

DRAFT
SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
November 7, 2018

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, November 7, 2018 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1st Floor Conference Room. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Reed Cutting, Rebecca English, David Hart, Mark Pattison and Larry Spang.

105 Federal Street

Whitney and Stephen Van Dyke submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install copper gutter

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/4/18
- Photographs

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

Whitney Van Dyke was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Van Dyke stated that the wood gutter is rotting and needs to be replaced. They have decided to replace it with a copper gutter. Ms. Kelleher provided a current photo with the new synthetic wood shingle roofing as well as an older photo showing the earlier 3-tab roof shingle and wood gutter. She noted that the new shingles look realistic in person. Ms. Van Dyke stated that it takes 6 months for the copper gutter to settle and they will also paint all the soffits.

There was no public comment.

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

22 Beckford Street

Jocelyn Levin and Christopher Sallah submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new storm windows in black

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/23/18
- Photographs

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

Christopher Sallah was present to discuss the project.

Chair Herbert stated that the existing window sashes are black and will match the new storms. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Design Guidelines call for the storms to be painted the house trim color, and in this instance matching the sash is a better look. Chair Hebert replied that she is in favor of it, noting that new storm windows on a Winter Street house are a good example and they should be documented with photographs.

Mr. Spang asked if this will be a multi-phased project, with one side completed per year. Mr. Sallah replied yes, the building has 49 windows and five sides due to a rear addition. Some repairs will be needed and it will take a couple years to complete. The Beckford façade will be done in 2018, the rear in the spring, the side facing

Beckford in the fall, then the driveway facing Federal Street. Mr. Spang and Chair Herbert discussed whether to approve the application for all phases or requiring the applicant to return for extensions since SHC certificates typically expire after 1 year. Ms. Kelleher noted that requiring renewal may delay the applicant's progress.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve as submitted, allowing the applicant to phase the project completing the installation one side at a time. The Commission will automatically renew the certification in the future to allow for the completion of the installation. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. English suggested that the storm window section on appropriate color selection be amended in the Design Guidelines. The Commission agreed.

19 North Street, Unit A - continuation

Andrew Milas and Dimitra Milas submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/25/18
- Photographs

Andrew Milas was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Milas stated that he spoke to the other owners in the building and has received their approval for the window replacement. He can provide written statements from them. According to historic photographs, the building had a variety of window configurations, some were 6 over 6 and others were 2 over 2, the entire house is 1 over 1 now. Chair Herbert noted that the second-floor windows were the only 2 over 2's and were probably original and the first-floor bay windows have changed over the years. Mr. Milas stated that after the last discussion with the Commission, they were left unsure of what to do with the new window configuration.

Chair Herbert suggested that the 2-story bay windows remain 1 over 1 since they are small, as are the center windows. The third-floor windows belong to another condo owner and will not be changed. Therefore, the two second-floor windows would be the only new 6 over 6 windows. She noted that if they go back to 6 over 6, the overall appearance of the building will be mixed-up. Mr. Milas asked if all windows should remain 1 over 1 and if they should change the sash color to bronze. Chair Herbert replied that the bronze aluminum cladding would not match the third-floor windows unless the other condo owner agreed to change his. Mr. Milas noted that an alternate color would be Almond.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve as submitted with the proviso that all replacement window sash be 1 over 1 configuration. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Milas stated that one basement window is visible from the street and the other is plywood but has a stone sill. The driveway side wooden window sill will be replaced with granite and the new windows will match the new ones being installed on the house. One basement window will be Jeld-wen with 4 panes and the one along the driveway may be 3 panes depending upon the width.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Vijay Joyce asked if the basement windows were a means of egress. Chair Herbert replied no.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve as presented for 2 basement windows, one on either side of the house will be Jeld-Wen with 4 panes on one side and 3 or 4 on the other, with new granite sill in a grey tone to match the existing granite base and to match the height. The window colors to match the new windows. Cutting seconded. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

18 Chestnut Street - continuation

Dorothy Kelleher submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for new windows and paint colors

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/15/18
- Photographs
- Paint samples

Victoria Kelleher was present to discuss the project.

Chair Herbert asked if the window were being refurbished.

Ms. V. Kelleher noted that as the oldest house on Chestnut Street she wanted to refurbish the windows and hired a woman to restore the sashes. The window restorer removed the sash and stored them in her brother's garage. In total 35 sets of windows were removed. The restorer refuses to return 15 sash sets, but the storm windows are still in place. A police report has been filed. Ms. Kelleher is now seeking approval to install new replacement windows.

Ms. P. Kelleher noted that the replacement windows now proposed by the applicant are better than the Kolbe replacement sash kits previously proposed, which would have had smaller panes of glass.

Ms. V. Kelleher noted that the window muntins will have the same dimensions as the original. The proposed paint colors are similar to the colors at 1 Cambridge Street: "Black Forest Green" for door and shutters; "Lambswool" for trim and fence; and "Wayside Inn" for body. Chair Herbert asked if the storm windows will match the trim or shutter color. Ms. V. Kelleher replied trim.

Chair Herbert asked what will occur at the rear façade. Ms. V. Kelleher replied a garden that she will discuss with the Commission at another time. Chair Herbert noted that the Commission has jurisdiction over the fencing, which was removed without notice, and that the sawed-off sections of fence posts need to be replaced. Ms. V. Kelleher noted that the fence was moved to accommodate the trash dumpster.

Mr. Cutting asked why the applicant was requesting to change the façade color from grey to brown. Chair Herbert noted that 1 Cambridge Street is a soft brown with cream accents, but the existing grey on this home is stately. The Commission agreed. She noted that some shades of grey can have green or blue undertones. Ms. V. Kelleher stated that the house will be painted in the spring. Mr. Hart stated that Sally Zimmerman from Historic New England could be consulted on potential early house colors. Ms. P. Kelleher to provide the contact information.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Lou Sirianni, 6 Botts Court, asked what the ramifications would be since there was no notification when the windows or fence were removed. Chair Herbert replied that the fence removal was temporary to get a dumpster on the site and Ms. V. Kelleher didn't know that window removal required approved. Mr. Sirianni stated his concern with the rear of the property since the neighbors want to see a garden, not a parking space in the area where mature bushes were recently removed. Ms. V. Kelleher replied that the bushes were dead. Mr. Sirianni asked for the window manufacturer. Chair Herbert replied Millworks which the Commission finds acceptable. Chair Herbert asked when the manufacturer could begin. Ms. V. Kelleher replied that Millworks is ready to start but are awaiting the Commission's approval. Mr. Sirianni asked that the discussion of a new façade paint color be deferred, since there have been two grievances with this property; the fence and the paving at the parking spots. Chair Herbert

replied yes, the cut fence posts need to be replaced; however; the abutters' fence was better design and the Commission could ask that the replaced fence be similar to the neighbors'. She asked that all grievances be submitted in writing. Mr. Sirianni replied that he will document the conditions and make recommendations.

Ed Wilkins, 5 Botts Court, stated that when the previous owners built the rear patio they asked the landscape architect to match the new fence to his and he wouldn't want to see a different style fence installed. He reported that the contractor's fence removal method was to jar the fence loose despite it being attached to their fence. The fence was eventually cut, moved and reinstalled in a make-shift manner, but he wants to keep the two adjacent yards compatible. Chair Herbert replied that the new fence could be custom to match parts of each neighboring fence.

Gary Gill, Ward 3, noted that other Chestnut Street residents are concerned with this house and they aren't in favor of the proposed house color. The home at 110 Derby is a similar color but it fits in that neighborhood. He is also upset with the fence being taken down and the windows taken out. The applicant should have researched the process before she began.

Tom Murray, 14 Chestnut Street, stated that he is the closest abutter to the property. The proposed façade color needs Commission approval. In the 35 years he has lived next door this house has been altered without permit and he is happy to see it fixed up. He noted that there has always been a parking spot but the land is full and the driveway became wavy. Ten years ago it was leveled with crushed stone but became wavy again. The rear garden would be a welcome change, the ground is soft from ground water that is undermining the foundation. He noted that the window issue wasn't expected and is unfortunate.

Mr. Sirianni suggested that the Commission also approve the driveway and that Murry Masonry do the work.

Chair Herbert recommended that the Commission defer the colors. Ms. V. Kelleher stated that the police are investigating whether the windows can be obtained, but she has some of them. Chair Herbert noted that the glass can't be replicated and asked how long the interior work would continue. Ms. V. Kelleher replied 2 months and noted that the Commission can speak with the detective if needed. Chair Herbert stated that they don't want to approve new windows if the original ones can be obtained. Ms. V. Kelleher noted that the contractor found the window company. Mr. Spang expressed his opinion that the applicant didn't create the situation and suggested that a replicated window sample be provided to review. Chair Herbert agreed since the quality of the window company is unknown. Mr. Hart suggested the supplier submit a sample and specifications.

Mr. Gill questioned how this situation occurred without the knowledge of the Commission. Ms. P. Kelleher replied that removing, restoring, and reinstalling windows is a frequent practice. Mr. Spang noted that the homeowner can't be blamed since she didn't know that this would happen, and the Commission can only offer help at this point.

Ms. Herbert closed public comment.

Ms. P. Kelleher to schedule a site visit to confirm the existing conditions on Dec 5th. Chair Herbert stated that the restoration normally takes several months and asked for the intended window refurbish schedule. Ms. V. Kelleher replied that it was unknown since this would be a major restoration that began in the summer. Chair Herbert noted that storms will help retain heat in the house while the painting and plastering is completed. She will speak to the Contractor during the Dec. 5th site visit. Mr. Spang suggested several Commission members review an installed sample sash within the next week or two to speed up the process. Chair Herbert stated that Mr. Spang will speak with contractor and Mr. Pattison and Mr. Hart will review the sample sash. The applicant shall let the Commission know when the sample has arrived.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to request a sample from the applicant for the proposed window application, to be submitted prior to the December 5th meeting, or a sub-committee shall review the sample on-site if it's available prior to December 5th. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried. Mr. Hart

amended the motion to include approving the existing windows to be restored. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue the discussion regarding proposed paint colors. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

1-3 East Collins Street

East Collins Realty Trust submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish a single story building.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/18/18
- Photographs
- Concept drawings by Red Barn Architecture dated October 9, 2018

Michael Myer were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Myer stated that the building will be demolished for a new rehabilitation center, which will host AA meetings. Mr. Hart noted that photographs and documentation of the building will be required.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Mary Knight, 5 East Collins Street, expressed her concern with the existing building being unoccupied. The building has flooded and hazardous black mold could be released when the building is demolished. She noted that the windows have significant condensation when it's cold and she asked if there will be an interior inspection and remediation of the mold. Ms. Kelleher replied that she will confer with the Building Inspector to see the steps of demolition when mold is present. Chair Herbert noted that the structure must be cleared by the Board of Health and the Commission can make asbestos and mold testing a condition of the WDDO approval.

Gary Gill, Ward 3, reported that neighbors have witnessed water entering the rear of the building during high tide and they want to know what will happen with the property. Chair Herbert replied that waiving the demolition delay will allow the Commission to work with the owner to modify the building so it either meets their needs or it can be moved. Mr. Gill noted that the neighbors have flooding concerns for the neighborhood due to rising tides and want nothing to be placed there. Mr. Kelleher stated that this is a flood zone and the applicant will also need to meet with Conservation Commission for the demolition and proposed new construction.

Mr. Spang suggested the applicant submit concept sketches, provide the height of first floor slab above grade. Mr. Myer replied that they will building on-top of the existing walls, the first floor will be 2-feet above sea level with a 3-story steel building above. Mr. Spang asked if stilts will be used to address the flood plain issue. Mr. Myer replied that they will comply with whatever the Conservation Commission requests. The storm drains haven't been maintained for over a decade which is caused the flooding, but that will be redone. Mr. Spang asked if a hazardous materials survey was completed; window caulking, light bulbs, etc. Mr. Myers replied yes, 6-8 years ago and no hazardous materials were present. The Building Commissioner walked through the space and there are test wells from National Grid and the building is being monitored for flooding. Chair Herbert stated that the Commission will want the report to make sure the structure is ready for demolition.

Ms. Knight requested clarification on the extent of the proposed demolition. Mr. Myer stated that the building will come down except for the bottom 2-feet of wall. The foundation will be reused, which Engineers determined was salvageable. There will be another walk-through with the Building Commissioner.

Chair Herbert asked if Chapter 91 was required. Mr. Myer replied no, but it is unknown if there will be water access. The building will become a medical and educational facility with security. Chair Herbert noted that a

restoration of waterfront was important since this site has Salem's only sand dune. Ms. Knight stated that a portion of this site is subject to Ch. 91 requirements. Mr. Gill noted that the beach has a berm with two man made paths to the left and right sides.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the waiver of the demolition delay with the proviso that the Building and Health Departments, and all other required Commission and Departments be involved to ensure that abatement is addressed. The hazardous materials report, Photographs, dimensioned plans and elevations of the interior and exterior of the building must be submitted to the Commission prior to its demolition. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

106 Bridge Street

Carol I. Snyderman and Laurence R. Snyderman submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish a single-story commercial garage

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/25/18
- Photographs
- Drawings by Griffin Engineering dated 7/31/18

Attorney Joseph Correnti, Larry Snyderman, and Bob Griffin of Griffin Engineering were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Correnti stated that the building is a 5-bay garage constructed out of CMU. The property, which was once 2 lots, is under agreement with Juniper Point Construction who has received approval from the ZBA to construct 8 town homes in 2 buildings (4 units in each). One building will face Bridge Street and the other will face Cross Street. SLP is currently conducting some remediation of the stained soils.

Mr. Griffin stated that the front face of the existing garage building was constructed in 1960 with an additional 3 bays added on Saunders Street side. This is visible along the front façade by the use of slightly different CMU.

Chair Herbert asked where the building will be constructed. Mr. Griffin replied that the front building will be close to Bridge Street with the bike bath behind it. The building will have 3rd floor sliding doors leading to small decks. Atty. Correnti noted that there is no Design Review required for the new buildings; however, the applicant agreed to meet with the Historical Commission review prior to issuance of building permit. There are no detailed plans at this time, they will submit final plans, lighting, landscaping, trash location, and will construct a mock-up for the Planning Department. Although not within the Historic Commission's jurisdiction, the ZBA was concerned was the impact on the neighborhood. Chair Herbert requested Historic Salem, Inc. also review this project to provide design guidance particularly given the concern with the use of plastic railings and inferior windows. She noted that providing more historic looking finishing touches will stop the pattern that has been set on that street by the developer's five previously completed projects. Atty. Correnti noted that a more historic restoration will widen their market and could reduce their construction costs.

Atty. Correnti stated that the process has been pre-determined, and the Commission can provide input to the Planning Director Tom Daniel who has jurisdiction over the project to make sure it fits. All materials and plans will be submitted to the Planning Department for review, which the developer has agreed to do. They want to move the project forward in a timely manner. Ms. Kelleher replied that as a Planning Department staff member she will be a part of the project review. Chair Herbert noted the prominent location along an entrance corridor will encourage future buildings. She noted that the Historical Commission does not want to hold up the process but just wants to improve the end result.

Mr. Spang noted that Bridge Street is transforming from a commercial corridor back to residential and new owners need to contribute to the success of that transformation. He noted that during the review process, input needs to be

provided to the applicant before construction documents are prepared. This site is next to two gable-roofed historic properties and the gable ends of the new buildings should match with them to continue the streetscape instead of being different. He also suggested that the 3rd floor sliders are not historically appropriate. Atty. Correnti noted that the DRB has encouraged different materials, but that this is not a historic building. However, the developer does want it to be appropriate for the neighborhood. He also noted that the Planning Department review will be early in the process and not at final Construction Documents. The initial concept images presented to the boards lack detail and Pitman & Wardley and Red Barn Architecture are working together on a more fully developed design.

Chair Herbert noted that as the oldest street in Salem, Bridge Street needs to have a voice that speaks towards preserving the historic elements that remain.

Atty. Correnti noted that the Planning Department review process will be long and the plans won't be ready by the Dec 5th Historical Commission meeting. Granting the waiver of the demolition delay won't hold up the design review process and the current owner would like to close his garage and move the process forward. Chair Herbert stated her preference to continue to the 5th meeting to allow Ms. Kelleher to review the internal Planning Department process.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Gary Gill, Ward 3, stated neighbors are concerned with what is going on across the street from them given that the developer's previous projects have changed the look of the street. He recommended that the new project look more like a period home to fit in with the neighborhood.

Mr. Snyderman, Atty. Correnti and Chair Herbert discussed the impacts of delaying the Waiver of the Demolition Delay decision. Atty. Correnti noted that although this is the last approval they need, the paperwork hasn't been submitted to the bank yet and the structure isn't scheduled for demolition prior to the Commission's December 5th meeting. Mr. Spang noted that banks may want to see that the Historic Commission approval before they approve the property transfer. He noted that the Commission wants to help move the process forward to create a good project that is consistent with the historic Bridge Street Neck, but an approval could mean the neighborhood is left with an empty lot for an unknown length of time, surrounded by a chain-link fence while the developer waits for financing.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to continue to the December 5th meeting to review the design process by the Planning Department and to formulate a response. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

84 Washington Square East- continuation

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/8/18
- Photographs
- Proposed Site Plan by Griffin Engineering dated 7/27/18

The applicants were not present.

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

Other Business

The Commission discussed proposed revision to the Design Guidelines and revising the options for windows.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she hasn't received any comments from Commission members and suggested continuing discussion to the Dec 5th meeting.

88½ - 90 Federal Street.

The owner, Frances Flaherty, was present. Ms. Kelleher reported that the owners of the property have asked for reconsideration of the Commission's approval to retain slate shingles on the street-facing slopes of the side dormers. She and Mr. Hart met with the roofer on-site to discuss his concerns about joining the slate on the dormers to the architectural roof shingles. Chair Herbert also noted that the developer of the property installed a modern window in one of the side gables without approval and never painted two of the four downspouts before selling the property.

Chair Herbert asked if the sides of the dormers and roof would be clad with new material. Ms. Kelleher replied that the scalloped dormer side walls can remain. Only roof slope facing Federal Street would be slate and all others would be changed to architectural asphalt shingles. The roofer's concern was the cost and effort to strip and re-slate the dormer roofs, then to join it to the scalloped walls to the architectural shingles.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve revising the certificate to allow for architectural asphalt shingles on the street-facing sides of dormer roofs. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

384 Essex Street

Ms. Kelleher reported that a Certificate of Non-Applicability has been submitted for the replacement of slate shingles on building's upper portion of the mansard roof with architectural asphalt shingles.

The applicant/owner David Clarke was present. He stated that he wants to do some painting using the existing colors where there is some rotten fascia. He also stated that the roof valley is full of tar and needs to be re-flashed. He will preserve the fish scale slate shingles on the lower portion of the mansard roof. There is no visible valley but there will be copper underneath. There is a current leak in one main valley that needs repair. The front Flint Street corner may not be visible and even though half of the roof is hidden, you can tell that the roof is slate.

Ms. Kelleher asked the Commission whether the project might qualify for a Certificate of Hardship since the roof is partially visible from Essex Street. She stated that she didn't believe that it would qualify for a Certificate of Non-Applicability. The Commission could consider the changes based on limited visibility or non-visible changes. The other items are repairs in kind.

Mr. Clarke asked the Commission to consider approving replacement of the roof with the main leak, which is visible from Flint Street at this meeting so he wouldn't have to wait 1 month to make repairs. He stated that even though it would be a change in material, he believes this area with the leak isn't visible. The replacement would be with asphalt architectural shingles; the lower mansard would remain slate.

Ms. Kelleher recommended that she send the application to the Commission for a determination of whether roof slope is visible or not instead of making determination at the meeting without visiting the site. The rest of roof would be addressed at the next meeting. The Commission agreed.

95 Federal Street

Mr. Hart recused himself as an abutter to an abutter. Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant is proposing to screen the unit with bushes, which is a minimal solution for the vent. There was supposed to be a mock-up of the vent and this is not being done within the scheduled timeline. Mr. Cutting noted that this is a reasonable solution. Chair Herbert

stated that something else was already approved at this location that wasn't followed through, they could be done through the basement storage rooms and not be visible. The application was told to determine if what was approved meets code, an estimate for the work, and a statement from the installer saying that it doesn't meet code, but bushes were immediately proposed instead of investigating her suggestion. This is the heating system from Unit 2. She also wanted to move the bushes forward to hide the meters. Mr. Spang agreed that the applicant should return at the December 5th meeting, with technical information or an estimate so the Commission could consider whether to adjust their approval instead of just screening with plantings. Chair Herbert stated that the applicant is making this a time-consuming process by not wanting to find a better way to install the piping. He will need to take apart the hand-made lattice that is scribed to the granite and the screening proposed will require maintenance to ensure that continues to screen the equipment. It sets a precedent to approve this without documentation. The Commission agreed that the applicant needs to resubmit his documentation.

Proposed Municipal and Religious Adaptive Reuse Overlay District

Mr. Hart asked for clarification regarding the overlay district for the churches and municipal properties. Ms. Kelleher replied that the ordinance includes language requiring applicants to submit projects to the Commission for comment. However, the City Council is still in the process of reviewing the proposal.

Meeting Minutes

There were no minutes to review.

Violation Notices

Ms. Kelleher asked how to handle when an approval installation method doesn't work. Mr. Hart replied that the applicants would need to resubmit. The Commission agreed.

88½ - 90 Federal Street. Ms. Kelleher stated that the developer also installed a modern window, two of the four downspouts haven't been painted, and the property has been sold.

95 Derby Street – V.F.W. Ms. Kelleher stated that a violation letter was sent out to the applicant who will be present at the December 19th meeting.

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner