to bend. Also, there is no other location for the fireplace in second floor new bedroom. Fireplace is fairly small.

Ms. Herbert asked if condo association permission was required.

Mr. Stevens replied in the negative.

Mr. Cutting expressed concern that pipe will mar the surface of the building. But he noted that color of metal would fade into color of stucco. He also expressed concern that approval not be precedent setting.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve as submitted with proviso that work not be precedent setting.

Mr. Hart asked that a condition be added that vent be painted to match the color of façade as closely as possible.

Ms. Turiel seconded the motion with the amendment. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

#### Request for Determination of Historic Significance – Grotto of Our Lady of Lourdes - continuation

Jane Stauffer, Joe Cultrera and Mary Beth Bainbridge were present to discuss the grotto.

Ms. Herbert provided info on the discussion from the previous meeting on whether grotto is historically significant.

Mr. Cultrera noted that they were able to salvage much of the material from the grotto. The grotto will be rebuilt at Saint Mary's Cemetery on the Salem/Peabody line where most of the parishioners of the original church are buried. A plaque would be added to describe this history.

Ms. Bainbridge noted that the group has raised roughly \$15,000 towards the \$47,000 needed to rebuild the grotto and restore the associated statues and kneeler.

Ms. Herbert noted that it may be helpful to have design of interpretive marker.

Ms. Kelleher reported that Commission had asked for clarification on rebuilt design.

Ms. Stauffer presented drawings showing how grotto would be rebuilt to match existing design.

Ms. Harper asked if stones would be reused.

Ms. Stauffer replied that the mason would match original design but could not use all of the original stones.

Ms. Bellin asked for percentage of original stone.

Ms. Bainbridge replied that approximately 10% of original stones will be reused due to nature of dismantling.

Ms. Stauffer noted that the original stones were from Jefferson Avenue and the new stones could be used from same area to match existing color. She also noted that the original cross, wings, kneeler and both statues were salvaged.

Mr. Hart asked where the interpretive panel would be located and whether historic photograph of original grotto would be included.

Ms. Herbert suggested that historic photographs of church be included.

Mr. Hart noted that Commission was considering historic significance of grotto and not church.

Ms. Bellin asked for clarification on determining historic significance.

Ms. Stauffer noted that HSI has listed grotto as endangered.

Ms. Bellin questioned whether rebuilding the grotto meets the criteria for historic significance as the original grotto no longer exists and it will be relocated to a new site.

Ms. Herbert correlated it to a plaque highlighting an event or building which no longer exists.

Mr. Hart asked Ms. Kelleher to research appropriate wording for historic significance.

Ms. Harper asked if this project would be comparable to the Washington Arch on the Salem Common.

Ms. McCrea noted that the Community Preservation Committee did not recommend funding the arch since it was relocated and not rebuilt to original dimensions. She asked for clarification of the rebuilt design.

Ms. Stauffer replied that grotto will be rebuilt in its entirety with new stones. The design of the rebuilt grotto was smaller than original due to costs. If the City could provide additional funds, then the grotto could be rebuilt to original dimensions.

Mr. Hart and Ms. McCrea discussed whether the rebuilt grotto will be a re-creation or a replication.

Ms. Herbert suggested that language could read that rebuilt grotto would "Replicate as closely as possible".

The Commission agreed that Ms. Herbert and Ms. Kelleher would amend letter.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve amended letter. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. Six Commission members were in favor and the motion so carried. (Mr. Spang and Ms. Bellin abstained.)**

#### **Request for Letters of Support for Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Applications**

Ms. Herbert noted that the request for letters of supports for the Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit applications were approved prior by the Commission for a previous funding round. She asked the Commission to

consider making a motion to allow the reissue of a support letter with a new date as long as there were no changes to the project.

**VOTE:** Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the reissuance of support letters with amended date only. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.

35 Chestnut Street – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application – Letter of Support

**VOTE:** Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve support letter with new date. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

162 Federal Street – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application – Letter of Support

**VOTE:** Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve support letter with new date. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

55-57 Federal Street – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application – Letter of Support

**VOTE:** Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve support letter with new date. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

59 Federal Street – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application – Letter of Support

**VOTE:** Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve support letter with new date. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

203 Essex Street – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application – Letter of Support

**VOTE:** Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve support letter with new date. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

90 Washington Street – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application – Letter of Support

**VOTE:** Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve support letter with new date. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Charter Street Cemetery – Massachusetts Cultural Council Grant Application – Letter of Support

Ms. Herbert expressed concern about security issues at the cemetery and noted that she added language to support letter.

**VOTE:** Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve support letter. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

Ms. Harper reported that door on garden side of 114 Derby Street appears to be a composite door with wood grain, which was not approved by the Commission. She asked Ms. Kelleher to research.

Ms. Harper also reported about the upcoming A Secret Symposium at the House of the Seven Gables.



Approval of Meeting Minutes for December 7, 2016

**VOTE:** Ms. Turiel made a motion to approve the minutes of December 7, 2016 Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Community Development Planner