

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
March 20, 2019

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, March 20, 2019 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1st Floor Conference Room. Present were Chair Herbert Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, David Hart, Rebecca English, Mark Pattison, Larry Spang.

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

Christopher Sallah were present to discuss the project.

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

Mr. Sallah provided photos of the new painted trim details. Chair Herbert noted that she only found one example of a house with a light base and dark trim, it was a home off Pleasant Street with a white body and dark green trim, which created a sharp contrast. She noted that house has a pediment with heavy trim and black window sashes. She expressed concern that at 22 Beckford Street, the extra heavy molding in the same color as the trim would reduce the visibility of the details. She stated that the color contrast will work better on other parts of the house where there are more elements, however, the one remaining face will look odd. Mr. Sallah suggested adding shutters to the entire façade of the 1960's addition to make it more interesting and only the trim will be painted a different color. He noted that shutters may have never been on that façade before. The area is also undergoing a lead abatement. Ms. Bellin asked if the rear was visible from the public way because shutters may not help it and may only draw more attention to it. Mr. Sallah replied that it is not visible from Federal Street.

Mr. Spang noted that the applicant requested a retroactive approval for the painters accidentally painting the sashes black, but the owner also misunderstood the Commission's approval for the black storm windows and once the trim was painted black the applicant liked the look even though it wasn't their initial desire to do it in that color. The other three sides have not been altered. If this were to be approved the other sides would also be painted black. Mr. Sallah noted that if Commission does not approve he will paint the 8 window trim over again, but they do want the storms black. Chair Herbert stated that the walls are subservient to the rest of the building. To make other elements disappear they would need to be painted the body color. Calling out these windows by painting them all black means the details that make them special will be hidden.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Sallah stated that he won't continue the work until the lead abatement is completed but he can schedule both at the same time. The 1st and 2nd floors first and the 3rd floor last. Chair Herbert noted that the applicant has permission to do the sashes and storms in black only and what's been done with the painting of the trim has not been approved. Mr. Sallah stated that he will know the schedule within 3 months when the weather is better to wrap the project up. Chair Herbert suggested the applicant process as approved and make the comparison on his own about whether to request approval for painting the trim. Mr. Spang replied that proceeding with the route already started could result in all the windows being painted which would be inappropriate. Painting other more ornate window trim in black would take away from them. Painting these existing 8 windows back to the trim color wouldn't be a huge burden. Mr. Pattison and Ms. English agree that there is too much black and this is the time to draw the line.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to not approve the black trim as painted. Mr. Spang seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Sallah stated that he will let the Commission know as the process continues when he will be able to repaint the rear window trim back to the original trim color. Chair Herbert requested the applicant submit a photo of the copper vent for their records.

11 Orne Square – continuation

Pamela S. Coffin submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for fence replacement.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/23/19
- Photographs
- Fence estimates

Pamela Coffin, owner, was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Coffin presented the estimates. Mr. Pattison stated that he met with the fence company and discussed 2 alternatives for them to price. He suggested that either option would be an improvement to what was installed. Option 1: remove all pickets, remove boards, add a new strip to the front, and new rails. This would correct most of what was incorrect and will make it blend and look as if it's all one fence. Option 2: remove the post sections and start with new fence posts to make them flush. He recommended option 1 as preferable but noted that both will create the same end result - posts set behind the run of fence pickets. Chair Herbert stated that the existing fence has 4x4 posts and the new has 5x5. Mr. Pattison replied that the posts won't be seen from the outside anymore and it will look closer to the neighbor's fence, although there is still a height difference because of the gate at her driveway. Ms. Kelleher noted that painting it green will also make it less visible. Ms. Coffin noted that she received approval from Orne Square Board of Directors who also approved the rolling gate. Chair Herbert asked if the less expensive estimate works for them. Ms. Coffin replied yes.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve both alternatives. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Coffin stated that due to the cost, it may be a while before she can follow through with the fence reconfiguration.

95 Derby Street – V.F.W. - continuation

The V.F. W. submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for roof vent (after the fact)

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/5/18
- Photographs
- Drawings by Winter Street Architects

Kim Emerling, Commander of the VFW Post and Mark Meche, Architect from Winter Street Architects was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher stated that both the existing and proposed conditions were submitted, as well as responses to the Commission questions from Mark Meche about materials and screening for the vent. Chair Herbert added that baffling is also proposed.

Mr. Meche stated that the VFW asked for help after the vent had been installed. He hopes to make it disappear, but since it is so close to the roof edge adding too much screening may look odd. The 4 posts needed for the screening would be anchored to the structure. The louvers were close to passing the sound requirement. He considered new louvers, snow loads, but highlighted that this is not a high-performance vent. Chair Herbert asked if scrubbers could eliminate the odor concerns. Mr. Emerling replied that a concern of odors was unknown to him. Mr. Spang asked if the louvers were sound reducing. Mr. Meche replied that more sound goes up than out, so only an acoustic blanket is needed. They only need to block sound in one direction to shield one neighbor, but they will keep adding onto it until it complies with the sound requirements. He will draw other alternatives if necessary.

Mr. Spang asked if there was a hood exhaust and not a vent and suggested building solid walls that are brought down to the roof. Mr. Meche replied no, that would create a snow drift situation and it's only 8" from the edge. Mr. Pattison noted that the location near the edge makes it noticeable. Chair Herbert asked if metal slats would be used to conceal the previously installed vent. Mr. Meche replied no, a wood-like Azek material would be used for the slats that can be painted. Their contractor will help with the design to shield the vent. Chair Herbert asked if Health Department approval is required. Mr. Emerling replied no, sound only. Mr. Meche noted that the sound attenuation might be visible through the slats of the screening.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Spang stated that the screening proposal is a reasonable approach that will mitigate the sounds. Chair Herbert agreed.

Chair Herbert requested the proposed paint colors. Mr. Meche suggested grey or white. Mr. Pattison suggested "Battleship Grey." Mr. Meche noted that the applicant has changed the fan operation to lessen the noise but they will provide sound attenuation for the neighbors. Ms. Kelleher asked if additional interior changes can be implemented if the exterior changes don't meet the decibel levels. Chair Herbert replied that if that is the case the applicant will need to return to the Commission.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve the kitchen vent as it was installed with sound attenuation and new screening in a composite material such as Azek painted in a neutral gray color. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

95 Derby Street – V.F.W. - continuation

The V. F. W. submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for building renovation.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/22/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Winter Street Architects

Kim Emerling, Commander of the VFW Post and Mark Meche, Architect from Winter Street Architects was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Meche stated that they will achieve universal access with a new handicapped ramp at the side entrance of the building, noting that most people come from the parking lot behind the building. This is a minimal addition for a building with minimum features. The applicant wanted it to be brick, but he believed that a 2019 addition should have a different finish with some detail, although brick would be less costly.

Mr. Spang asked if the front entrance would be closed. Mr. Emerling replied no, it will be an emergency exit, making three exits total. The new ramped entrance will provide their primary access. Mr. Meche noted that new signage will be planned in the future. Mr. Spang noted that at less than a 5% slope, a slope walkway is not a ramp.

He asked if the height is more than 30-inches above grade requiring a guardrail. Mr. Meche replied that they want to add a small guard at the beginning of the sloped walk. Mr. Spang agreed that with the use of building it makes sense to add it. The structure will have a low sloped roof with either a wood or fiber gutter. The paneling and trim will be a composite material such as Azek or Hardiplank.

Chair Herbert asked if an electric door opener will be used. Mr. Meche replied no, they will have a 5-foot landing which meets code. Mr. Emerling added that they will provide key card access to enter.

Ms. Bellin asked if the second door on the opposite side of the building will be replaced in kind or glass. Mr. Emerling replied that the kitchen's delivery door will be replaced in kind. Mr. Meche noted that there are higher quality commercial doors to use for the 4-foot wide opening. Ms. Bellin asked if the window above the door is needed if the new door will also have glass. Chair Herbert suggested the door be solid and not glass since it is a fire exit. She noted that the door was to be replaced in kind with a solid door as previously approved. Mr. Spang agreed and Mr. Pattison agreed. Mr. Spang asked if there was paneling on the sides of the side door and if it were recessed. Mr. Meche replied, yes, the door is recessed in the 12" thick brick wall.

Ms. Bellin stated that the roof drawing refers to an existing ventilation hood and suggested removing it if its abandoned. Mr. Meche replied that the chimney is in use but the other hood coming up from the basement could be removed if necessary. Mr. Emerling noted that it was a chimney/vent from the basement kitchen that is no longer used.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to remove sheet metal vent from basement. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ramp & Addition: Mr. Spang stated that with the sidewalk sloping off they can use fences to dress up the edge and provide fall protection, similar to the rear Bowditch House ramp. A railing won't be enough but they can add a simple board fence to make the ramp feel safer and more welcoming. This addition will not look historic; however; this is a non-profit organization and they want to keep things simple but a fence will dress it up. Mr. Meche replied that the addition is meant to look like a combination of old and new. Chair Herbert added that future signage can be more decorative.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve as drawn, if they are considering installing a rail they must return for review and approval. Ms. Bellin seconded. Mr. Spang amended the motion to include the applicant submitting proposed paint colors. Mr. Cutting seconded. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Spang stated that the applicant needs to determine how to handle the front entry and the placement of signage and flags since the accessible route must be the main entry.

Mr. Meche stated that they will paint the addition a warm grey color. Chair Herbert that grey will provide a neat and clean institutional look.

126½ Federal Street -- continuation

Joy Remy submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove chimney

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/29/19
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant no longer proposes to remove their chimney; they instead are seeking to repair it and add a chimney cap. She asked the Commission to consider adopting an expedited approval process for future chimney caps by reviewing them as a minor change with a waiver of the public hearing process. Chair

Herbert suggested each applicant continue to present at a public meeting so the Commission could ensure that the cap was appropriate. Ms. Bellin agreed. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Commission would still review the cap in order to determine whether it constituted a minor change. Mr. Hart noted that this applicant's chimney was leaning but would be repaired.

22 Cedarcrest Avenue

MA Real Estate Holdings submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish a house

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/7/19
- Photographs

David Coutler, of MA Real Estate Holdings, was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant wants to demolish the house built in 1945, detached garage, and an outbuilding. Mr. Coutler noted that all of the structures are in a bad state and have been abandoned. The neighboring buildings are from 1920's and 30's. The porch has been enclosed and the piers were infilled with CMU. He will be building a new single family home on the now subdivided lot.

Mr. Hart stated that he visited the site. Mr. Spang asked if Zoning had approved the sub-division. Mr. Coutler stated that the subdivision qualified for as an ANR (approval not required) review. Ms. Bellin asked if the 3rd building is on Lot 24. Chair Herbert replied that the house and garage were on Lot 22 and the chicken coop on Lot 24. Mr. Spang suggested 2 motions, one for each lot. Ms. Kelleher replied that they don't typically include garages and either 1 or 2 motions is acceptable since they are only approving the delay. Mr. Hart recommended that measurements and photograph interior and exterior be submitted to the Historic Commission for the record.

Public comment:

Erin Britt, 32 Cedarcrest Avenue, asked how long the demolition will take and if it will impact any of their utility services. Mr. Coulter replied just a few days and no services will be interrupted.

Mr. Spang asked if hazmat inspection will be conducted. Mr. Coulter replied yes.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the demolition delay with the condition that dimensions and ¾ view photographs be submitted to the Historical Commission prior to issuance of the demolition permit. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

65 Federal Street -- continuation

65 Federal Street LLC submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish rear and side ells

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 2/19/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Thomas Mayo Associates

Michael Becker, Owner, and Tom Mayo, Architect from Thomas Mayo Associates, were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Becker stated that they've made more changes to the plan. Mr. Mayo noted that the existing home is in the middle with two rear additions. They will keep the existing building, remove the two rear additions and add one new rear addition. The four parking spaces on site will have impervious paving where there is currently asphalt.

The gabled roof will make a T at the rear of the building, the old shed roof on top of a 2-story additions will not have new side entries below.

Mr. Mayo stated that the entry shed roof will be removed, the gabled addition moves forward, and the addition is higher by only 1-foot so all the roof peaks are the same. A Nantucket dormer, a shed dormer between 2 dog house dormers, is an alternative as well as moving the dormers closer together to highlight the dormer less. This had allowed them to make the entrance bigger with a stronger stair. The North façade will be seen from Federal Street and the West façade will be seen from North Street. Mr. Becker stated that they took 1-foot off the East side for projections and it will be 2-feet further from the lot line. Mr. Mayo noted that code requires an overhang and they wanted to maintain the proposed overhang projections and provide some relief on that side of the building.

Ms. Kelleher asked if brackets will be installed. Mr. Mayo replied that they are keeping the existing brackets and will probably be repeating them at the rear using a fire-retardant material. Ms. Kelleher asked how the windows will be treated. Mr. Mayo added that the original windows in front will be restored and kept if they can. The new windows will be 6x6, wood windows by Pella. Along the lot line the windows may have to be metal for fire rating. Chair Herbert noted that Pella's windows are more delicate while Marvin windows are chunkier. She asked if they will remove the brick from the front stairs. Mr. Mayo replied that they will keep the entry but rebuild stairs. They will also remove the 1-story entry.

Ms. Kelleher asks if the stair case for the addition on the left conflicts with the original entrance. Mr. Becker replied that there will be one stair with a joint landing for both doors to use. Mr. Hart stated that he has concerns with new rear additions swallowing up the historic building. Mr. Mayo replied that the right side comes to the same line of the old addition and the left side will match that line. Chair Herbert noted that the applicant is undergoing a voluntary review by the Commission and SRA and DRB won't want commentary from the Commission on an advisory level.

Ms. Spang asked for the unit count. Mr. Becker replied 4 or 5 units. Ms. Kelleher asked if they can look at keeping a bay. Mr. Becker replied that ending the wall at the window, as it does now, would ruin the look of the building. Ms. Bellin noted that she prefers the current option; however, even with the 5th bay flush up to the addition, eliminating another bay means almost half the building is hidden. Despite this being an improvement, this is a dominate side of the building and you will lose 1/3 of the original building. The back side is less visible but it's not the dominant side of the building. Mr. Becker stated that he prefers the current option with the two smaller dormers and noted that Emily Udy of Historic Salem, Inc. suggested this cross plan. With no entry the addition could easily be removed to keep the bay and keep it consistent.

Mr. Spang asked about the windows on the left side that are tight to the property line. Mr. Mayo replied that metal windows with a 1-hour rating are acceptable and fire shutters aren't required. They will be designed to look similar to the wood windows. Mr. Spang noted that the Commission would like to see the windows first.

Mr. Mayo stated that leaving 4 bays on the left side and eliminating the entry will keep the look of option 1 on that side. Mr. Becker suggested a third option that is half option 1 and half option 2. Ms. Kelleher noted that keeping the 4 bay maintains the look to the front façade and the existing additions are more to the back of the property and less visible.

Ms. Bellin suggested keeping 5 bays in the front and add more to the rear of the property. Mr. Becker replied that there is no more space and he needs to accommodate the legal parking space on the side. Ms. Bellin asked if parking can be added to the front. Mr. Becker replied that they can't drive over the 63 Federal Street lot and tandem parking isn't allowed. There is also an existing tree at the rear they want to keep that is approximately 9-feet from the building. Ms. Mayo noted that they don't have 9-feet at the property edge and the vehicle on the end must pass through that area to rear the parking spot beyond. Being in a B5 also allows for off-site parking within 1,000 feet of the property.

Chair Herbert asked if they can eliminate a corner of the addition along the East side. Mr. Becker replied that they are proposing 4 reverse townhouses that will use the basement space. They will use window wells to provide light to the lower living spaces. Mr. Mayo added that the wells would be below grade and not visible on the elevation, although there would be a 6" lip. The entire window would be in the well. Mr. Hart noted that the proposed layout combination mixes the old pieces with the new. Mr. Spang noted that traditionally the utilitarian additions would be at the rear and treating it all the same isn't historically correct. There should be a cascading effect as you go from the front to the rear, there would be a simpler rear gable.

Chair Herbert asked if the siding will be removed. Mr. Becker replied that the aluminum siding and asphalt siding will be removed. The wood clapboard will be reused. The shutters on the front Federal Street façade will be wood, but not on the fire rated areas.

Mr. Mayo stated that he will create a 3rd option. Chair Herbert stated that he likes some of the original detail coming back, there are many good changes that just need some modifications.

Mr. Pattison asked if the new side door will be against the original house again. Mr. Mayo replied that they will have 1-foot less of space, will center the window, and pull it away from the interior corner. Chair Herbert noted that she is happy they are volunteering for the HC review. Maintaining 4 bays at the front rather than 3 is preferred. Ms. Kelleher noted that she will compile the Commission's comments and submit them to the SRA and DRB.

Mr. Becker asked for clarification on the modifying the Nantucket dormer. Ms. Bellin replied that it needs to be determined how wide to set the dormers while keeping it aligned with the modified left entrance or eliminating the left dormer all together. Chair Herbert suggested it be shifted to match the offset in the front and rear. Mr. Spang suggested they keep the single dormer on the East façade and do a Nantucket on the West façade facing the rear, so the dormer feels like it's meant to be part of the original house. Mr. Becker noted that they can keep it in its same location and not lose the roofline effect, since the existing dormer is further out towards the edge of the building. They didn't want to put casement windows on the front façade. Mr. Spang requested a window sample.

There was no public comment.

25 Lynde Street -- continuation

Evergreen Realty Trust submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish rear ell.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 2/19/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Thomas Mayo Associates

Michael Becker, Owner, and Tom Mayo, Architect from Thomas Mayo Associates, were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Mayo stated that the previous plan was to remove the rear addition and construct a new addition. They have a 10-foot right of way on the driveway on both sides. Cars on the right side of the property will parallel park on the right. They will build out to the 10-foot setback line and revised the plan to include a 24-inch from recess to install a planter. They will offset parking for 1 on the right sides, along with 3 parallel parking on the edge, and 1 parallel parking garage spot. He noted that they lowered ridge line on front addition and eliminated a door and a dormer from that addition to scale it back even more. The garage doors and trim will be painted to match the body color to help conceal it. The dormers above were designed to match existing and the bedroom dormer windows will be casements. The existing rear door was moved to the far end of the right side where they will replicate the shape attached to the building. The front gambrel will keep the ridge line shape which is complimentary to the original structure.

Mr. Mayo stated that the 2 additions on the 3rd floor will match the original, the foundation will be cut granite blocks with large granite curbing at the front flower bed that will wrap around to meet the side elevation. Ms. Kelleher noted that the addition is very close to the existing addition size. Mr. Becker replied that it is only 3 or 4-feet longer than the original addition. They will also remove the windows from the garage doors and leave only flat panels to help minimize them further. Mr. Spang asked if 1 large door will be used for the parallel parking garage. Mr. Mayo replied yes, and one 24-foot long garage door will be installed on the other side of the building for 3 cars. Mr. Hart noted that 3 units in existing building where 5 units are proposed and garage parking is not historic. Mr. Mayo noted that the structure is surrounded by parking lots. Mr. Becker noted that no ZBA approval is needed if parking is within 900+ feet of the property. Chair Herbert asked about the existing parking spaces. Mr. Becker replied two and technically other off is off-site by 0-feet. There are 3 easement spaces on the right side of the property that they don't use.

Mr. Spang suggested they eliminate the planter and installing the planting at grade. He also suggested they make eliminate interior walls between the garage to allow a vehicle to drive under the building and out the other side to eliminate some additional maneuvering.

There was no public comment.

23 Summer Street -- continuation

23 Summer Street LLC submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish rear ells.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 2/19/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Thomas Mayo Associates

Michael Becker, Owner, and Tom Mayo, Architect from Thomas Mayo Associates, were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Mayo stated that they previously proposed six cars on site and four spaces below. The revisions set the addition back from the main building and rotated the rear addition. They've added a widow's walk on the roof to conceal HVAC equipment. On the original building the modern bay window will be replaced with a new window. The strong cornice line will be kept and the circular window duplicated and French doors will open on the balcony. They will keep the slate roof shingles on the front Summer Street building. The structure and cornice line will step back, but not down, with a 1-foot to transition to the hip roof and shingles of the rear addition.

Mr. Mayo stated that there are three options for the garage door treatment and for the dormer on top. Nantucket dormers will provide more floor space than a shed dormer or they could mimic the front dormers. He also noted the slight angle of the existing rear addition.

Mr. Hart expressed his opinion that the applicant is obliterating the Federal style building and he is not in favor of the proposed changes. Ms. Kelleher asked if they have explored setting back the addition more than 1 foot. Mr. Mayo replied that lowering the roof doesn't work well with head height or the cornice line; however, the Summer Street façade will not be changed.

Mr. Spang requested the unit count. Mr. Becker replied 10 units with 10 cars and they are eliminating one parking space.

Mr. Spang asked if they considered an ell at the rear, since the proposed addition is just an extension of the existing building and the detail looks false because they are so different. The addition should be more utilitarian. He asked why the mechanical equipment can't be placed on the existing building rather than the addition. Mr. Mayo replied

that it's behind the main building on the addition. Mr. Becker noted that a rear widow's walk at the rear would be harder to achieve.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the building has been modified several times over the years but the third floor still reads as shorter with the smaller windows, and the large central chimney gives the main building a grand feel. Mr. Becker replied that the mechanical units at the widow's peak will be barely visible. He noted that both the SRA liked the proposal enough to send it to the DRB for review. Chair Herbert replied that this project needs expert historic input.

Chair Herbert suggested that the widow's walk be moved to the back of the building. Mr. Spang suggested the applicant expand the envelope or create a carriage house effect, since a 1-foot push back isn't visually significant. There needs to be some differentiation between them, possibly eliminate the pitched roof. Mr. Becker replied that they want a step down between the original house and addition and not an extension that will create a big house effect. They want a step down that is more historically appropriate. Mr. Pattison suggested that they drop the cornice or thin out of the cornice at the addition. Chair Herbert suggested a simplified cornice. Mr. Becker replied that he would not like to terminate a cornice into a roofing which will create a long-term maintenance issue, although a synthetic material would be on the old house too. Chair Herbert stated that a conversation with both the SRA and DRB is needed since they have the oversight on this building. Mr. Hart noted that he was involved in 2 similar projects where the owner dug down 2-feet and restructured the addition to keep the historic Victorian structure intact.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she will draft a letter to both the SRA and DRB to be reviewed by the Commission. It will be broad since different members have different opinions. Ms. Bellin suggested Mr. Spang's modification ideas be included.

Old Town Hall – Community Preservation Act Application – Request for Letter of Support

Ms. Kelleher presented information on City's proposal to complete an historic structures report for Old Town Hall with Community Preservation Act funding.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the letter of support. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

Bowditch House – Community Preservation Act Application – Request for Letter of Support

Ms. Herbert presented information on Historic Salem, Inc.'s request for CPA funds to replace the roof at the historic Bowditch House.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she would draft a letter of support for the Commission to review before it is sent to the CPC.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the letter of support. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Salem Athenaeum – Community Preservation Act Application – Request for Letter of Support

Ms. Herbert presented the Salem Athenaeum's request for a letter of support for their application for CPA funds to complete a full assessment of their building including climate control and handicap accessibility.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she would draft a letter of the support for the Commission's review prior to its submittal to the CPC.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the demolition delay with the condition that dimensions and ¾ view photographs be submitted to the Historical Commission prior to issuance of the demolition permit. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

14-16 Hodges Court

Ms. Bellin asked how the project is progressing. Chair Herbert stated that the interior renovation is 90% complete and they are close to getting occupancy.

There were no minutes, violations or correspondence to review.

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 10:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner