

DRAFT
SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
January 16, 2019

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1st Floor Conference Room. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, David Hart, Larry Spang.

18 Chestnut Street – continuation -- CONTINUED TO THE NEXT MEETING

Dorothy Kelleher submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint colors.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/15/18
- Photographs

VOTE: Bellin made a motion to continue to the next meeting. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

22 Beckford Street – continuation -- CONTINUED TO THE NEXT MEETING

Jocelyn Levin and Christopher Sallah submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for new trim color

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/14/18
- Photographs

VOTE: Bellin made a motion to continue to the next meeting. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

125 Derby Street - continuation

125 Derby Street Condo Association submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace basement window infill

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/20/18
- Photographs

Christian Haselgrove was present to discuss the project.

Chair Hebert asked if there were 4 units. Mr. Haselgrove replied yes. Chair Herbert stated that in the past she was asked to provide a mat at the front entry during Christmas in Salem since the granite step could be slippery. She asked the applicant if a mason could straighten the granite steps when the new granite insert would be cut to fit the basement window opening. Mr. Haselgrove agreed that the step can be slippery when icy. Leveling the step is on association's list of items to fix but it's not a priority like the structural items that are needed, and it's unknown what is involved with leveling the step. Chair Herbert suggested that the granite in-fill and leveling of the step be done at the same time to bring the cost down. She suggested that filling in the void with brick is not the best approach and a thin granite veneer will blend-in better. She asked him to provide an estimate for both.

Ms. Kelleher asked if the applicant had scoped out granite for the infill and noted an Essex Street property as an example which is very well fitted. A piece would need to be cut to fit rather than ordered. Mr. Haselgrove replied that he found one granite supplier that suggested using pavers, at a cost of \$200-\$300 for each 1-foot x 2-foot piece. He asked for suggestions on other places to look. He will meet with a mason this upcoming weekend. Mr. Spang noted that the opening may need a brick back-up to fill in the depth with a granite veneer that should be slightly setback to acknowledge that there was once an opening, especially since the color won't be perfectly matched. Mr. Spang suggested that old foundation stone could also be used. Mr. Haselgrove noted that he will continue to research granite in-fill options. Chair Herbert suggested Northeast Nursey or Backyard Depot. Mr. Cutting suggested Dilisio Brothers Landscape. Ms. Spang suggested Old New England Granite and noted that the mason will have contacts to suggest as well. The Commission considered reviewing the request in concept with the applicant to come back for final approval. Old New England Granite in Lynnfield may also be a resource.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve a granite veneer in-fill to be recessed 3/4" - 1" with final approval from the Commission in the field. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

95 Derby Street – V.F.W. continuation -- CONTINUED TO THE NEXT MEETING

XXX submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for building renovation and roof vent (after the fact)

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/5/18
- Photographs

VOTE: Bellin made a motion to continue to the next meeting. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

84 Washington Square East- continuation -- CONTINUED TO THE NEXT MEETING

Thomas and Anthony O'Donnell submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish rear garage

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/8/18
- Photographs

VOTE: Bellin made a motion to continue to the next meeting. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

Member Openings: Chair Herbert reported that replacement members will be needed for JoAnne McCrea and Jane Turiel. She also reported that Rebecca English may be unavailable for some time. She suggested Stephen Mallory, the Manager of Historic Structures and Landscapes for the PEM who lives in New Hampshire, or another PEM staff member. Ms. Bellin suggested Mark take Jane's place as an alternate. Ms. Kelleher suggested a member from of the local historic districts. Mr. Spang suggested a Salem architect. Chair Herbert suggested a graphic designer to help review projects with signage. Mr. Hart suggested Kevin White of the House of Seven Gables. Ms. Kelleher noted that the appointments for the Historic Commission need to be updated on the website, and the re-appointments of Mr. Cutting, Mr. Spang, and Ms. Bellin are pending.

Adaptive Re-Use Overlay District ("AROD") Ordinance: Chair Herbert reported that under the proposed ordinance, the Commission will continue to have jurisdiction over any building in an historic district. For buildings outside the

districts that are historic, the Commission would only be able to provide comment. She expressed concern that unforeseen conditions could arise during construction that require changes after the fact. With binding review by the Commission, the Commission would not be required to review these changes. She suggested that one SHC member sit on the Planning Board so the topic can be raised at a Historic Commission meeting where they can provide a vote. She noted that during the December and January City Council meetings, 20+ people offered public comment and stated their desire for SHC binding approval. Ms. Kelleher replied that state law prescribes how the Planning Board operates and that requiring a SHC member on the board as a voting member would not be allowed. However; the Planning Board can vote to accept the Commissions comments or not. Chair Herbert stated that she would like language to be added stating that the Commission shall have jurisdiction either in whole or in part of all buildings under this ordinance, and to possibly have representation at the meetings where these items are discussed. She noted that there may only be 2-3 projects per year and a Commission member could attend those Planning Board meetings as an alternate.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the “new construction” term is concerning since new freestanding structures are reviewed by the DRB; however, the Historic Commission has legal authority to make a binding decision, not the DRB, and that needs to be clearly stated. Existing buildings would also need to be included. Under state law municipal and religious uses are exempt and do not have grand-fathered status. St. James School was exempt and without this ordinance would have to meet the underlying 2-family zoning, which doesn’t make sense for that property. Mr. Spang noted his support for redevelopment that protects historic fabric and preserves historic buildings. Chair Herbert added that the general public wants the Historic Commission involved to make sure new uses fit within their neighborhood. The laws have changed, and special permits are no longer allowed through use variance and the ZBA can no longer approve use changes. Mr. Spang noted that for two recent demolition delay projects, the ZBA referred the applicant to the Planning Board staff for final design review. He asked if that could work for the Historic Commission. Ms. Kelleher replied that it would depends on staff and Planning Board make-up; however, Historic Commission oversight would be the best alternative. Mr. Spang noted that with demolition delay, unforeseen conditions arise during construction and they would want the applicant to be sympathetic to the historic fabric, and the same goes for additions to historic structures.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the “new construction” wording was also concerning, since new freestanding structures are reviewed by the DRB but the Historic Commission has legal authority to make a binding decision, not the DRB, and that needs to be clearly written. The DRB will remain included for review of freestanding and new construction. Mr. Spang noted that DRB and SHC review would be a lot for an applicant, and it should depend on who has jurisdiction. If the purpose is to save the buildings that would be the Historic Commission not the DRB. Chair Herbert replied that the DRB should provide input to the Historic Commission in those instances. Ms. Kelleher noted the Planning Board member have a prescribed review authority that doesn’t allow another body to become part of that review and this would just add another layer of review for municipal and religious use buildings. An applicant can delay the work and install something with no oversight.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the ordinance could include language to designate a property subject to the ordinance as a single building local historic district. Mr. Spang noted his desire to preserve architectural heritage in the City and he was in favor of an individual district proposal and the Planning Board would determine if the Historic Commissions ideas get implemented. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Planning Board has a broader view and are less into the details. The City Council will review this at their January 17, 2019 meeting and only written public comments will be allowed.

VOTE: Ms. Spang made a motion in the interest of protecting the important architectural and historical heritage of the City of Salem, particularly the religious and municipal buildings as they are reused, the Salem Historic Commission should be involved in the review process, that those structures be included in their jurisdiction in the preservation of these important historic resources. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner