

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
May 1, 2019

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, May 1, 2019 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room. Present were Chair Herbert, Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, Rebecca English.

266 Lafayette Street – CONTINUATION

Tyna L. Hull and Paul F. de Napoli submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to rebuilt front porch

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/18/19
- Photographs

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

21 Washington Square – CONTINUATION

Renewal Ventures LLC submitted a Certificate of Hardship for removal of snow fence

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/21/19
- Photographs

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

23 Chestnut Street

Otis and Susan Edwards-Mistler submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter door and windows on rear ell.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/16/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Derby Square Architects

Lee Dearborn of Derby Square Architects and Otis Edwards, Owner, were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Dearborn stated that the rear garden house isn't visible from Chestnut Street and only the top corner is visible from Pickering Street. They will remove 6 double hung windows on the west façade of the garden house and a small door and add 3 new fixed floor-to-existing header height windows at the 3 left openings and an operational Nanawall glass door system in place of the right 3 windows. There will be landscape alterations and a new terraced patio in place of two existing wood framed staircases. The curvature of the garden house will be mimicked in the new patio, they will eliminate any handrails and create a gradual procession down to the back yard. The new 3 windows will be painted white to match the windows of the main house. The detached carriage house will remain as is.

Chair Herbert asked how the brickwork will be handled. Mr. Dearborn replied that it will be deconstructed, and the brick will be reused with new mortar to match the existing color. The header material will be precast to handle the span and painted white. They will remove an existing chimney and interior fireplace, the 8 other chimneys on the

main building will remain. Mr. Edwards added that the fireplace is currently bricked-in and non-functional. Chair Herbert asked if the interior of the garden house was used as living space and if the fireplace could be made functional. Mr. Edwards replied that it is living space although many elements have been removed. Access to the space from the main house is through a narrow hallway and the fireplace hearth projects out approx. 24" into the space and has no historic significance. It's not centered in the room and is awkwardly located at the right side of the room by the entry. The space will become a family room for their children, and they plan to open it up more to the garden and backyard, since they have no current outside area to use, only stairways that lead to a yard.

Mr. Dearborn noted that the space was named Garden House since the floor level is just above grade and the current window sills are at chest height. The sills will be lowered to integrate it with the garden. Chair Herbert asked about the pitch of the gutters. Mr. Dearborn replied the center downspout will be removed and the gutter will become two pitched towards each end. Drywells will be used to eliminate the puddling of water which has caused the brick patio to sink into the ground. Research at the Salem Public Library and a plate negative from the PEM showed a small portion of the garden house stepping down to grade indicating it had better access to the garden. The further back 3 windows have more space between them and transitions from 3 width to a double width, indicating an extension of the Garden House, although the city didn't have information on the date of this extension. Ms. Kelleher noted the two corners of the building facing the garden are rounded.

Chair Herbert asked for the proposed patio composition. Mr. Dearborn stated they've explored a poured surface with different patterns. He added that the Nanawall can collapse like an accordion but out of the three doors one of them can be used as a single door. They will replace an existing skylight with a new 10-0'L fixed skylight with a copper frame but the roof pitch will remain. The existing mechanical split system in the floor will have the condenser relocated to the carriage house. English asked why there will be 2 sets of doors. Mr. Dearborn replied that the rear opening will be for a Nanawall and the side wall openings for the windows and a second Nanawall. The patio won't wrap around the building and an outdoor kitchen is no longer proposed.

Ms. Bellin asked why the chimney demolition was proposed. Mr. Dearborn replied that it was desired by the owner and his interior designer, to provide a clear view down the hallway without needing to awkwardly walk around the chimney. If the hallway was wider it wouldn't be as much of an issue. Chair Herbert stated that a site visit should be conducted prior to the next meeting and requested that stakes be placed to show the proposed massing. The proposed windows changes and removal of the chimney are significant issues.

Mr. Dearborn noted that the interior room is a bathroom. Ms. Bellin noted that the bathroom has two windows. Mr. Edwards replied that there will be one window, the rooms will include a walk-in shower for in-laws and other toilet room elements. Chair Herbert suggested they reconfigure the windows to create more blank wall space for the bathrooms. Mr. Dearborn replied that they didn't want to disturb the existing windows.

#### Public comment:

Stanley Smith, neighbor. Provided a contextual photograph of the building and property and noted that he met with the Owner that afternoon. He expressed concern that the design that doesn't look like it belongs within the historic house McIntire District. The fenestrations should match the rest of the house like the Secretary of the Interior Standards recommend. The proposed would be a better fit for a modern building, the proposed would no longer look related to the house because of the fenestration, rhythm, and dimensions would differ. The new work should be sensitive to the rest of the house.

Raphael Crespo, 25 Chestnut Street. Agrees with Mr. Smith. The integrity of the building, windows and scale shouldn't be there. The proposed design looks commercial and foreign to the language of the historic district. As the next-door neighbor, he would see this view 100% of the time.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Herbert suggested the applicant rethink the proposal, noting that she agreed with the neighbors that the proposed design has a commercial feel but noted that it could be modified to French doors. Mr. Dearborn stated that he wants to match the proportion of the 6"x6" divided lite windows and muntin pattern. Chair Herbert noted that the Commission discourages chimney removals at integral parts of the house although rear ones are less of a concern. This building has a softness that is lost with the proposed design that gives it a different feel.

Chair Hebert asked for the timeframe of the installation. Mr. Dearborn replied September is their intended start of construction.

Chair Herbert suggested they design something more dramatic at the rear of the property that is less visible to the neighbors. There could lower the windows somewhat and provide a rear exit to connect to the rear yard.

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion continue to May 15<sup>th</sup> regular meeting. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

The Commission discussed scheduling a site visit for the property. Ms. Kelleher stated that she would send an email to determine a date and time for the visit.

#### 53 Summer Street

Chris and Stacey Norkun submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for new design for rear barn.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/16/19
- Photographs

Chris and Stacey Norkun were present to discuss the project.

Chair Herbert noted that if the structure was demolished and rebuilt it may not qualify as a residence in the future. Ms. Norkun stated that they've spent 10-month developing the plans and drastically reduced the size and configuration of the post and beam structure. After the barn collapsed, they reevaluated the old structure which was too big and decided that creating a larger structure felt wrong. Chair Herbert asked if the structure was accessible from the rear. Ms. Norkun replied no, the neighbor's rear driveway gives them the right-of-way. Ms. Norkun noted that they will submit an application at a later date to install a new custom fence at the perimeter of the property and between the barn and the Gedney House. GAF Slateline architectural shingles in "Antique Slate" color will be used for the roof of the barn to match the main house and single hung custom wood windows with interior pull levers and authentic joinery will also be used as will deadbolts at the doors. The custom-made structure will be fabricated at a factory in Connecticut called The Barn Yard and built on site. It should be completed in mid-September. It will be used as an extended family space. A large 9-pane fixed window will be installed over the door, not a transom, to let in more light. No light will be added above the window because it would have felt awkward. Chair Herbert added that several other projects used awning windows that have the appearance of double hung windows.

#### Public comment:

James Zavaglia, 29 Summer Street, abutter. He is in favor of the proposed design.

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

39-41 Washington Square

Jeremy & Leah Peterson, Barbara Pervier, David & Lucy Coviello, Jane May, Nikolaus Sucher submitted a Certificate of Hardship to replace slate roof with asphalt shingles

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/16/19
- Photographs

Jeremy Peterson, David Coviello, and Jane May were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Peterson noted that they submitted the existing condition report on the roof. The slate roof is in bad shape and trying to repair it will damage it further. Chair Herbert stated that they need the opinion in writing. Ms. Bellin agreed and added that having it all replaced is concerning since this roof has more visible areas than other projects. Mr. Peterson noted that they received a quote from the contractor for the main roof of the structure, not the entire roof. Ms. Kelleher asked if the ell building behind the sun room has a slate roof. Mr. Coviello replied that the top right is asphalt and the left wing has rubber. Chair Herbert stated that a section of the back had been changed to asphalt shingles without approval and suggested a site visit.

Mr. Coviello stated that he has had leaking issues with a skylight and also noted that squirrels that had accessed the attic through holes were removed. Mr. Peterson added that the soffits have been rotted through. He stated that the lowest price proposal to replace with architectural shingles was \$32,00. Slate would be double the cost and would not include necessary carpentry repairs that would be an additional \$10,000. All of these roof concerns and the 200-year-old slate can be seen and accessed on the rubber roof outside his unit. Mr. Coviello added that roofer, Kevin O'Keefe, informed them that even walking on the slate roof would cause more damage.

Ms. English asked if they priced replacing the front in slate and rear in asphalt. Mr. Peterson replied that they didn't ask about that specific roofing combination. Chair Herbert asked the applicant to submit the proposed materials to Ms. Kelleher.

Public comment.

Barbara Schwartz (address not known) stated that slate falls off the building in high winds and land in her garden and yard. She stated that she didn't believe a hybrid roof makes sense since their home has double visibility, and maintaining the slate is historic but also a headache. They would need slate on both sides which is more aesthetically pleasing than asphalt, despite other houses have asphalt too. Ms. Kelleher noted that only two other buildings on the street still have slate roofs. Mr. Coviello noted that slate also has a sheen when wet and wouldn't look the same with asphalt.

Mr. Peterson noted that the snow fence is in bad shape and they need to block off the sidewalk in the winter, so they are proposing a double-rail snow guard. The asphalt shingles would be Slateline in the color grey.

Mr. Coviello stated that the proposed skylight would be approximately 21" wide to fit between the rafters and it would be installed at the rear of the building.

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion continue to May 15<sup>th</sup> regular meeting. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

18 Peabody Street – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application

Request for Letter of support

Ms. Kelleher stated that no one associated with this application was available to attend the meeting, but a letter of support could be submitted after the fact. They have not met with the ZBA yet. In order to receive tax credits,

they'd need to meet a very high standard. The building is a Colonial Revival style building in deplorable shape. There was once a storefront and they want to add it in again. They are proposing a more appropriate 6 over 6 window pattern, rather than the current 1 over 1. Ms. Bellin raised concern about how reintroducing the first-floor storefront will look with a residential use, requested a photo, and asked how long the façade has been in its current state. Ms. Kelleher noted that the building restoration will be rigorously reviewed by the MHC and she can include the Historic Commissions reservations about the storefront in the draft of a letter. Ms. English asked if the applicant can he make revisions after the letter has been submitted. Ms. Kelleher replied yes. Ms. Bellin suggested providing a letter of support and supporting the renovation as a whole. Ms. Kelleher noted that the entire street is residential and reintroducing a storefront won't be similar to anything else. Chair Herbert stated that changing the façade below the window lintel won't look right with the detail above. There should be another option and the façade should still be restored.

There was no public comment.

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

#### CLG National Register Eligibility Opinion Request – Proposed Lynde Street National Register Historic District

Ms. Kelleher stated that this would be a separate district and the SHC can make their opinion known to MHC. In order for 10-12 Lynde to get tax credits it needs to be in a historic district and the neighbors would need to be notified of this change. The Board reviewed the boundary map. Chair Herbert suggested that an existing carriage house be include in the boundary despite modifications it's undergone.

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

#### Other Business

13 River Street: Ms. Kelleher stated that their renovation work did not receive approval from the Commission despite using the correct materials. It is also not on record with the Building Department.

12 Carpenter Street: Ms. Kelleher stated that the Commission approved the renovation work. Chair Herbert asked if the windows were replaced or if they were existing windows. Ms. Kelleher replied that she would look into it and noted that there are no storms.

Forest River Park: Chair Herbert stated that John Goff found arrow heads at the park and the parking lot renovation done in relation to the drainage project from Canal Street was completed without an archeological survey. Ms. Kelleher replied that this work should have been in the SHC jurisdiction due to state funding, which triggers historic review. She noted that the Commission provided comment when changes were proposed to the MBTA rail line.

Historic Salem, Inc. 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Gala: Ms. Kelleher noted that HSI extended an invitation to the Commission members to attend the gala.

Preservation Month: Ms. Kelleher stated that the 3rd annual breakfast will be Monday, May 13, 2019.

CDC Eligibility Option for a grouping of buildings in the downtown. Ms. Kelleher stated that the MHC did not agree with the proposal to expand the Downtown Salem NR District boundaries because the subject area but built after the fire. She noted that the area could be nominated as a separate historic district, but it would require entail more work by the CDC.

Ms. Kelleher stated that The Bridge at 211 sent an invitation to the Commission for a Preservation Month strategy session.

**Election of Officer:**

Ms. Herbert noted that the Commission had not appointed a vice chair and asked the Commission members present if they would like to be serve as the vice chair. Ms. Bellin offered to serve as the vice chair.

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to make Ms. Bellin Vice-Chair. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Community Development Planner