

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
April 4, 2018

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, April 4, 2017 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, David Hart, Joanne McCrea, Larry Spang, and Jane Turiel.

314 Essex Street - continuation

Paul J. Pinto and John F. Casey submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a new fence.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/5/18
- Photographs
- HABS drawing of garden

Mr. Casey was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Elizabeth Peterson, Director of the Witch House, stated that she is in support of the proposed fence.

Ms. McCrea stated that she is concerned that the fence will make it urban, asked if it will be on the property line, and noted that she didn't want the existing vegetation or the tree to be impacted by a new fence. Ms. Kelleher replied that the new fence will be installed along the edge of the driveway and the tree is belongs to the Witch House. Ms. McCrea stated that the tree should be taken care of. Mr. Casey noted that the tree will remain and one side will be trimmed to allow for the installation of the fence. Ms. Kelleher noted that at the previous meeting a condition was placed on the fence that it must follow a certain path.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Ms. Joyce Kenney of Lafayette Street noted that if less than 30% of the trees branches are trimmed, the tree will remain healthy.

Mr. Hart stated that Ms. Kelleher sent out an original plan from 1936 and the new fence will follow the original fence route.

Ms. Bellin added that the tree and the plantings are all on the Witch House property.

There was no additional comment.

**VOTE: Ms. McCrea made a motion to approve the installation of a new fence with the condition that special care be paid to the existing tree so that it is not harmed during fence installation. Ms. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

384 Essex Street - continuation

Robert Barnard submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to repair entry portico

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 2/1/18
- Photographs

Ms. Herbert noted that the applicant requested a motion to continue the discussion.

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion continue until the next regular meeting on April 18th. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

170 Federal Street

Timothy Obert and Matthew Obey submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new light fixtures.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/12/18
- Photographs
- Product specifications

Mr. Obert was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Obert stated that they plan to install 2 new light fixtures since there is no existing light at the front of the house. One gas fixture will be installed by the front left window and the second will be an electric 3-bulb fixture installed in the driveway. Ms. Herbert asked if they will be cast iron. Mr. Obert replied yes. Mr. Spang asked if the two fixtures would be identical. Mr. Obert replied yes.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Ms. Joyce Wallace, 172 Federal Street, stated that she lives next door and is in favor of adding the fixtures.

There was no additional public comment.

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

254 Lafayette Street

Renaissance Condominium at 254 Lafayette Street Trust submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new paint colors.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/12/18
- Photographs
- Paint chips

Roland Brophy, Jaclyn White and Shane Young were present to discuss the project.

Ms. White stated that the building is a six-unit condominium.

Ms. Herbert noted that the original deck balustrade was painted white and she suggested that the body paint color be used instead so that it stands out less. She noted that it was allowed only because there was an existing balustrade in that location that they replaced. Mr. Brophy replied that it can be painted any color. Ms. Herbert noted that the rear deck is plastic but since it cannot be seen from the street so it can remain.

Mr. Brophy presented a mock-up of the proposed paint colors. He noted that it is a darker version of original body color, the previous is 10 yrs old and faded, and the new color will stand out more and they want to highlight the Victorian elements.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the window sashes and storm windows will remain a brown/bronze color.

Ms. Bellin asked if the 3 horizontal moldings were the decorative elements being added. Ms. White replied that two of the three are existing but are currently painted a golden yellow, only the bottom molding is new. Ms. Herbert added that the subtle gold color has faded. Mr. Hart stated that he finds the proposed red color for the horizontal trim to be too stark. Ms. Bellin agreed with Mr. Hart. Ms. Herbert replied that the new color will be more of a terra cotta color than the cherry red depicted in the proposed image.

Ms. White noted that the doors will be a plum color. Mr. Brophy noted that there are three doors to paint, one in the front, one facing the parking lot side, and one at the rear.

Ms. Bellin asked if the accent color will be under the trim color. Mr. Brophy replied that the dentil work is difficult to see and that the trim will be darker.

Ms. Herbert stated that she was in favor of the proposed paint color scheme, noting that third floor porch balustrade should also match the body color in order to soften the appearance of the roof porch.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Ms. Simian Brun, neighbor, stated that she was in favor of the proposed paint colors.

The Property Manager for the adjacent property (name not known) stated that the owners of 248 Lafayette Street are in favor of the project.

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the proposed paint colors as proposed with the proviso that the porch balustrade to be painted the body color. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. Six were in favor (Mr. Hart abstained) and the motion so carried.**

Request for Comment under Section 106 / Hawthorne Cove Marina, 10 White Street – continuation

Ms. Kelleher reported that Mr. Hart had visited the property and submitted his notes on the existing conditions and the potential effects of the proposed work. She also noted that Historic Salem, Inc. submitted a letter expressing the organization's opinion that the impact should be considered for the entire site, not just the affected area as defined by the Army Corp of Engineers. She noted the owner has made changes to the building to mitigate the impacts, including moving the proposed structure away from The House of Seven Gables, adding additional windows, and using metal siding in an attempt to make the new structure blend in with the neighborhood.

Mr. Hart stated that in October of 2017, the Massachusetts Historic Commission requested comments from the Salem Historical Commission relating to the construction of a 7,500 SF building at the Hawthorne Maria (approx. 200 ft. long x 60 ft. wide x 38 ft. high. Comments were requested because the structure will be located within the Derby Street National Register Historic District and is adjacent to the House of Seven Gables National Historic Landmark complex and the Derby Street Local Historic District. He stated that he visited the site on Friday, March 30, 2018 to identify potential adverse effects of the project on the Gables property. He noted that there is a narrow view corridor from the Gables House to the proposed marina building, but that the existing boats and tents would conceal much of the view. He also noted that residential properties in the local historic district surround the subject property, and many of them may be adversely affected by the view of this new building. However, the proposed new culverts, which are the subject of the Army Corps review, will be below grade and should not have any adverse effects on the Gables property or the residential structures.

Ms. Herbert stated that this project is before the Historical Commission because it falls under Section 106 review due to the need for Federal permits. She noted that the Commission has not been asked to comment on the new building (the concern is with the proposed visible rip rap wall possibly infringing on the Historic District, which it is not), however, they can provide their opinion. She noted that the existing tents and boats will be relocated to the inside of the building which will improve the look and view of the property and the HC will provide a letter to this effect.

Mr. Spang stated that the use is consistent with the marina use within the Historic District but recommend the owner consider materials for the exterior cladding other than the proposed metal siding that would allow the building to better fit in with the neighborhood and the Historic District.

Ms. Herbert noted that the building will be grey and will have windows to fit-in with the residential neighbors. She suggested that a copy of the letter be sent to Derby Street Historic Neighborhood Association prior to their next meeting.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Ms. Turiel made a motion to provide a letter to the Massachusetts Historic Commission. Mr. Spang amended the motion to include Mr. Hart's write-up so the MHC is aware that a member of the local HC visited the site, and to add that the façade material be reviewed and potentially changed to be more consistent with the Historic District. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### Presentation on Proposed Renovations to 94 Washington Square East

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti, Grover & Frey was present to discuss the restoration and renovation of the former Knights of Columbus building. Richard and Jay Goldberg of Spire Investments and architects Peter Pitman and Brigitte Fortin of Pitman & Wardley Associates were also present.

Atty. Grover stated that Spire Investments has a purchase and sale agreement to purchase the Knights of Columbus building. While the building is not located within the Washington Square local historic district, it is a prominent building on the Common so they are presenting the project to the Commission to receive input before presenting to the Zoning Board of Appeals on April 18th. Ms. Kelleher noted that most of the properties on the eastern border of the Common are not in the local historic district. Ms. Herbert noted that many property owners on that side chose not to join the Historic District when it was first formed.

Mr. Pitman stated that the property is on the corner of Washington Square and Briggs Street. The 1818 Federal style structure has undergone numerous modifications - in the 1850's Italian Revival features were added and in the 1970's a single story historically insignificant addition was added to the rear. Spire Investments intends to maintain and restore the historic portion of the building and construct a new addition on the rear in place of the existing 1970s wing. The existing rear addition will be taken down to the first floor plate and rebuilt to resemble an independent attached structure. The parking lot will be updated and renovated with new plantings and fences

Ms. Herbert asked if the rear façade and windows of the 1818 structure will be obscured by the two additional stories being added to the existing rear addition. Mr. Pitman replied yes, noting that the plans do not expand the existing footprint other than a new entrance on the driveway side of the structure.

Ms. Herbert asked if the brick of the addition will be removed. Mr. Pitman replied that they anticipate everything being removed down to the foundation and the addition will be reframed to extend the handicapped accessibility into the 1818 structure.

Ms. Bellin asked if a demolition delay review is required for the addition.

Ms. Kelleher replied that only full demolition is subject to the demolition delay ordinance.

