

DRAFT
SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
March 16, 2016

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, March 2, 2016 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, Kathryn Harper, David Hart, Joanne McCrae, Larry Spang. Staff: Patti Kelleher.

33 Warren Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

The Applicant, Joseph Kaye, submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct 6 raised planting beds at the rear of his property.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant has requested a continuance to April 6, 2016.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue the hearing. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.

Several abutters were in the audience. They asked if they would receive notification of the continued hearing.

Mr. Cutting requested that Staff send a continuation notice to the abutters of 33 Warren Street for the hearing on April 6, 2016.

On the previously issued violation notice regarding the rear deck, Ms. Herbert read a letter from the City Solicitor regarding the Commission's issuance of a Certificate of Non-Applicability. The Solicitor stated that while the Commission determined that the proposed deck would be non-visible from public way, it was in fact visible. Therefore, since the 21 day period to rescind the decision has elapsed, the Commission's decision now stands.

The abutters spoke in opposition to the City's actions. They stated that they would not have objected to the deck if the owner of 33 Warren Street had followed the proper procedures for approval.

Ms. Herbert stated that the applicant had followed the proper procedures and had presented an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness which would have required a public hearing. The Staff and the Commission made a determination that the proposed deck would not be visible from a public way and therefore qualified for a Certificate of Non-Applicability which did not require a public hearing process.

82 Derby Street (continued)

Debra Lewis Hogan and Lawrence Hogan submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the Derby Street entry door and transom window and install a new fiberglass six-panel door with glazing in upper panels and a new entablature trim.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 2/10/16

- Photographs
- Drawing received 3/14/16

The applicants Debra Hogan and Larry Hogan were present. Their builder Bob Irvine was also present.

Mr. Spang abstained from the discussion.

Mr. Irvine stated that the owners had made changes to the proposed door to respond to the Commission's requests at the last meeting. The originally proposed fiberglass door has been changed to a fir door and the door trim has been changed to break up the height of the door and to be more in keeping with the neighborhood. Mr. Irvine presented a photograph of existing door on Derby Street that is similar to what is proposed at 82 Derby Street. He also noted that he had prepared drawings showing the scale of the work, per the request of the Commission.

Ms. Herbert asked if the horn light cable could be buried in the wall for aesthetic purposes.

Mr. Irvine stated that it would require an electrician and the fire alarm company would have to sanction the work.

Ms. Hogan stated that she and her husband have invested \$100,000 on interior improvements and have so much more that they would like to do on the building. She expressed concern that they would not be able to bury the cable at this point in the renovation project.

Ms. Herbert stated that it was only a suggestion and was not mandatory.

Mr. Hart asked if the applicant was still proposing to use PVC for the trim. He stated that he appreciated the change to a fir door and asked the applicant to consider changing the PVC trim to wood as well.

Mr. Irvine expressed concern about the lack of longevity of pine trim and stated that he felt that PVC would weather better and would not chip. He also expressed his concern that there isn't a good primed wood trim for exteriors and his opinion that painted PVC looks like wood.

Ms. Herbert replied that PVC can peel differently than wood, although this may no longer be accurate as the material has changed.

There was no public comment.

The Commission discussed the extent of work occurring at this building.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to accept the application to alter the existing entry door and surround as presented in the drawings dated 3/14/16. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.

287-291 Lafayette Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Renewal Ventures LLC submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a freestanding aluminum post-and-panel sign measuring 36” x 48” with top panel set 72” above ground.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 2/12/16
- Photographs
- Sign specifications dated 3/5/15

Ms. Kelleher reported that the Applicant has requested a continuance.

VOTE: *Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue the application. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

331 Lafayette Street, 335 Lafayette Street and 5-7 West Avenue – Waiver of Demolition Delay

The applicant, Lee Family Enterprises, submitted an application for a waiver of the demolition delay ordinance to demolish all buildings on the subject properties.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant has requested a continuance.

VOTE: *Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue the application. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

The Commission discussed the process for a waiver of the demolition delay ordinance.

VOTE: *Ms. Bellin made a motion to send a letter to the applicant stating that the Commission approved the continuation but requested that the applicant attend the next meeting with his proposal for the site. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

15 River Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Larissa Lucas submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to build an enclosed one-story addition at the rear corner of her house to match footprint of existing shed.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 2/17/16
- Photographs
- Plans prepared by R J Framite Construction dated 3/15/15

The applicant Larissa Lucas was present. Her carpenter Rolf Franke was also present.

