

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
December 4, 2019

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, December 4, 2019 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room. Present were: Reed Cutting (Acting Chair), Larry Spang (Chair), Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce, Milo Martinez and Stacey Norkun.

6 Federal Court - CONTINUATION

In a continuation from a previous public hearing, the Commission heard the request from Federal Court Realty Trust for a Certificate of Hardship to demolish a carriage barn

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/5/19
- Photographs

Mary Richard and Attorney John Fitzpatrick were present.

Ms. Kelleher and Attorney Fitzpatrick discussed conversations with the City Solicitor on the language for the Commission's conditions on the Certificate of Hardship to demolish the carriage barn. Ms. Kelleher reviewed the conditions: salvage material; preserve foundation as part of landscape plan; and work with neighbors on need for boundary fencing. Additional items (landscape plan, building documentation, were submitted at the last meeting.

The Commission discussed salvaging building materials from the barn prior to demolition. The Commission agreed that the cornice corbels should be salvaged. Ms. Norkun suggested that the wide vertical sheathing boards appear to be in good condition and should be saved. Mr. Joyce also suggested that the doors be salvaged as well. Attorney Fitzpatrick recommended that the Applicant be allowed to exercise reasonable judgement on what material can be salvaged. The Commission agreed.

The Commission agreed that they could provisionally issue the certificate subject to approval by City Solicitor and Applicant's counsel of final language. If agreement on the language is not made within 30 days, then Applicant will return to Commission's first meeting in January.

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

**VOTE:** Mr. Joyce made a motion to issue the Certificate of Hardship to allow the demolition of the carriage house with a provision that if certificate language is not approved by City Solicitor and Applicant's counsel, the Applicant will return the Commission at its January 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. Ms. English seconded the motion. Four members were in favor and one was opposed (Ms. Norkun). The motion so carried.

9 Cambridge Street - CONTINUATION

In a continuation from a previous public hearing, the Commission heard the request from Andrea and Colin Grant for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an architectural shingle roof.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/23/19
- Photographs

Andrea and Colin Grant were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Grant reiterated their request to apply an architectural shingle instead of a GAF Slateline “designer” shingle. Mr. Grant stated that the building’s location to a nearby tree. The architectural shingle will inhibit lichen growth and would have a greater longevity. Ms. Kelleher reported that her research indicated that the longevity and wind strength of the architectural and designer shingles is the same, but the costs are different. Mr. Grant noted the following: Slateline Designer shingles are \$62 bundle, 3 bundles per square; architectural shingles are \$35-37 a bundle; and three-tab shingles are \$32 for 3-tab. The construction is different; designer shingles are constructed similar to a 3-tab but are thicker. Architectural shingles have two layers and are constructed of fiberglass and asphalt.

Ms. Norkun stated that she has begun researching other roofing options. There is a metal roofing that mimics wood shingle roofs, which is highly rated.

Ms. Kelleher noted that most of the straight cut shingles have been discounted.

Mr. Martinez noted that there is a Certainteed Highland Slate that may be appropriate, but the Commission has not yet received an application for this shingle. Mr. Cutting asked about the shading color. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Commission has not yet discussed the variation of color for shingles and has instead discussed the angled, 3-dimensional appearance.

The Commission discussed previous approval of architectural shingles in the historic districts. Ms. Kelleher noted that the City will be submitting a grant application to update the Commission’s Guidelines.

Mr. Joyce noted that the Commission has approved architectural shingles with extenuating circumstances, including height of roof, setback from the street, and pitch of roof that limits visibility of shingle.

Ms. Grant noted that the Nantucket Historical Commission approves architectural shingles with specific colors. Ms. Kelleher noted that she had researched other historical commission and the appropriateness of architectural shingles varies.

Ms. Kelleher noted that composite shingles have been approved in the district. Mr. and Ms. Grant responded that they were not interested as they are double the cost and do not have a good rating.

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

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue the application to the Commission’s January 15, 2020 meeting. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

*Mr. Spang arrived at this time*

#### 19 Flint Street - CONTINUATION

In a continuation from a previous public hearing, the Commission heard the request from Lenney Trust for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an architectural shingle roof.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/5/19
- Photographs

Mary Pax Lenney was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Lenney presented a photograph of the roof slope documenting that this section of the roof has asphalt shingles. She stated that she researched the cost of GAF Slateline since this was the Commission’s preference. She asked if the Commission might consider a less expensive option based on the conversation of the previous application.

The Commission discussed the limited visibility of the roof slope from a public way.

Ms. Kelleher suggested that the color of the new shingle may be more important than the shape of the shingle.

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

The Commission agreed that the applicant should continue and return with a proposed color of shingle and a sample piece of slate.

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue the application to the Commission's February 5, 2020 meeting. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 5 Botts Court - CONTINUATION

In a continuation from a previous public hearing, the Commission heard the request from Brendan Collins and Caroline Crandall for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove a chimney.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/5/19
- Photographs

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

Mr. Collins presented a review of the application, noting that the property's inventory form stated that only one chimney was present in 1968 when the form was completed. Ms. Kelleher noted that the inventory form describes the changes that have been made to the house, including early 20<sup>th</sup> century changes to the roofline, removal of the center chimney. He also presented quotes to replace (\$10,000) and to remove the chimney.

Public comment:

Amy Miller, 8 Botts Court expressed her support for the request, noting that the chimney to be removed was not highly visible unless specifically looking.

Ms. Kelleher presented three additional letters of support from Louis and Vicki Sirianni, 6 Botts Court, Lawrence Frej, 9 Botts Court, and Alex Marks, 7 Botts Court.

Ms. Norkun asked how the roof will be patched. Mr. Collins replied that there were leftover shingles from a previous roofing project that will be used to match. The Commission agreed that the rear roof slope is not visible.

Mr. Collins noted that the chimney stack does not serve a firebox and appears to be a later addition. Mr. Spang asked if it serves a furnace and if so, how will the furnace be vented. Mr. Collins replied that the furnace will be vented out the rear of the house.

Mr. Martinez reported that he was present on the site visit and the interior floorboards indicate that both chimneys appears to have been built at the same time. He noted that the 1968 inventory form was completed by a volunteer, who was responsible for simply completing a checklist on the building and may have missed the second chimney. Ms. Kelleher added that later inventory forms were completed by professionals who provided an in-depth architectural description. Mr. Martinez presented photographs taken during the site visit.

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the application as presented with the condition that the roof be patched to match existing shingles and noting that the view of the subject chimney is de minimis from a public way and the chimney is not original to building. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Five members were in favor and one was opposed (Mr. Martinez). The motion so carried.**

8 Chestnut Street

Leo and Wendy Kraunelis submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a new shed addition.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/5/19
- Photographs

Leo and Wendy Kraunelis were present to discuss the project.

Mr. and Ms. Kraunelis provided a recap of the damage caused to the building from a tree that fell during a wind storm. Ms. Kelleher noted that the applicants had submitted this application, but it was not notified for the previous meeting.

Mr. Kraunelis presented the request to add a 12' x 10' x 8' tall addition for storage. The addition would be custom built and not a kit and would have a hip roof similar to main building. He presented three options for door with preference for door with square lights. Commission agreed, noting that the door would have limited visibility through the adjacent park. The addition would also be visible only down the long driveway and through vegetation in the park.

The Commission discussed the existing door on the west elevation of the addition. The door may have once provided access to an unheated storage area, but the addition is now residential, and the door no longer functions.

The Commission discussed the pitch and height of the roofline. Ms. Norkun asked if the existing window will be retained. Mr. Kraunelis replied that the addition will cover the window but would not extend the full length of the wall.

Mr. Joyce asked if the cornerboard on the existing addition would be removed, if the gutters would match and the roof overhang. Mr. Kraunelis stated that the cornerboard would be retained and the addition would be setback. New gutters would be copper to match existing. The roof overhang would match existing; the drawing does not correspond to actual overhang.

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

Ms. Norkun recommended that final construction drawings be submitted to the Commission for approval since the current drawings are more concept than actual construction details.

Mr. Martinez and Mr. Joyce asked if a gable roof would be more appropriate than a hip roof. Mr. Kraunelis replied that the building has a variety of roof shapes and the hip matches the rear addition.

**VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to approve the application as presented with the requirement that final drawings with dimensions and materials specified be submitted for final approval by Commissioners Spang and Norkun. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

374 Essex Street

James Sullivan and Emma Hamilton submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate a carriage barn.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/18/19
- Drawings by Seger Architects dated October 28, 2019
- Photographs

Dan Ricciarelli of Seger Architects was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Ricciarelli presented the plans to restore the carriage barn, noting that the project has applied for historic tax credits. The Commission discussed the proposal to change the existing barn door. Mr. Spang asked if the large pane of glass would appear out of place for the district. Mr. Ricciarelli noted that the door would be renovated with an exterior panel of glass similar to changes made on a barn door on a building on Webster Street that also received historic tax credits. Mr. Spang suggested that a multi-light glass panel be considered since the barn door would likely be open much of the time and the large single glass would serve as a window. Other Commission members stated that they did not have concerns about the design. Mr. Ricciarelli stated that he could reach out to the Park Service and Massachusetts Historical Commission to see if they had concerns with the single light window.

Mr. Joyce asked if the ox-eye windows would have louvers. Mr. Ricciarelli replied that windows would have glass. All existing windows would be restored.

Mr. Spang asked for paint colors. Mr. Ricciarelli replied that colors would remain as existing.

Mr. Joyce asked about gutters. Mr. Ricciarelli replied that there are no gutters currently as the building has a deep overhang.

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

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 87 Federal Street

Albert Goodhue Condo Association submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace gutters.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/19/19
- Photographs

Rachel Lieberman and Michelle Andrews on behalf of the Goodhue Trust were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Lieberman presented the application to replace the wood gutters that are in deteriorated condition with aluminum gutters. Originally looked at fiberglass but it would be too expensive and copper, but it should not be painted. Her contractor noted that other nearby houses have aluminum gutters. She stated that they would like the gutters to be painted to match the house. She also expressed concern that copper gutters are frequently stolen. Mr. Spang asked if wood gutters were considered. Ms. Lieberman replied that the wood would be expensive, would require significant maintenance and there are fewer contractors who work with wood gutters. Ms. Lieberman stated that aluminum gutters would be in 32 gauge.

Ms. Kelleher presented drawings indicating the difficulty with tying the new aluminum gutter into the building's decorative cornice molding. Mr. Spang asked for clarification on whether the gutter continues onto the return. Mr. Joyce said he thought it was crown molding. The Commission agreed that the building's cornice molding was slightly different on each side of the building. Ms. Lieberman asked if there would be similar problem if a copper gutter was used. Mr. Joyce replied that the profile was most important. Mr. Spang suggested that there was once a continuous fascia piece. All agreed that the copper gutter would be difficult to tie into crown molding. Ms. Norkun asked if downspouts would remain in existing locations. Ms. Lieberman replied that she believed so.

Mr. Joyce recommended replacing with new wood gutters lined with copper or sheet metal, which would have a greater longevity. He stated that he could not support replacement with aluminum gutter since it would significantly alter the building's significant architectural details. He illustrated this by comparing the building's wood gutters with aluminum gutters on the adjoining property. The Commission agreed. Ms. Lieberman and Ms. Andrews expressed interest in wood gutters but were concerned about cost.

Public comment:

Ms. Kelly Tyler of 23 Warren Street reiterated the concern about the longevity of new wood. She relayed her experience with replacing wood gutters at her property and stated that working with a good contractor is critical. Her gutters are oiled and not lined. She offered to provide the name of her contractor to Ms. Lieberman and Ms. Andrews.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the replacement of wood gutters with new wood gutters to be lined or oiled to match existing profile and dimensions. New downspouts in aluminum to be painted to match existing and to be placed in existing locations. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 23 Warren Street

Nick Lewis and Kelly Tyler submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows on rear ell.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/14/19
- Photographs

Kelly Lewis was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Lewis presented request to replace single-glazed Brosco wood replacement windows on the west elevation of rear ell, noting that the contractor will be matching trim on rest of house and not using factory casement and trim. The new Marvin Ultimate double-glazed wood windows would have bronze spacers and would match muntins detail of casement windows on the east side of ell. She presented a sample Marvin Ultimate window. Fourteen original wood windows on the main house have been restored by Window Women.

Mr. Joyce asked if windows would have wood exterior. Ms. Lewis replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Cutting noted the window's distance from the street and their limited visibility.

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

**VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve the application as presented with the condition that windows would have half screens Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 42 Warren Street

William Durkin and Abby Elizabeth Conway submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter windows.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/18/19
- Photographs

William Durkin and Abby Elizabeth Conway were present with their contractor Paul Conway.

Ms. Conway presented the application to replace paired windows with a smaller single window to accommodate interior kitchen remodel. She noted that windows on the house vary in size and placement.

Mr. Spang asked if the paired windows are original. Ms. Conway replied that she believed so since they match other windows on the house.

Ms. Norkun asked how the shutters will be salvaged and reused as described in the application. Ms. Conway replied that the shutters may be reused on the rear and she was not sure if new shutters would be used on the new window. Mr. Martinez suggested moving the shutters to the second floor windows where modern shutters are currently.

Mr. Spang asked for the height of window sill from floor. Ms. Conway replied approximately 2'. He asked if it was possible to build interior kitchen cabinets differently to retain existing windows behind cabinet. He suggested keeping existing casing in place and adding clapboards to fill space. Mr. Martinez suggested that it would be difficult to open windows from the interior if behind cabinet.

The Commission discussed single versus double glazed windows.

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

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the application as presented with the condition that new window be all wood, single-glazed with ½ screen and trim to match existing window trim on house. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 8 Botts Court

Amy Lauren Miller submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new shutters, paint color and gutters.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/18/19
- Photographs

Amy Lauren Miller was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Miller presented request to replace inappropriate shutters with new historically-appropriate Red Cedar wood shutters and paint with new color Benjamin Moore "N40380 Regal Soft Gloss Black". New England Shutter Mills will fabricate shutters, including custom-made shutters for windows that currently don't have shutters. The front porch floor would also be changed to "black". The lattice would be painted black too. Main body of house will remain existing yellow color.

Public comment: Ms. Kelleher read a letter of support from neighbors.

Ms. Norkun expressed concern that the black selected for the shutters would be too harsh with the yellow color of the house. Ms. Miller stated that she could change the color of the black. The shutters will be pre-painted at the factory and may not match exactly with the color black of the porch floor. The company offers two options for black, only one of which will be a true black. The porch floor has already been painted in the BM Soft Gloss black.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the application for shutters and new color for porch and shutters as presented. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Ms. Miller presented the request to replace wood gutters on rear additions. Ms. Miller reported that the existing undersized gutters are experiencing significantly splashover that is causing deterioration of the building. Roger Pettite will be working on the gutters. Mr. Pettite has worked on other houses in the district.

The Commission discussed the new gutters and how they would relate to the building's cornice molding. Mr. Martinez suggested that some of the splashover could be caused by the downspout on the upper roof dumping into the gutter on the lower roof. Ms. Miller replied that they had considered correcting the situation but there was no place to add a new downspout in that location. The Commission asked how the copper would relate to the gable

return trim. Ms. Kelleher noted that Cambridge Historical Commission recommends gutter coppers and she would reach out to them to see how they address gable return detail.

Mr. Martinez asked if wood gutter could remain on upper roof to connect with gable return trim. A new copper gutter could be used for bottom roof. Ms. Miller asked if a copper downspout could be used instead of the aluminum downspout. Mr. Joyce replied that it could be used but wood gutter should be lined in copper.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the application as presented with the following changes: gutter on two-story rear ell to be in wood and lined in copper to match dimensions and details of existing wood gutter; new downspout between two-story ell and single story addition to be round, fabricated in copper and with a larger dimension than current downspout; and new gutters on single-story addition to be in copper. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 27 Chestnut Street

27 Chestnut Street Trust submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install vent pipes.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/20/19
- Photographs

Elizabeth Padjen was present on behalf of the Trust to discuss the project.

Ms. Padjen noted that her father Oscar Padjen recently passed away. The house has been in the family for more than 50 years. She is now seeking to complete some repairs at the property, including replacing one of the building's two boilers and the water heater, which are failing. They are seeking to replace with high efficiency systems that need to be vented through an outside wall. She stated that they considered various locations to minimize the visibility of the vent pipes but the building's configuration limits placement to the proposed location through the basement window in the rear addition. Ms. Padjen presented drawings of the building elevation. She noted that existing fencing and evergreen plantings would hide the vent pipes from certain vantage points. Additional evergreen rhododendrons would be planted to further screen the pipes. The 9-light basement window would be removed, and the frame would be retained. She presented an example of the single flat oval vent that would be used. An additional vent pipe would be added for the water heater. She presented photographs of the variety of high efficiency vent pipes on houses on Charter Street. She stated that the panel and pipes would be painted black to match a basement door on the same elevation closer to Chestnut Street.

The Commission discussed the design of the infill panel and where the pipes will be located on the panel. Mr. Spang asked if the vents pipes could be located in the upper part of the panel. Mr. Martinez asked if the color of the basement frame will remain white. Ms. Padjen replied that the panel will be black, and the frame will be the current white. The Commission considered the use of a palimpsest window or "ghost window" whereby the interior would be infilled or bricked in and the frame remains in place. The Commission debated whether to use a white or black frame next to the granite foundation and whether brick should be used for infill. Mr. Joyce suggested the use of shutters to infill the space. The Commission agreed that a black frame would make the panel fade visually and the panel could have trim details added to read as a door.

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

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the application as presented with the following changes: foundation window insert to be fabricated with trim detail to mimic appearance of foundation door found at the northern end of east elevation of main building. Insert, vent and vent pipe to be painted all black to match shutters. Rhododendrons to be planted for further screening. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Other Business

The Commission discussed the schedule for the first meeting in January. Per the calendar, the first Wednesday of the month is January 1<sup>st</sup> and meetings can be held. Ms. Kelleher reported that the options were to schedule a different meeting time or to cancel the first meeting and only hold the second meeting in January. She stated that it can be challenging to find a meeting room and to have members available to find a different meeting time. She stated that there is only one application for the next meeting on December 18<sup>th</sup>. The Commission agreed to cancel the first meeting in January and hold the next meeting on January 15<sup>th</sup>.

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

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Community Development Planner