

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
November 20, 2019

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, November 20, 2019 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1st Floor Conference Room. Present were: Reed Cutting, Milo Martinez, Mark Pattison, Erin Schaeffer. Not present: Rebecca English, David Hart, Vijay Joyce, Stacey Norkun.

9 Cambridge Street - CONTINUATION

Andrea and Colin Grant submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for architectural roof shingles

Continued to the December 4th meeting

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/23/19
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher reported that this application was included on the agenda by mistake. The applicants requested a continuation to the December 4th meeting.

337 Essex Street - CONTINUATION

Proprietors of the Salem Athenaeum submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace sign

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/1/19
- Photographs
- Revised sign mockup

Jean Marie Procius was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Procius redesigned the sign based on the Commission's recommendations. There will be one large sign and two smaller signs, one at the front gate and one at the rear gate. The smaller signs will have the hours and additional information. The large sign will have an iron bracket painted black instead of a wood cross-members. The front small sign will also be metal but with a wood back to act as a frame. The small sign will be 11" high x 14" wide.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that the sign revisions are an improvement and should capture the attention of people. The details are consistent. Mr. Martinez noted that the sign was a handsome redesign. Mr. Pattison stated that the sign has nice improvements; however, he was concerned that the dimensions of the large sign at 30" w x 36" with a 36" wide bracket would be too large, noting that it will be wider than the Ropes Mansion sign across the street; however, the long name makes it hard to see without enough white space around it. The Commission agreed that the mockup doesn't reflect the size of the sign and fonts accurately. Ms. Schaeffer noted that the font is approximately 4" H x 4" W which isn't unreasonable in terms of font size, but the text could be narrower and shorter to reduce the size of the sign, and also not as long. Mr. Pattison noted that the existing sign is squarer; however, the green portion at the bottom helps to visually shorten the overall sign length. Ms. Schaeffer agreed.

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

VOTE: Ms. Schaeffer made a motion to approve with the plans dated, November 20th 2019, as presented. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All four were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Prociuous noted that due to the upcoming winter, the new sign will be installed on the existing post until approximately May 1st 2020 when the new post can be installed in the ground.

6 Federal Court - CONTINUATION

Federal Court Realty Trust submitted a Certificate of Hardship for demolition of carriage house

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/5/19
- Photographs

Mary Richards of Trustee of Federal Court Realty Trust were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Richards stated that at the last meeting the Commission was leaning towards approving a Certificate of Hardship. She's been working on addressing the items the Commission was concerned with: demolition plan; evaluation of foundation; landscape plan; drawings; and salvaging what they could with the structures taken down. She provided the basic demolition plan from her contractor indicating that the foundation would remain as is. A mason, Tony from J.A. Masonry of Milton, MA evaluated the foundation on Saturday, November 16th and he felt the foundation was in good condition and could be saved. Ms. Richards provided a landscape plan of the small orchard to be planted if the structure were to come down, which includes arborvitaes to bloom in the spring of 2020. Although landscaping is not under purview of the Commission, she exercised a good faith effort of what will be put planted, and a designer from Ipswich will help with the plantings next year. Ms. Richards stated that scaled drawings are impossible to do at this point due to the condition of the barn. Ms. Kelleher noted that the property file has scaled plans of the building by Staley McDermitt. Ms. Richards added that she has a reduced copy of the property survey to determine the shape of the lot and what will be filled in without the building in place.

Ms. Schaeffer asked where the proposed trees are in relation to the corner of the brick house. Ms. Richards replied from the chain-link fence, all the way through the lot, and up to the Tinti's fence at the other end. The trees begin at the end of the ell and run parallel to Federal Court, behind where the barn is now. Specific measurements were included.

Ms. Richards stated that in terms of items to salvage, the corbels are in good condition but it's unknown what else can be salvaged. There are some parts of a door that separate the two halves. She will be on site prior to the demolition to remove and salvage any items she can.

Ms. Kelleher noted a new item to the condition based on discussions at the last meeting - working with neighboring property owners to determine whether any fencing is necessary. Ms. Richards replied that she will apply to the Commission to install fencing along the perimeter; however, there is a missing fence on the west end where it abuts the former Pitman home on Federal Street. It is not visible from a public way but it will be secured.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she sent a draft of the conditions to the applicant and the City Solicitor for review but the City Solicitor has not yet spoken with Ms. Richards's attorney.

Mr. Pattison stated that he is concerned with the potential bond beam for the foundation that is proposed by the mason, because if it's incased in concrete it can't be removed. Since the mason's report said the foundation is in good condition, he recommended repoint the masonry joints and not installing a bond beam. The foundation is structurally sound and installing a bond beam would make it more challenging to build on the foundation in the future. Ms. Richards replied that she thought it would be more stable with a bond beam but she hadn't discuss it with the mason.

Ms. Schaeffer read the mason's letter for the record. She noted that the proposed concrete cap can be detrimental to field stone. Mr. Pattison added that it would also look very industrial. Ms. Kelleher recommended the issue be

reviewed through the legal department prior to making a motion, since adding conditions to a certificate can be tricky.

A letter was submitted from Flannery Handymen outlining the demolition plan. Ms. Schaeffer stated that the applicant or Attorney should speak to the Building Inspector about a more detailed plan for demolishing a building of this size, in terms of safety, etc. That should happen before a decision is made on this building. Ms. Cutting noted that the safety fencing must be a demolition plan. Ms. Schaeffer noted that 1) how long will the safety fencing be up, 2) where it's located, and 3) why it is needed should be identified. Ms. Richards replied that she will return with that information, noted that the fence is being rented so it won't be long term. She doesn't want people walking through the area. Ms. Kelleher stated that this information is typical when the Commission is reviewing a demolition delay and the applicant has submitted material to answer all of the items.

Ms. Schaffer asked how the foundation is currently filled. Ms. Richards replied that it appears to be an asphalt floor on top of the foundation, it's not dirt as they thought. Mr. Cutting asked if the asphalt would remain exposed or if the dug-out area would be made plantable. Ms. Richards replied that she could not say at this time, additional demolition work is needed. Stone will be visible from Federal Street and from a public way you'd see the wall of the foundation.

Mr. Pattison emphasized that encasing the foundation in concrete is not desired, only repointing the existing foundation. Ms. Richards replied that she won't allow the mason to install a bond beam. Ms. Kelleher suggested it be made a condition. Ms. Schaeffer requested an official decision for a demolition in a Historic District from the City Solicitor. Ms. Kelleher replied that she will make sure the City Solicitor and Applicant are in contact.

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

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the December 4th meeting to allow the City Solicitor to formalize the language for the demolition approval. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

12 Mall Street - CONTINUATION

North Ventures, Inc. submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish house.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/27/19
- Photographs

The Applicant was not present.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting. Ms. Schaefer seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

138 Federal Street

Peabody Essex Museum submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for slate shingles on rear ell and barn.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/5/19
- Photographs
- Sample slate shingle presented at meeting

Steven Mallory was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Mallory stated that a replacement upgrade of a slate roof is proposed for the rear ell and barn. The PEM replaced the roof on the main mansion 5-years ago with the same slate currently being proposed. The carriage barn was constructed in approximately 1795, and has some Colonial Revival revisions. The existing asphalt 3-tab shingle roof is failing and using slate will allow for a longer preservation of the roof. The rear ell has the similar roof condition. The same slate shingles were also approved for the Ropes Mansion and East India Marine Hall and comes from the northern region of the country. There is a time crunch because their roofer has an opening, slate roofs should be installed in colder months and not in the heat of the summer, and because the quarry is also about to close for the season. He added that the rear ell was originally an independent 5-bay house that was moved there from an unknown location, to expand the size of the mansion.

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

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve as presented. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

8 Chestnut Street

Leo and Wendy Kraunelis submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows on rear ell and architectural roof shingles.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/5/19
- Photographs
- Computerized renderings

Leo Kraunelis was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher clarified that Mr. Kraunelis submitted applications for two separate projects but only one for the window replacement and roof shingles was advertised for this meeting. The second application for a new shed addition will be heard at the next meeting.

Mr. Kraunelis stated that during the October 17th 2019 storm, their house was hit by a falling tree. Two structural engineers suggested they remove the roof as the top wall plate was crooked and new framing couldn't be added. He noted that last year, two windows and one door were removed and replaced with Pella Architect Series windows. He is now proposing to change another five existing windows to the same Pella window. Mr. Kraunelis noted that the house has balloon framing and new framing was installed to level the windows. They took the side walls approximately halfway down to the second story window and built up new framing from there. Overtime the house had settled; however, the entire ell was brought back up to a level height. They tried to match the roof ridge height to recreate what they had, at the same height and scale. Ms. Kelleher stated that as an emergency Mr. Kraunelis received a Certificate of Non-Applicability to rebuild the rear ells in kind. Ms. Schaeffer noted that she approved the Certificate and the new window is roughly the same size.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the architectural shingles proposed are the same that were previously approved, GAF Slateline, and they are still available. Mr. Kraunelis stated that the existing 3-tab shingle is not high quality, and they will re-shingle that entire side then the rest of the house in the near future, but they wanted a higher quality shingle. The Pella windows were previously approved for the ell of this structure a year and a half ago, as well as at other structures within the historic districts. Mr. Kraunelis noted that the windows are top of the line, all wood, with both interior and exterior applied muntin profiles, and cost \$1,600 per window. Ms. Kelleher noted that it's closely replicates a true divide lite window, although black sashes have a visible white jamb liner. The jamb liner is not as visible in a white window. Mr. Kraunelis reported that the windows sills will be custom built to match. Mr. Pattison requested that the new windows have period appropriate half screens not full screen. Mr. Kraunelis replied that they will add half-screens.

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

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve as presented with half-screen on the Pella windows and GAF Slateline roof shingles. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All four were in favor and the motion so carried.

19 Flint Street

Lenney Trust submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for architectural roof shingles.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/5/19
- Photographs

Mary Pax Lenney was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Lenney stated that one side of the hip roof has asphalt shingles while the rest are slate. The shingled roof is leaking and needs to be replaced. The Commission questioned the material on the rear hip roof and whether it was in fact slate like the rest of the roof. Mr. Pattison requested the ridge cap material. Ms. Kelleher noted that it is hard to get a view and determine the material from Flint Street. Ms. Lenney stated that the new shingles won't be installed until next spring. Some slates did fall off on other parts of the roof and the roofer patched the holes with new slate to stop the leaking. She added that she believes the light shingle color is original and not faded. A new architectural shingle would be charcoal grey. Ms. Kelleher noted that some architectural shingles are appropriate and suggested a color match that is similar to the concave roof of the mansard roof. Mr. Pattison stated that the shingles shouldn't replicate wood. GAF Slateline or CertainTeed are more designer and would be more appropriate. Ms. Schaeffer stated that the applicant needs to determine the existing shingle, and the new should be straight and not have an angled edge. Ms. Lenney stated that she will match her neighbor's shingle.

Public comment: No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the Dec 4th meeting. Ms. Schaeffer seconded the motion. All four were in favor and the motion so carried.

7 North Pine Street #2

Stephanie Ellis submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/25/19
- Photographs
- Renewal by Anderson window brochure

Jamie Ferino from Renewal by Andersen and Ashley Ellis (Daughter of Unit #2 Owner) were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Ellis provided photos of a windows that they don't believe are original or historic. Mr. Ferino noted that seven new windows on the front and side of the unit are proposed. The front windows have no grille pattern but the side windows do and those will be matched. Ms. Ellis noted that the four high windows have no grille pattern either and may have been replaced in 1996, and they will be replaced. The two double windows were Renewal by Andersen and are composite. The dormer windows are wood but are not original to the house. Ms. Kelleher noted that the unit was restored in the 1980s and it is unclear if the windows were replaced at that time but they are tradition wood 2/2 true-divided lite windows. Mr. Pattison noted that the windows were not original.

Mr. Ferino stated that the Andersen Renewal windows are a wooden polymer composite. Ms. Kelleher noted that they can be painted and they were previously approved for a that already had windows replaced. Ms. Schaeffer requested the side window material. Mr. Ferino replied wood single pane windows. Mr. Pattison noted that he would be less concerned about using the proposed windows for the second and third floors, but not for the lower levels. Mr. Martinez noted that the Commission recently approved a non-wood window that wasn't painted. He asked what colors the proposed window come in, because they seemed beige or pinkish. Mr. Ferrino replied that they are paintable, but not by manufacturer.

Mr. Ferino noted that the 1/1 window configuration at the third floor will be replaced in kind. Mr. Pattison requested all new sashes be painted to match the trim color. Ms. Ellis replied that she will obtain the paint color previously used from the condo association.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that the window types on the first and second floors should be consistent. The upper floor is higher and harder to see. Mr. Pattison added that windows 303, 304, and 201 should have the same 2/2 configuration. Ms. Ellis replied that the first-floor side window could match the side windows at the other end for consistency. Mr. Ferino asked if the muntins needed to be internal or external. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Commission's design guidelines state that they must be external and not internal or between the glass.

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

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to accept the application with the condition that windows 303, 304, and 201 have a 2/2 configuration, windows on the third floor have a 1/1 configuration to match the existing dormer window configuration. All sashes to be painted to match the existing sash trim paint color. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. All four were in favor and the motion so carried.

5 Botts Court

Brendan Collins and Caroline Crandall submitted a Certificate of Hardship to remove chimney.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/5/19
- Photographs
- Engineer's report

Brendan Collins and Caroline Crandall were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Collins stated that they want to remove a chimney that a home inspection indicated was leaning and unsafe. If it were to fall, their neighbor's children play in the road next door. They can't afford the quote from Murry Masonry to rebuilt it to historic standards and they want to remove it instead. They don't believe that it is original; it doesn't serve any fireplaces in the house and there is another chimney that provided heat. This chimney narrows through the opening which they believe indicates that it's not original. Ms. Kelleher noted that the chimney in question is less visible than the other chimney on the building.

Mr. Pattison asked how much of the chimney is exposed. Mr. Collins replied that it goes into the attic and seems to have been built to mirror the other chimney. Mr. Pattison noted the probability that this chimney is original and the internal elements were removed. Mr. Collins added that this stack goes to the basement; however, the other chimney has a much bigger base in the basement.

Mr. Pattison requested a site visit to look inside the structure and determine the chimney's history.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that they haven't approved chimney removal applications in the recent past; instead they have asked applicants to reconstruct them above the roofline. Mr. Collins asked if it could be removed temporarily and rebuilt. Mr. Pattison suggested they brace it on the leaning side and secure it to the roof as a permanent solution.

He noted that there other avenues that could be considered to stabilize the chimney. Ms. Kelleher suggested a site visit within the next two-weeks at which time a decision can be made. Ms. Schaffer suggested they consider alternatives to demolition.

Public comment:

Ms. Kelleher read a letter from neighbor Stan Usovicz, who is in favor of the removal of the second chimney.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

The Commission and the applicants agreed to a site visit on November 23rd at 8 am.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the December 4th meeting. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All four were in favor and the motion so carried.

10 Cedarview Street

MPM Companies, LLC submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish house.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/7/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Artform Home Plans and Griffin Engineering

Bob Griffin of Griffin Engineering was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Griffin stated that the existing house was built in approx. 1930. It's a single story camp style structure that hasn't been taken care of in years and has overgrown vegetation. The 24-foot x 24-foot shed will also be removed. They don't believe it's worth saving and it has no architectural significance. Ms. Kelleher noted that the existing structure is smaller than other nearby houses and is set back from the street. Mr. Griffin added that the lot size is 5,600 square-feet, 50-feet-wide and between 110 and 112-feet-deep. The new 1,600-1,800 square-foot house will be approximately in the same location. Ms. Kelleher noted that new building plans have been included in the application.

Ms. Schaffer asked if there were similar structures of the same style. Ms. Kelleher replied that Cedarview Street is a narrow, dead-end road, and most houses are capes or smaller ranches and the proposed structure fits in with the neighborhood. Other houses are of a similar size and it's outside of the local historic district.

Public comment:

Mike Slavin, 11 Cedarview, asked if the new building will affect the neighborhood in terms of sewer and if it could be moved forward. They only received a notice of demolition and don't know what was proposed. Mr. Griffin replied that the house will be 5-8-feet closer to the street than the present building. Ms. Kelleher suggested the applicant reach out to neighbors so they can see what is proposed. She noted that there is no requirements to send notices of demolition delays but she started doing it so the neighbors were notified. Mr. Slavin requested their timeline. Mr. Griffin replied that the project could be completed within 6 months.

Jean-Luc, 12 Cedarview, stated that the home is close to the reservation and he asked for the demolition plan and whether rodent abatement is planned. Ms. Kelleher replied that rodent control is part of the demolition requirements. Ms. Schaeffer added that rodent abatement by neighbors is a good practice with every demolition project, but is particularly good practice in the winter. Jean-Luc requested a plot plan that shows the boundaries and trees to make sure it's not encroaching on his property.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve the waiver of the demolition delay with the standard conditions added for dimensions and photographic documentation. Ms. Schaeffer seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

There was no other business.

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:00PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner