

DRAFT
SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
December 19, 2018

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, December 19, 2018 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1st Floor Conference Room. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, Rebecca English, David Hart, Mark Pattison, Larry Spang, Jane Turiel.

18 Chestnut Street – continued until January 2, 2019

Dorothy Kelleher submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint colors.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/15/18
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant had requested the application to be continued to the January 2, 2019 meeting.

22 Beckford Street - continuation

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/14/18
- Photographs

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

Christopher Sallah was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Sallah stated that he will submit photos of the copper vents for their records. The body and trim are same color and the storm windows and sashes are black. Chair Herbert noted that window trim painted black is atypical for Federal Street and she suggested the applicant seek advice regarding historically appropriate paint colors. Mr. Sallah noted that all the trim paint will be completed in one season although the storm window work will be costly and new sashes will be made. Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant received approval for new black storm windows in October and he thought the trim should also be black but that wasn't what the Commission recommended. Mr. Sallah replied that he will change the black trim color if the Commission finds it unacceptable. Chair Herbert suggested the applicant receive a few opinions and the Commission will provide some names, although the body color is usually darker with lighter trim.

There was no public comment.

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

125 Derby Street – continuation – CONTINUED TO THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/20/18
- Photographs

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

84 Congress Street - continuation

Pequot Filling Station, Inc. submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish single story commercial garage building

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/5/18
- Photographs

Attorney Bill Quinn was present to discuss the project and represent the developer. John Seger, Architect, was also present.

Atty. Quinn stated that the Historic Commission had expressed concerns with the concept, so they've submitted revised plans to both the Commission and Planning Board. They hope to receive final Planning Board approval on January 3rd. Chair Herbert stated that Mr. Spang made suggestions via e-mail to minimize the naming of the building and she suggested that the building lettering be placed in stone rather than using large protruding letters.

Chair Herbert asked whether landscaping was proposed. Mr. Seger replied that they've received landscape approval along both sides of the street, they've added planters on the garage side along Dow Street, and the urban look of Congress Street will remain. Chair Herbert suggested a living wall be installed on a portion of the front façade to soften the look and change the character of the building. Mr. Seger replied that the Planning Board was not in favor of the juniper trees so they will present a revised plan for site plan approval. Chair Herbert noted that the Commission previously requested that the applicant work with the Planning Board on proposed changes, so they continued the waiver of the Demolition Delay. Since the applicant has followed through on the request, therefore the Waiver should be granted.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Hart asked which elevation the gas and electric meters will be installed. Mr. Seger replied on the driveway side off Congress Street, the narrowing of the existing curb cut is for an easement with the neighboring building along with parking, and a small grate screen wall perpendicular to Congress Street to match the garage screening.

Chair Herbert asked where mechanical units will be installed. Mr. Seger replied at the center of the roof where it will be minimally visible. Chair Herbert requested acoustical safeguards be installed on a minimum of 3 sides and the proposed mechanical screening should be submitted to Ms. Kelleher.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the demo delay with color digital photographs of all sides, drawings with vertical and horizontal dimensions. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher noted that prior to granting the official Waiver of Demolition Delay, the property owner must submit the photograph and plans of the building to the Commission.

21 Washington Square North - continuation

Salem Renewal Ventures LLC submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate the building, including the removal of small dormer

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/20/18
- Photographs
- Drawings by Seger Architects

John Seger was present to discuss the project. David Pabich, owner, was also present.

Chair Herbert stated that at the previous meeting they continued the discussion of the rear addition and whether the balustrade should extend the full length of the addition or only halfway. She also questioned whether the small skylight on the roof should remain. Ms. Kelleher provided two photos from the Phillips Library collection showing a skylight from 1850 and 1896. The skylight could be part of the original construction. Chair Hebert noted that the structure was built in 1837 and the skylight, in her opinion, could stay or go. Mr. Seger replied that the scale of the skylight is troublesome even if it is historically significant, because it interrupts the roof and distracts from the front face of the structure that faces Salem Common. He prefers to remove the skylight and return the roof to its pure state. Chair Hebert noted the dormer's copper roof and that the sides have operable windows. She asked if it can be carefully removed and preserved since it is unique. She noted that the window was well made and operable at one time but is not painted shut and is too high to look through.

Mr. Hart suggested the skylight was a later addition that could remain. Mr. Seger replied that architecturally the skylight doesn't make much sense as an addition to the roof. Ms. Pattison noted that there is a similar skylight/window on his 1906 house on Hardy Street.

Mr. Seger stated that the upper rear porch has turn balusters and simple 2x2 balusters at the first-floor porch. One is more for street presence and the other is for a less visible roof deck. Another roof deck across the street also has turn balusters. Chair Herbert replied that the rear is visible and decorative, while the ground level at the rear is utilitarian and they shouldn't embellish it.

Chair Herbert asked Stephen Mallory, Manager of Historic Structures and Landscapes for the PEM, who was in the audience, for his opinion on the porch balusters.

Mr. Seger stated that they moved it over, instead of adding a whole skirt board for the wooden deck they used a fiberglass Dura-Deck to match up with the entry door threshold. Chair Herbert noted that Mr. Spang asked if there were sleepers under the deck and if the unit owner would prefer to look at a rubber roof beyond the end of a new deck or if they should deck the entire area. Mr. Mallory stated that the applicant is not restoring or replacing something original and the balustrade would typically fall short of an eave line on the roof would fall short of the roof line. He suggested continuing the railing along Williams Street only, to maintain the sightline from the road, but not to continue it along the entire roof, which will save money. It's not original and doesn't need to be matched to an original. The Commission was in favor of the modification.

Mr. Seger noted that if the owner could extend the deck to the end they would also extend the railing. Mr. Mallory suggested that at 12-feet long, they should move the newel post to the end and add a median newel post for support or to gain approximately 18-inch they add a well-constructed mid-rail joint at that location. Mr. Seger agreed.

Chair Hebert asked Mr. Mallory about the simple 2x2 turn balusters at the lower level. Mr. Mallory replied that they are appropriate and reflect the modern construction.

Mr. Hart noted that the building was askew on its lot, since the South and East elevation are turned 180 degrees. Therefore, the plans should identify which side is which for the record. Ms. Kelleher suggested the applicant name the Washington Street elevation so the plans can make sense.

Chair Herbert reiterated that the porch will have a turn balustrade as show on the roof with a single run, and another newel post in the center. The lower balusters 2x2 simple utilitarian as shown. Mr. Seger agreed.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the railing design with turn balustrade on the roof with a single run, another newel post in the center and simple lower 2x2 utilitarian balusters. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Chair Herbert asked what would happen to the window. Mr. Pabich replied that it would be salvaged.

VOTE: Ms. Turiel made a motion to approve removing the dormer window. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

1 Brown Street – Peabody Essex Museum

The Peabody Essex Museum submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the fence and site improvements

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/21/18
- Photographs

Stephen Mallory, PEM Manager of Historic Structure and Landscapes, was present to discuss the project.

Chair Herbert noted that the PEM is proposing to continue what exists from the Armory Building along Brown Street and eliminate one driveway and widen the other. Mr. Mallory added that the gate opening is too narrow and the last brick post at the driveway has been replaced after being hit and the proposed design duplicates the existing fence and details. The existing fence is in bad shape, all 6 segments have been partially replaced or are out of plumb and only two of the three granite sections are in good condition. They will take the fence down and rebuild the posts as is. DeAngelis Restoration will do the ironwork and an existing fence section will be used as a template. The granite curbing will be made level, the asphalt sidewalk will become brick, and a new curb cut and cross walk be added across Brown Street.

Chair Herbert noted the uneven spacing of the brick piers in the rendering. Mr. Mallory replied that the new fence will have evenly spaced piers, the double piers will be a pedestrian gate, and the vehicular entrance will have no gate. Chair Herbert asked if the Ward House would be moved in the future and if it would require a fence reconfiguration. Mr. Mallory replied that the fence wouldn't require further modification since most 17th century houses faced south and the rear faced the street, although it would impact the parking which could be placed where the Ward House is currently located. The current proposed fence will stand the test of time along the Essex block. Chair Herbert asked if the final brick pier will come right up to Bray House. Mr. Mallory replied no, an accessway will remain for maintenance purposes. He noted that the neighborhood residents wanted to maintain the existing design to see into the Essex Street block. The cast iron gets vandalized and need repair annually, the fence on Essex Street would be vulnerable, living fence need constant upkeep, and hard fences won't provide visibility.

Ms. Bellin stated that hardware and details are needed for the gates so the Commission knows exactly what is being replicated. Mr. Mallory replied that the fence and gates have undergone numerous repairs, but the new hardware and detail will match the original system. Ms. Kelleher asked if there will be a gate. Mr. Mallory replied that the gate detail is missing from the drawing but will be replicated. Chair Herbert requested that existing condition photos be submitted. Ms. Kelleher requested elevation drawings since it will be needed to make the new fence. Ms. Bellin requested ascetically appropriate details be used. Chair Herbert noted the 5'-8" height of the brick piers, asked for the dimensions of the gate and if a cross bar would be needed for stability. Mr. Hart reiterated that fence elevations and details of hardware should be submitted, and the proposed design can be approved and the hardware approved separately.

Ms. English asked for the proposed timeline of this work. Mr. Mallory replied that the fence section to be duplicated can be removed this winter and Nazzo Masonry restoration is on board to rebuild the piers. Chair

Hebert asked if the fence work will be completed prior to the water infiltration system in the parking lot. Mr. Mallory replied yes.

Public comment:

Mike (last name not known), a neighbor, asked when the fence and landscape work will be completed. Chair Herbert replied the fence work in the winter and excavation for drainage system in the spring. Mr. Mallory added that the Federal garden restoration will take place in the summer of 2019, the fence work could start in the spring depending upon the weather and contractors. They hope to finish in September of 2019 and may hire a historic plantings gardener. DeAngleis wants to remove a section of fence so they may begin the restoration immediately.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the fence but to submit detail on the gate and to continue that portion to the second meeting in January, and to approve the removal of the existing fence section for duplication. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

95 Derby Street – V.F.W.

The V.F. W. submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for building renovation and roof vent (after the fact)

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/5/18
- Photographs

John Sumner, an elected official of the VFW, was present to discuss the project.

Chair Herbert stated that the interior bar and kitchen work has been completed but the Historic Commission wasn't consulted for the exterior work. Ms. Kelleher noted that two windows have been boarded up and a roof vent was added. Mr. Sumner replied that they boarded up the back of the kitchen and can paint or brick up the openings, and they wish to keep the exterior material. The previously broken window no longer had panes and the interior space became a utility room. Chair Herbert asked about the doorway, the white board over the windows, and the kitchen vents on top of the roof. The Commission would want to disguise the vent with a parapet wall or screening. Mr. Sumner replied that the vent is 3-feet high. The Commission suggested the vent be painted black and brick up the windows with a 1" recess to highlight to former openings. Mr. Sumner agreed. Mr. Hart suggested the vent be painted flat black or dark charcoal.

Public comment:

Cynthia Carr, Building Property Manager at 97 Derby Street, stated that the new vent is very noisy and generates a smell so strong she can no longer use living room with the windows open.

Delores Jordan, 97 Derby Street, stated that her garden is no longer enjoyable and sound proofing should be added to the vent to conceal it. She didn't know the applicant would change out the windows or the roof vents. She can smell the vent exhaust from her bedrooms and she can no longer open those windows. Chair Herbert replied that the building owner should go to both the Building Department who should have notified the Historic Commission. Ms. Jordan requested the applicant change the direction of the vent and she has 2 residents to think about.

Mr. Hart asked if the building previously had a kitchen and if a permit was issued for the work. Mr. Sumner replied that they did not previously have a kitchen but they did get a permit. Chair Herbert replied that the Building Department didn't notify the Commission and didn't consider the venting as a concern of the Commission. She stated that the Commission will want an acoustical study on the vent noise so it can be minimized. Mr. Sumner replied that the Inspector conducted a noise check and determined that it generated the same noise level as an AC unit; however, there will be sound ordinance test done. Mr. Hart suggested the applicant look into a different

ventilation system. Chair Herbert suggested the applicant coordinate with Ms. Kelleher and the Building Department on solutions that also need to be shared with the neighbors.

Ms. Carr noted that the vent is louder than any A/C unit. Chair Herbert suggested she submit her information to Ms. Kelleher.

Ms. Bellin asked for the times when the kitchen is used. Mr. Sumner replied daily, Monday – Friday from noon until 11PM and Saturday from 11Am to 11PM. Longer hours attract more veterans and they received a grant to do the renovation.

Ms. Kelleher stated that an official sound study should be completed. Mr. Pattison suggested interior sound deadening options. Chair Herbert suggested they limit their hours for now until the matter is resolved.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve in-filling the window openings with brick in place of wood panels and to match the brick color as closely as possible recessed. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue the roof vent discussion. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Sumner stated that the side door on White Street is useless and wind blows through the window. They want to replace it as is and no canopy is needed since the door is recessed. The new door will match the look of the existing. Chair Herbert suggested they return with options for the Commission to review.

Ms. Carr noted that cords on White Street flap in the wind.

Ms. Hart stated that architectural plans and elevations will be needed to review the proposed work, as well as better quality photos. Ms. Kelleher noted that she will assist the applicant with the application to improve the 1920's architecture.

Mr. Sumner stated that they will work on the acoustical issues. Chair Herbert suggested the applicant involve the neighbors and contact the Licensing Department and Board of Health for their suggested hours of operation.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to request that the applicant study the vent system and study alternative methods to minimize the detrimental effects including noise and odor reduction. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Request for review of proposed changes to 13 Arthur Street carriage house conversion

Architect David Jaquith was present to discuss the project. Deirdre and Seth Robert, owners, were also present.

Mr. Jaquith presented the plans that were given to the Building Department. The Contractor installed an awning window where a double-hung window was proposed, an issue that could have been resolved in August.

Ms. Kelleher stated that after she was notified by the Building Inspector that the applicant wanted a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) it was discovered that the approval design didn't match what was constructed. The first-floor window should be 2x2 double hung sash window; however, an awning window was installed. Also, the paired window in the gable end was also smaller than what was approved. Mr. Jaquith noted that the Contractor made the change on his own. Mr. Robert added that their Contractor took advantage of them, delayed their windows by 2 months, and most likely gave them left over stock windows. Chair Herbert asked if a 1/1 window or a 2/2 window could fit into the opening. Ms. Jaquith replied that the Owners wishes to keep the upper double hung window and change the 1st floor window to a 3-foot high double hung over the sink.

Chair Herbert stated that the Contractor will receive a letter from the Historic Commission, and they will copy both the Owner and Architect. She requested a list of all items that need to be fixed. Mr. Robert replied that the new 2/2 window is narrower but the same height. Chair Herbert asked if the Contractor will need to patch around the window if it were replaced. Mr. Jaquith replied yes, there would be interior plaster and tile work. Chair Hebert noted that stacked field stone were placed below the deck.

Ms. Bellin asked if the applicant wished to keep the smaller 2/2 window above. Mr. Jaquith noted that due to the current opening size the new window will be shorter and would be installed in the spring. Owner would like to receive a temporary CO, and there is a 1 year waiting period. Mr. Robert replied that he has no issue with the shorter upper window due to baseboard heating installed below. Chair Herbert suggested the applicant consider adding an enlarged window to their list of Small Claims Court items.

Public comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to install a new first-floor 2/2 window. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Jaquith stated that he will provide a dimensional sketch of building elevation with the larger windows.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the Commission will issue a letter to the Building Inspector stating that they've authorized the work to be completed within 6 months and request that a temporary CO be given. Ms. Bellin asked if the Building Inspector knew there was a change. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Inspector noticed at a site visit, but the Contractor told him that the Owners and Historical Commission would not care; however, a stop-work order should have been issued. Mr. Jaquith noted that the Contractor should be reported to the state.

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

The applicant was not present.

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

CLG National Register Eligibility Opinion Request - Proposed expansion of Downtown Salem National Register Historic District boundaries – continuation

Ms. Kelleher stated that there is an existing district and the CDC is seeking to expand the existing Downtown Salem National Register District to include several buildings they own between the Downtown and Lafayette Park. Most of these buildings are multi-story, mixed use with commercial below and residential above. Once the CDC receives approval from the Commission on the expansion they will reach out to affected property owners. Property owners can only object in writing and if more than 51% object, the expansion will not be listed. Salem is a Certified Local Government, the Commission has the right to determine whether a structure is eligible for listing in the Nation Registry.

Ms. English asked why a neighbor would oppose. Ms. Kelleher replied that National Register listing is primarily an honorary designation but if Federal or State licensing, permits or funding are involved then a review process is required for changes. If an owner uses their own funds then it wouldn't trigger a review. Some neighbors don't want government oversight. Neighbors must formally object with a letter; however, there are numerous absentee landlords. The Downtown District could be expanded beyond this, but they don't have the capacity to do more. The CDC also wants to be able to use historic tax credits. Ms. English noted that this seems like a good opportunity for the CDC. Ms. Kelleher added that this doesn't include the new hotel lot, which is labeled as "D" and would not be contributing. If the Commission approves, she will draft a letter.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to draft a letter. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Appointment of temporary representative to Community Preservation Committee – continuation

Chair Herbert stated that Joanne McCrea's term on the CPC is almost up; however, she is willing to take over for Joanne through the May award season at the least. She also suggested that Stephen Mallory be considered for a new Commission member since he works for the PEM.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to allow Chair Herbert to fill Joanne's CPC seat through May 2019. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

Violation Notices

Ms. Kelleher presented photographs of a new fence on Orne Square that did not receive approval. There are discrepancies between the design of the original fence and the new fence - one has flat top pickets, is 1-foot taller, and doesn't go down to the ground.

VOTE: Ms. Pattison made a motion to send a violation notice. Ms. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the florist on Derby Street did not submit a certificate of non-applicability for paint colors. She hasn't received the application and the new paint colors are not the same as what existed.

The Commission discussed the lack of members for the January 2, 2019 meeting.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to move all continued items from January 2nd to January 16th. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Preservation Planner