Mr. Pitman stated that the materials and colors will be refined. For the historic main building, the windows will be replaced, the trim and Federal style front entrance will be restored, and they will restore as much as possible in the interior. The rear addition will be all new with a new brick transition to break up the façade. There will be no bump-outs or bays because the footprint is too close to the property line along Briggs Street. The façade will be broken into three components; the main structure, the connector, and the addition and several architectural styles of the neighboring house were considered. Other details will include: iron grilles installed below the first floor to mask new

window wells for egress from the basement bedrooms; shutters hung appropriately at the windows; period details installed; simulated true divided light clad windows although a manufacturer hasn't been selected; architectural roof shingles; HardiPlank siding; and Boral trim which has less expansion and contraction than other products.

Ms. Herbert stated that the windows along Briggs Street will stand out and asked the Goldbergs to consider Pella or Marvin windows, which have been approved by the Commission in the historic districts. Mr. Pitman noted that all of the windows on the front structure will be replaced. End windows on the front façade windows aren't arched, they have blind arches above them and the new windows will also. No photos of the original door have been found but a Federal style fan will be used above the door. Ms. Herbert suggested using salvaged doors. Mr. Pitman noted that forensics indicate that the doors were 8 feet high and the square columns will be rehabilitated with heavier cast stone Corinthian square capitals over new square fluted Corinthian columns.

Mr. Pitman stated that for the new addition, the rear elevation facing the parking lot will have arched single windows with black sashes, the body will be painted tan/khaki with white trim, and an appropriate brick will be used. The addition will not be designed to match the neighboring period homes but it will feature the same scale, at 39'-9" high.

Mr. Pitman stated that the main house will have 5 units, including a 3-story townhouse and the addition will have 15 units. In the main historic building, one townhouse will include the curved stair case at the main entry. The historic library room will be preserved as will other historic details. The trusses in the attic will remain exposed. Ms. Herbert praised their final configuration on the main building, which will preserve most of the building's original architectural trim.

Mr. Hart noted that the Historical Commission has no preview over the window shutters, but noted that traditional shutters were large enough to completely obscure the window when closed and asked if the proposed shutters are decorative or functional. Mr. Pitman replied that they will be located appropriately, hung properly, and they will be functional.

Ms. Spang asked if the property line was at the building edge. Mr. Pitman replied that there is only an 8" change in depth only to create a small shadow-line.

Mr. Hart stated that he is opposed to the use of the architectural roof shingles because they are slanted, which is not a traditional design. He suggested the use of 3-tab roof shingles which help make the roof less noticeable. Ms. Kelleher noted that some architectural shingles have a straighter cut and offered to provide a list of shingles approved by the Commission in the past. Ms. Bellin asked if the same shingle is proposed for all roofs. Mr. Pitman replied that the slate at the main house hasn't been evaluated but they plan to repair it in kind. Architectural shingles are proposed on the addition's new mansard roof and on the connector roof which will be minimally visible with a shallow pitch.

Ms. Herbert noted that the plantings will begin at the end of the addition and will extend to the end of the parking lot along the main building. Mr. Pitman added that plantings are also proposed around the main building. Mr. Spang noted that the proposed plantings are 2 feet deep but the width of the parking lot is wider than required so the planting bed could be enlarged to 5-10 feet deep to allow for more substantial landscaping to improve the character of the street. Atty. Grover noted that they will have a landscape architect on board in time for the Planning Board meeting in April.

Mr. Spang expressed concern that the connector may appear odd in brick since it will be new and part of the addition. He recommended that it match the cladding of the addition. He also suggested that the stairs be pulled back and the second floor recess match the one on the first floor. Mr. Pitman replied that they copied the house across the street and wanted to make it look like an addition that was added, but it could also have clapboards. Mr. Spang stated that new modern brick would look very different than the historic brick and would not match. Installing clapboards and pushing it back from the corner so the main building stands in front of it should be considered.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Ms. Joyce Kenney of Lafayette Street noted that this building is on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms.

Kelleher added that the owner had considered using tax credits. Mr. Richard Goldberg added that the economics of the credits didn't work or they would have used them.

Mr. Morris Schopf, 1 Cambridge Street, noted that the detailing and character of houses across the street don't have 7-8 bays. The proposed design of the addition indicates a streetscape of three Federal style buildings in a row close together, not one Federal building and an apartment building. He suggested creating the appearance of three building facades instead of two, with roof and height variations, to make it look like it is part of the historic streetscape and neighborhood. He asked whether the Historical Commission would be providing Design Review and Site Plan Review. Atty. Grover replied that the Planning Board has that authority.

Mr. Louis Siriani, Botts Court, commended the architects on plans to preserving the details in the main building by creating a townhouse.

Ms. Joyce Kenney asked if either of the roofs will be flat. Mr. Pitman replied the main structure appears flat but it has a slight pitch. The existing addition roof is flat but the new roof will be a mansard.

Ms. Herbert asked if the mechanical units will be seen from the street. Mr. Pitman replied no, that they will be concealed on the roof. He added that the height is designed to make the structure accessible. Ms. Herbert asked if varying the roof height would cause any problems. Mr. Pitman replied that the Planning Board will determine that. Mr. Siriani expressed his opinion that raising the roof at the middle two bays would not help the rhythm, noting that in terms of symmetry there should be two three-bay structures not three two-bay structures with entrances along the street, but those entrances are missing from the street line.

Mr. Goldberg agreed that additional landscaping along Briggs Street would be beneficial. He noted that while the main entrance would be at the rear and the Briggs Street entrances are missing; these design features help to reduce the activity seen by neighbors across the street. The current use is commercial with noise generated by evening functions. Residential will be the highest and best use, which is a win – win situation to create stability for the neighborhood.

Ms. Herbert noted that Mr. Goldberg offered to give the Historical Commission a tour of one of their previous restoration projects. Mr. Goldberg invited the Commission to visit 16 Broadway in Beverly, which includes a ballroom and carriage house converted to residential use with some commercial.

Mr. Spang stated that moving the addition further from the street would allow the creation of townhouse entrances. He asked for clarification on the window wells, which the designs show having a 4 foot long x 4 foot wide recess. Mr. Pitman replied that those are egress window wells for the bedrooms. They will be between 2 and 3 feet down from grade and will be covered by a wrought iron grate. Mr. Spang suggested a door rather than a grate which make it a dark hole. Mr. Pitman replied that the grate would provide natural light. They could consider a beadboard panel, door, or a different style of grate. He noted that the basement windows will be secured operable windows on the sides with 4 foot width to provide light, the required egress, and safety when opening the windows, and the window wells on the face of the building don't meet code. Mr. Spang noted that those wells could fill up with trash and debris and he believes they will be an unattractive feature resembling an alley.

Ms. Bellin noted that the Historical Commission has no demolition authority but asked that the applicant provide photos of the existing addition prior to its demolition.

Ms. McCrea asked if the shutters will be functional and have the ability to close to reduce noise for neighborhood. Atty. Grover noted that noise was a concern of the neighborhood. Ms. Herbert replied that the window shutters will be operable.

Atty. Grover asked if the Historical Commission could provide a letter of support for their application before the Zoning Board of Appeals. The ZBA will review the proposed building density, building height, and the preservation of the main building. If the Commission is not ready to provide full support, the Commission could state that they support the project in concept but is not yet ready to endorse the details. The applicant could then return to the Historical Commission for another presentation prior to the applying for Site Plan Review before the Planning Board.

Ms. Herbert replied that the Commission can discuss providing a support letter stating that they are in favor of the direction the project is going in, provide some preliminary design comments, and state that they are waiting for more detail. She recommended that the letter state that the Commission is pleased that the main building will be restored and they appreciate that their comments are being considered, and that the Commission will weigh in again once the final details have been determined. Ms. Kelleher suggested the applicant provide streetscape views.

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to provide a letter of support. Ms. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 111 Highland Avenue

Harts Hill LLC submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish a commercial building.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/27/18
- Photographs
- Site plan
- Elevation drawings

Rachel Lutts was present on behalf of the applicant Peter Lutts to discuss the project.

*Mr. Cutting recused himself as a tenant of the applicant.*

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant has received approval from the ZBA for a 2-family house on the property. The City Assessor records date the existing building to 1920 which triggered a Demolition Delay. Ms. Bellin asked if proposed images were available. Ms. Lutts replied that they have provided proposed plans and elevations. Ms. Kelleher stated that there is no inventory form for the building and it has not been surveyed so there is no information on the history of the building. Ms. Herbert noted that this was a former gas station. Ms. Bellin asked if there was a hazardous waste issue. Ms. Lutts replied none that she is aware of. The structure has been rebuilt several times, the walls are CMU, it has been abandoned for over 10 years, and the applicant Peter Lutts is unaware of any existing historical components.

Ms. Herbert asked if Historic Salem, Inc. had been contacted to see if they had any information on the history of the building. Ms. Lutts replied that she did not believe they had been contacted and she added that the gas station sign is still in place. Ms. Herbert noted that interior and exterior photo documentation will be requested prior to its demolition.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve as submitted with the proviso that the owner provide color digital photos of all facades, measured drawings of the exterior, digital photos of the interior, and the gas station sign prior to its demolition. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. Six were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 132 Essex Street - continuation

Peabody Essex Museum submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for renovations to Phillips Library buildings.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/15/17
- Photographs
- Drawings by Schwarz Silver Architects

Bob Monk and Phillip Johns of the PEM and Robert Silver and John Traficonte of Schwartz/Silver Architects were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Hart stated that Bill Barlow has requested to speak about the project. Mr. Barlow is retired from the National Park Service as a preservation architect of the North-East region and is familiar with projects of this type.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to allow Mr. Barlow to speak prior to the PEM presentation. Six were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Mr. Barlow stated that he is a retired Sr. Historical Architect with 40 years of experience with the National Park Service. He was involved in the restoration of more than 5,000 structures including The Statue of Liberty, Ellis Island, Faneuil Hall, and the Old State House, and oversaw policy and the restoration of the historic structures. Locally, he was responsible the general supervision of most of the restoration work in this area in the 1990's, and supervised the Salem Visitor Center with the intent to construct the headhouse. He spoke with Ms. Herbert and Mr. Hart about this project and his thoughts on how to approach this project.

Mr. Barlow stated that typically, the period of historical significance would be determined first, as well as what contributes to and sustains that significance. He noted that the two buildings, Daland House and Plummer Hall, were independent until 1907 when they were purchased and a connector added between them to create the Essex Institute. That change, including the creation of a new main entrance, which made the two other entrances insubordinate, is what informed him of how to now view this building. When the connector entrance was created a window was included above it. At Plummer Hall, the crowning balustrade remained but the stairs removed. Re-establishing the Plummer Hall entrance would be at odds with what was created when the buildings were joined.

Mr. Barlow also noted that photos indicated that the upper floor of the connector entrance has also undergone several changes. He suggested that since the proposal will radically change the lower level, the PEM should consider other changes to infill the entire connector façade to create a unified design.

Mr. Barlow expressed his opinion that in regards to the rear buildings, the 1960's Stacks building is no longer viable but is part of the historic fabric. When it is removed the rear elevation should be reevaluated and it should embrace the open structures in the back. He stated that that was the intent of the earlier arcade design at the Visitor Center, to link the open area and the collection of historic buildings. He recommended that the PEM has a responsibility to address and develop that relationship with the historic structures of the district and if it's not done it will be a lost opportunity since the rear has equally important elevations, a relationship to the open space. He asserted that the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation are applicable in this case.

Ms. Herbert noted that previous discussions with the PEM about what could be put back onto the Plummer Hall, the Historic Commission was told nothing. In 2007 she mentioned the balustrade over the lintel and below the window, but Mr. Monk stated that they were removed due to deterioration. Mr. Barlow replied that replacing those balustrades at Plummer Hall would allude to it being an entrance and when the connector was constructed that entrance was purposely downgraded. He stated that he would rather see the energy go towards making a real universal entrance in its entirety, not just at the bottom.

Ms. Herbert questioned the windows above the Connector entrance and whether the bricks in that area are inferior. Mr. Barlow replied that there will be a disparity with retaining the top portion of brick and there will be an ease of construction to take off the brick face of the Connector and start from scratch, matching the brick and details, instead of just trying to solve the access issue. Mr. Hart stated that at the last meeting he made comments on the Essex Street façade and that is why he recommended that a preservation architect be involved. Mr. Barlow added that there are opportunities to explore and the proposed level of intervention should be one of quality.

Ms. Herbert noted that since the buildings are located within the Washington Square Historic District, the Commission should look at the entire campus as a whole. Mr. Barlow replied that it is not a stand alone structure and this is why there are districts.

Ms. Herbert stated that different elements of the PEM Essex Block campus have been before the Commission but the Commission needs to look at the overall plan and not just bits of pieces, since the changes are big and important. She asked where the PEM is with the design of the entire campus. ‘

Mr. Monk replied that it will take a lot of work, review from multiple PEM departments, and review of the individual structures. Study reports have been completed for individual buildings, which will all become pieces of a larger plan. The Daniel Bray House has a lot of historical fabric. They are discussing which historic period the building should be restored to and what its use should be, which they are currently working on. Plummer Hall and the Daland House are a gateway to the historic Essex Block experience. These will not be the average everyday museum; the PEM wants to find the most appropriate ways to reinterpret them in exciting ways. He noted that this may involve moving structures on the campus although the Bray House will stay in its original location. The PEM consultant has determined that the John Ward house has more original fabric than any other period house in New England. A lot of research has been done but they are years away from determining a master plan for the entire campus.

Ms. Herbert replied that she doesn't understand why it is taking this long to put together a comprehensive plan.

Mr. Silver stated that at the previous meeting certain portions were approved but no decision was made to allow them to change the face of Plummer Hall, to remove the 1966 Stacks building, and there was still a question regarding the screening of the mechanical units on the roof. He indicated on the drawings two alternate designs to treat Plummer Hall. One plan treats it the way it was in 1907 without the staircase and the other plan restores the front of Plummer Hall to a period earlier than 1907 when the staircase was in place. He noted that the design of the Connector building façade has not been modified since its approval at the previous meeting.

Mr. Traficonte stated that the revised presentation drawings address the issues they were instructed to focus on and any bigger issues can be discussed. The proposed design from March 28<sup>th</sup> included the removal of the fire escape, steps, rear porch, and Stacks building and the restoration and relocation of the brownstone entry stairs to Plummer Hall. He noted that rehabilitation of the buildings, how they fit into the Essex Block, and where the entry to the Essex Block occurs, as well as whether that entry occurs through these buildings or between Plummer Hall and the Armory Building are important decisions to make. He stated that they still recommend removing the Stacks building which obstructs much of the open space. This rehabilitation will keep the most significant features from the most significant period, 1907. Mr. Silver added that the 1966 addition wouldn't have been there in 1907.

Mr. Barlow noted that this removal also makes the building more viable.

Mr. Traficonte noted relocating the stairs back in front of Plummer Hall would recognize the significance that existed at Plummer Hall before 1907, although options including the steps and not including the steps will be presented. At the last presentation, PEM had recommended relocating the stairs back to Plummer Hall, retaining the existing window at the top of the stairs as it existed in 1907 and no balustrade in front of either the window or above the lintel. He noted that originally the PEM was not seeking to reinstall the stair to Plummer Hall, but if the decision is to put the stair back they now recommend the entry be restored and treated just like Daland House, with a door, stair and walkway, and a gate that is shut to the public. This would result in a central accessible entrance at the Connector while preserving the former individual entrances to each building. The Daland House has always had this entry so this preserves it as the manor house entry. If the Plummer Hall stair is not moved back the window would be kept and the balustrade would be reinstalled like it was in 1907. A photo of Plummer Hall from 1931 shows an iron fence along the sidewalk, which the PEM also recommends installing. In summation, he recommended that if the Plummer Hall steps are reinstalled the window should be replaced with a door and if the steps aren't put back, the window should be retained as it was in 1907 when the stairway was moved and a window was installed.

Mr. Barlow stated that bringing the central entrance down to grade is the right direction, but he's still recommends making it more powerful so it reads as a main entrance, because three entrances could confuse people.

Mr. Traficonte stated that in the 1960's there was a window added above the entrance with a brownstone surround. The second floor connector windows were changed when a third floor with window was added, so all Connector

windows would match.

The Commission, applicants, and Mr. Barlow discussed when the upper levels of the connector were constructed and whether the connector façade was re-bricked, since the brick in that area doesn't match any other brick on the façade. The Commission, applicants, and Mr. Barlow also discussed whether the upper level connector windows were metal or wood.

Ms. Herbert stated that with regards to the Connector they have approved moving the entrance down but nothing regarding the windows.

Mr. Barlow reiterated that they should have looked at the entire façade not just the bottom half, and if the decision has been made to remove the lower half and infill the area above it then the historical significance has already been violated.

Ms. Herbert stated that this an important project for the PEM and it needs more input.

Mr. Barlow stated that in regards to the Stacks building, he believed the shelving/racks are structural and the brick façade is the outer skin of the building. Curating levels have advanced since it was built in 1966 and it's impractical to try and reuse a building with blank walls that infringe upon the historic structures. He expressed his opinion that the removal of the Stacks building would be an improvement. He stated this is an opportunity to go further, enhance the rear elevation, and acknowledge its relationship to the adjacent buildings. He noted that the Stacks building is historic and a contributing building but there should be some kind of mitigation as part of the Commission's approval process. He asked the Commission to understand and address these interrelationships before it gets taken down.

Ms. Herbert added that part of the reasoning for the Stacks removal is that the building cannot be made code compliant because the shelving would need to be moved to provide accessibility and moving the shelving will undermine the structural integrity of the building. She stated her support for the removal.

Mr. Spang asked for clarification on how the relationship to other buildings could be improved. Mr. Barlow replied that he has not reviewed all of the possible options. This is an opportunity to acknowledge the neighboring buildings, move some of the smaller buildings so they are better presented. Mr. Barlow recommended exploring how to make the secondary entrance more significant and engaging, and how the blank walls could have more fenestration.

Mr. Traficonte replied that they presented a different rear entrance but the Commission requested they retain the Grimshaw portico in place. Mr. Silver noted that the rear entrance is aligned with the front entrance on Essex Street.

Ms. Herbert noted that the Commission approved removing the stairs and deck at the rear, not the relocation of the Grimshaw portico.

Ms. Bellin requested clarification of what the Commission approved at the previous weekend.

Ms. Kelleher stated that at the last meeting the Commission approved the following: removal of the rear entry porch and construction of new rear porch with associated alterations to the adjoining windows per the March 5, 2018 drawings with some minor modifications to the balustrade design to be worked out with staff; alteration to the façade of the Connector building for accessibility purposes per the drawings dated March 5, 2018; removal of the existing fire escape on the West elevation; and restoration of the original window openings on the Vault wing per the February 7, 2018 drawings.

Ms. Bellin stated that in regards to the entire campus, a lot of pieces are still being discussed and new pieces are being added. She expressed her concern that if the Commission is to look at this as an entire campus and changes in conjunction with one another, they don't have that additional information to be able to address it. If there are some pieces that can be addressed they should address them but if the Commission feels they need a full design the discussion should be continued.

Mr. Monk stated that he understands the desire for a campus plan but that won't happen within the timeframe that the PEM needs to move this particular project forward. He stated that the requested changes wouldn't preclude any further planning and reconfiguration of the Essex block and in fact the removal of the Stacks building facilitates that. He reiterated that the PEM is not in the position to take on the entire campus in this timeframe, that will take years to complete it the way the PEM would want it to be done, and this is a step in the right direction.

Ms. McCrea noted that is clear that the Commission is only looking at pieces, and she questioned whether the PEM is doing something just to do something without having a fuller claim on what it will all look like in the future. She expressed concern about whether positive things are being done with this piecemeal approach.

Ms. Herbert noted that the study of the four different periods of the Bray House has gone on for so long that some of the windows are now boarded up and she believes they have been enabling this process.

Mr. Monk replied that once their study of the Bray House is complete they will make a recommendation to the Commission as to which period the PEM feels is appropriate to restore the house too. He stated that he understands the request for a larger master plan but he takes issue with the assertion that this significant project is considered a little piece.

Ms. Herbert suggested that the pressure to move the PEM offices out of 10 Federal Street is affecting the timetable to make the changes at the Daland House and Plummer Hall.

Mr. Monk replied that moving out of 10 Federal Street is a component of the project, but they have other alternatives for office space. He stated that the proposal before the Commission is to get these buildings restored and usable.

Mr. Spang asked how long the plywood will remain on the Bray House.

Mr. Monk estimated one month to get the necessary people on site to make the necessary repairs. Two options are being studied. The storefront windows are from 1901 and interior historic fabric is suggested to be from 1860, which would involve different windows than the 1901.

Mr. Spang stated that if another property owner were to apply to do work to the front of their house with the other side in disarray; with boarded-up windows and a fence falling down, stating that they only wanted to focus on the front and not the back because they aren't thinking about that yet, that person would be given a violation. The PEM may have multiple buildings on multiple properties but it is the same issue. A master plan of the site is not needed for him to make a decision on the current proposal but he said that there are many things that the PEM can do in the short term to improve the property.

Ms. Herbert agreed.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Ms. Diana Warren, Sudbury, expressed her agreement with Mr. Barlow that the entire Essex campus needs to be looked at and dealt with holistically. She noted this building is also under the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) jurisdiction because in 1972 the Essex Institute entered into an agreement with MHC to designate the campus as a Massachusetts Historic Landmark. This designation includes a deed restriction stating that no significant changes could be made without MHC permission. She noted that this applies to the entire Essex Institute complex, not just Plummer Hall and Daland House. She suggested that since this will go before Mass Historical, the Commission's decision is precedent setting, and it is important that the Commission deliberate on the entire campus. Any structures boarded up are in violation of that agreement. She expressed her opinion that there is no justification for taking down the Stacks building, which is a historical part of the building's use and conveys the evolutionary history of the structure, as a windowless repository to store the library archives. Thoughtful care and attention to detail went into the construction of the Stacks building. She stated her disagreement with changes that would lend itself to a false sense of historical interpretation. She noted that historic preservation is the task not personal preference, and that the Stacks building represents the history and use of the structure. She stated that in 2009, the PEM was planning an expansion of

the Stacks building, so it should stay, at least until there is a holistic plan.

Mr. Gary Gill, Ward 3, noted that the 1890's photo before the construction of the Connector showed the two structures. He expressed his opinion that these buildings are the best parts and he would prefer two separate structures with no connector. He also recommended that no structures should be removed from the rear façade. Neighbors at the rear see the deteriorating and want the rear area to be addressed. Make a main entrance the focal point.

Mr. Tim Jenkins, 18 Broad Street, expressed his belief that bringing the building back to a certain time, as best you can, is the intention of the Secretary of the Interior standards. The MHC issues are significant. The Bray House hasn't had activity in approximately 10 years and this is a great opportunity to link the two projects together. He recommended that the PEM return with a master plan. He noted that the Morgan Library in New York City has significant collections housed in their buildings and the idea that these buildings can't be used for archival storage is a concern. He asked if it's been proven that the Stacks building can't hold the collection. He recommended that the public needs to be fully informed of what is possible with the Stacks building before there can be justification for taking it down. Only when all the facts are given should the decision be made.

Ms. Herbert stated that they haven't required documentation from the PEM as to why the Stacks building needs to come down but they want that in writing. She agreed with Mr. Spang that the PEM needs to fix the rear of the property; including removal of the fence, cleaning up the parking lot, removing the stone dust piles on the grounds, and restoring the windows at the Bray House and repairing its roof so that the plastic tarp can be removed. She asked why \$50 million can be spent on an addition to the Museum but the rear of one of its main features looks as it does. She suggested the applicant return with a plan to clean up the back of the lot before anything else is discussed.

Ms. Kelleher stated that there are still two items to deliberate on, the Stacks building removal and whether or not to relocate the brownstone stairs.

Ms. Herbert recommended that these items be continued to the next meeting and she suggested the applicant rethink Mr. Barlow's recommendations about the windows above main entrance and how to embellish it. She noted that permission was already given to replace the rear deck but she suggested that the applicant rethink that as well.

Mr. Silver asked for some direction with the front of Plummer Hall. Ms. Bellin suggested they continue for one month and return with a better idea of all the items mentioned to see a more holistic plan for the Commission to discuss, as well as documentation for the Stacks building.

**VOTE:** Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue the application for one month so the applicant can return with a better idea of all the items mentioned and to provide a more holistic plan for the Commission to discuss, as well as documentation for the Stacks building. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

**Mr. Hart amended the motion to include addressing the legal aspects with the agreements with the Mass Historic Commission. Mr. Cutting seconded. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### Preservation Month Planning:

Ms. Herbert stated that at a recent Historic Salem, Inc. (HSI) meeting, Ms. McCrea had recommended a preservation award for the multilingual historic plaques in the Point Neighborhood sponsored by HSI and the North Shore Community Development Coalition (CDC). Since HSI cannot give themselves an award, Ms. Herbert suggested that the Historical Commission give HSI an award. Ms. Kelleher noted that the house plaques are in English, French, and Spanish. The Commission discussed the recognition of the evolution of that area and its history, the need to recognize the work that was very well done, and the opportunity for giving awards in the future.

**VOTE:** Ms. Bellin made a motion to provide an award to HSI and the CDC for the multilingual signs. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the kick-off breakfast for Preservation Month will be held during the second week of May and workshops will be scheduled in May and June and possibly through the summer.

Violation Notices

95 Federal Street

Ms. Kelleher stated that she hasn't heard back from the owners on proposed changes to remedy the violation.

278 Lafayette Street

Ms. Kelleher stated that she is drafting a clerk's certificate for the outstanding violation.

260 Lafayette Street

Ms. Herbert stated that the historic height of the porch balustrade does not meet current building codes. The applicant can contact the State Building Inspector to request a waiver. She stated that the Salem Building Inspector told her that he informed the property owner about the current building code requirements but she installed them at the historic height anyway. The Commission agreed that they could support the applicant with the request to waive restriction of meeting the new code and to install a historic balustrade.

Mr. Spang stated that he will help Ms. Kelleher with the paperwork to do that. He stated that it is to have the support of the local building inspector or the State Board won't approve it. He noted that Seger Architects worked on the low stair balusters at 162 Federal Street project and received a waiver from the State.

Meeting Minutes

December 21, 2017

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the December 21, 2017 meeting minutes. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Six were in favor and the motion so carried.**

January 17, 2018

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the January 17, 2018 meeting minutes. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. Five were in favor and the motion so carried.**

January 31, 2018

**VOTE: Ms. Turiel made a motion to approve the January 31, 2018 meeting minutes. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. Mr. Hart abstained, he was not present. Five were in favor and the motion so carried.**

February 7, 2018

**VOTE: Ms. Turiel made a motion to approve the February 7, 2018 meeting minutes. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. Seven were in favor and the motion so carried.**

February 21, 2018

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the February 21, 2018 meeting minutes. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Six were in favor and the motion so carried.**

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:15PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher, Preservation Planner