Mr. Franke stated that the proposed addition was very small and was similar to the site of an outhouse.

Ms. Lucas noted that the addition would have very limited visibility from a public way.

Mr. Cutting asked for clarification as to the extent of visibility.

Ms. Lucas responded that only the top of the addition's roof would be visible.

Mr. Franke stated that the addition's roof will be covered in 3-tab shingles to match the house's roof and the addition would be painted to match the house. He stated that the addition would like more like an outhouse.

Ms. Herbert read two letters of support into the record. The owner of 13 River Street expressed their support for the addition, noting that she would look over the addition. The owner of 15½ River Street, the adjacent neighbor, also expressed support for the addition.

Ms. Bellin asked for clarification on the Assessors Map as to where the addition will be located on the house. Ms. Lucas drew on map where the shed is now located, which is the location of the proposed addition.

Mr. Spang asked if the elevation of the addition would be coplanar with the house.

Ms. Lucas replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Spang expressed concern about the use of a second cornerboard at the junction of the addition and the house. He also expressed concern about the width of the proposed cornerboards, which appear oversized even though they match the width of the cornerboards on the house. He noted that the house cornerboards extend up two stories.

Mr. Franke replied that he intended to match the cornerboards already on the house and has to build the addition to the wall plane of the house. He stated that he could eliminate the second cornerboard and use clapboards instead.

VOTE: *Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the certificate with an alternative to put in clapboards instead of a second cornerboard. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

329 Essex Street

Jason Mohaghegh submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a 10 inch copper vent on the rear wall of a single-story rear ell.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 2/22/16
- Photographs
- Drawing of vent (<http://copercaps.com/images/copperwallside.jpg>; 3/1/2106)

The applicant Jason Mohaghegh was present.

Ms. Herbert asked the applicant to indicate on the photograph of the ell's rear elevation where the vent will be installed. She also asked why a vent was being used instead of flush louvered vent.

Mr. Mohaghegh stated that he is installing the vent for an upgraded range as part of kitchen renovation. He stated that he asked his contractor for the most appropriate and least intrusive vent for the range.

The Commission noted that a previous owner had completed substantial work restoring the exterior of the house.

Mr. Mohaghegh agreed but noted that little work was completed on the interior, which has only one bathroom. He stated that he purchased the property three months ago.

Mr. Cutting asked if there were other alternates to breaking the plane of the wall with a vent.

Ms. Herbert noted that it may be more difficult to vent a range than a dryer.

Ms. Herbert asked if there was a way to screen the vent.

Mr. Cutting asked for specifics on where the vent will be located.

Mr. Spang estimated that the vent would be approximately 63" off the floor based on interior drawings of the kitchen design.

Mr. Mohaghegh reiterated that he asked his contractor for the least intrusive option.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the application as presented. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion.

Mr. Hart requested an amendment to the approval requiring the center line of the vent to be approximately 77" off the first floor level.

Mr. Spang expressed concern about stating a specific height since there may be changes in the placement based on construction needs. He suggested that the Commission could specify a general location such as matching the height of an exterior window.

Mr. Hart withdrew his amendment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to accept the application as presented. Ms. Harper seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.

81 Derby Street

Charles Hope Companies LLP submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate a severely deteriorated two-family building.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 2/29/16
- Photographs
- Schematic design drawings by Annette Popp dated 1/28/16

The applicant's agent Daniel Bumagin and architect Annette Popp were present.

Mr. Bumagin provided background on the history of the property, stating that it was now in receivership. He noted that the property was mortgage-free and all taxes have been paid.

Mr. Bumagin presented photographs of the house, adjoining properties, and views of Derby Street. He also presented photographs of houses with knee walls similar to what is proposed for 81 Derby.

Ms. Herbert noted that 66 and 68 Derby Street were recently completed; one is a reconstruction and the other is new construction.

Mr. Bumagin presented a support letter signed by 6 neighbors.

Ms. Herbert suggested that details be posted on the building to let neighborhoods know what is being proposed.

Mr. Bumagin noted that when the applicant took control of the building it was full of debris. Cleanup required ten 30-cubic yard dumpsters. He also noted that the building was a two-family with no second means of egress. He is now proposing to a high quality renovation while respecting financial needs.

Ms. Popp presented architectural plans, noting that the proposal was to extend the addition on the east elevation up one story, extend the roof up 3 feet, and add windows in the gable.

Ms. Herbert asked if there were basement windows currently.

Mr. Bumagin replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Herbert asked if the proposal was to eliminate the chimney.

Ms. Popp replied that both chimneys would be removed.

Mr. Hart asked how high the roof would be increased.

Ms. Popp replied that the roof would be raised 3 feet.

Ms. Herbert asked about the proposed height in relation to adjoining house.

Mr. Hart commented that the proposed third story windows do not align with second story windows.

Ms. Popp responded that it might be possible to move windows slightly to align.

Mr. Hart suggested that the three windows could be closer together as a triple window.

Mr. Spang noted that the submitted drawings are somewhat confusing as they show the demolished area.

Ms. Herbert asked why the proposal calls for only two windows on the first and second stories of the side addition since the existing single story addition has three windows.

Ms. Popp replied that the space where the third window would be located is intended to be an interior closet but a window could be added if necessary.

Ms. McCrea asked about the materials of the railing at the entry.

Mr. Bumagin replied that it is wood.

The Commission discussed the proposed removal and alteration of windows on east elevation.

Mr. Spang asked how close the house was to the abutters.

Ms. Popp presented preliminary survey of property boundaries and Ms. Kelleher presented the Assessors Map.

Mr. Spang asked if the applicant had considered re-orienting the façade of the house to the park/grass lot side on the east since they were undertaking such significant interior work. He felt that it would be more beneficial for occupants of the building to have views of park.

Mr. Bumagin noted that the second floor unit does face onto grass parcel. First floor unit did not have an option due to existing interior staircase and the need for it to remain a 2-bedroom unit.

Mr. Spang replied that the east elevation of the house as proposed reads as the “back” of the house even though it was most visible and suggested that it would be better to emphasize it more with larger windows.

Mr. Bumagin noted that don't have access to that side of property line.

Mr. Spang recommended that the windows be designed larger than proposed, noting that the Commission does not have purview over the interior of the building but would prefer larger windows on the prominent elevation.

Mr. Spang expressed concern about raising the roofline.

Mr. Hart stated that he was not as concerned about raising roof but would prefer that gable windows be tightened to a triple window. He recommended that windows either be aligned over second story windows or brought closer together.

Mr. Cutting asked about the proposed lattice and requested that it be square and not diamond. He also asked how it would be trimmed.

Ms. Popp replied that she has not developed details yet for the rear stair and lattice but was responding to feedback to screen the stair.

Mr. Spang asked if building codes required a roof over the rear egress stair.

Ms. Popp replied that code requires stairs to be free of snow.

Mr. Cutting asked about materials.

Mr. Bumagin replied that the house is currently clad in vinyl siding, which covers earlier cladding of asbestos shingles. He stated that he would like to use Hardy fiber cement clapboards due to their durability and maintenance.

Mr. Cutting asked if siding layers will be removed.

Mr. Bumagin replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Harper and Mr. Hart asked about the proposed finish of the Hardy siding.

Ms. Popp stated that they preferred the grained finish.

Ms. Harper noted that paint finish is guaranteed for 15 years on Hardy siding.

Ms. Popp expressed concern that using the smooth side of the clapboard can appear more plastic-like.

Ms. Harper noted that wood clapboards are usually applied smooth side out.

Ms. Popp replied that she is willing to use either finish.

Mr. Spang noted that his neighbor used the same siding applied smooth side out and that he believed it looks fine.

Mr. Spang noted that this area of city receives a lot of extreme weather and that he believed Hardy siding would weather better.

Mr. Cutting asked about previous applications for this siding.

Ms. Harper replied that in the past the Commission has approved this type of siding in circumstances where the clapboards are difficult to paint.

Mr. Cutting noted the extreme circumstances of this house and noted that very little architectural detail remaining.

Mr. Hart expressed his support of Hardy plank siding in this circumstance but prefers smooth side of board.

Mr. Spang asked applicant about the schedule for renovations.

Mr. Bumagin stated that he hopes to have his application heard at the Board of Appeals soon.

Mr. Spang expressed the following concerns about the proposed design: the cornerboards are too thin, no water table is proposed, and the roof pitch on the addition is too shallow. He also expressed concern about the proposed window configuration and size and the proposed use and design of the proposed lattice. He noted that a cornerboard of 7 1/2" width is preferable. He recommended that the application be continued in order to finalize the details.

Mr. Cutting asked why lattice needed to be installed.

Mr. Spang stated that he was more concerned about the lack of design for the staircase roof and how it visually ties into building.

Mr. Cutting asked how will rear stair would be finished and whether posts would include trim.

Mr. Spang drew some suggested details to make rear stairs look more like a traditional porch.

Ms. Herbert suggested the applicant consider including decorative roof brackets.

Ms. Popp noted that Secretary of Interior Standards suggests that historic details not be added if not original.

Ms. Herbert noted that revised drawings could be submitted to staff and distributed to the Commission for individual comment.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Deborah and Larry Hogan of 82 Derby Street asked to review drawings to determine whether design would have an impact on their property.

Mr. Bumagin noted that he had received comments from an owner across the street who was concerned that the proposed 3 foot height increase would impact his view.

Mr. and Mrs. Hogan expressed their pleasure that the applicant will retain the gable roof and agreed that it will be a big improvement over the building's existing condition.

The Commission requested that the applicant bring a sample of the proposed siding in a smooth siding and the proposed colors for the house.

Mr. Spang recommended that the applicant visit 127 Columbus Avenue to see an example of cement board siding painted in Boothbay Blue.

VOTE: *Mr. Hart made a motion to continue the application . Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

Universal Steel

Mr. Hart recused himself as an abutter to an abutter.

The Commission reviewed a draft letter prepared for the Mayor and the City Council regarding the future development of the former Universal Steel site.

City Councillors Heather Famico, Steve Dibble, and Elaine Milo were present. They expressed their interest in the Commission's participation in future discussions on the project.

VOTE: *Ms. Bellin made a motion to accept the draft letter. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

Peabody Essex Museum Memorandum of Agreement

Mr. Hart recused himself from the discussion.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the Peabody Essex Museum had submitted a Memorandum of Agreement for the Commission's consideration and approval. She stated that the PEM had incorporated all of the requests made by the Commission and Historic Salem.

VOTE: *Ms. Bellin made a motion for the Commission to sign the Memorandum of Agreement as presented. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

Minutes

VOTE: *Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the minutes of February 3, 2016 and February 17, 2016. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

Athenaeum

Mr. Hart recused himself as a trustee of the Athenaeum.

Ms. Kelleher presented draft letters of support for the Athenaeum's request for grant funds from the MHC and the Salem Community Preservation Act funds.

VOTE: *Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the support letters. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

Other Business

Ms. Bellin asked Ms. Kelleher to check the February 17th minutes to see if the Commission had requested staff to confer with the City Solicitor on another item besides 33 Warren Street.

Ms. Harper asked about the Commission's guidelines relating to barrier free access. She reported that a resident of Chestnut Street will be seeking to install a temporary handicap ramp. The Commission's Guidelines state that a temporary ramp may be installed if a date for removal is indicated and drawings are submitted. She asked if the removal date could be subject to an extension since the owner did not know how long it would be needed.

Mr. Hart noted that guidelines state it will be removed when no longer needed.

Ms. Bellin suggested that the owner apply under Hardship and submit a drawing of any changes necessary to the existing fence for the ramp installation.

Mr. Hart noted that the guidelines for barrier free access date from 1997 and should be revisited.

Ms. McCrea asked whether staff knew any details on a recent comment made by the City regarding 100s of new units being built in the Point Neighborhood.

Ms. Kelleher responded that she believed it was a statement made in regards to the City's pursuit of 40R zoning.

Ms. Bellin stated that she didn't believe the City was still pursuing this zoning.

City Councillor Famico stated that she was not sure about the status of the proposed zoning.

Councillor Milo noted that there are public meetings scheduled on the zoning proposal; one was held in December with a second meeting to be held in the future.

Ms. Herbert recommended that the Commission considering assigning a member(s) to review applications for Certificate of Non-Applicability a rotating basis. The Commission discussed extending the 24-hour turn-around to reply to an application.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner