

DRAFT
SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 2019

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, June 5, 2019 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were: Reed Cutting, David Hart (Acting Chair), Rebecca English (participating remotely), Vijay Joyce, Mark Pattison and Erin Schaeffer. Not present: Milo Martinez, Stacey Norkun and Larry Spang.

Mr. Hart reported that the Historical Commission was awarded an appreciation plaque from Historic Salem, Inc. during HSI's 75th Anniversary celebration.

Mr. Hart noted that Commission member Rebecca English was participating remotely through speaker phone.

4 River Street

Lindsey and Brendan Wakeham submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new paint colors

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:
- Photographs

Lindsey and Brendan Wakeham were present.

Ms. Wakeham presented the application to repair the house and paint the house in a different color scheme. The scheme is similar to a color scheme shown on a house in Newport. The color would be a lighter shade of pink and all trim color would "Jewett White" The green door would remain the same color.

Mr. Cutting stated that he was in support of the proposed color scheme.

There was no public comment.

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

21 Washington Square North - continuation

Renewal Ventures LLC submitted an application for a Certificate of Hardship to remove snow fence on roof.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:
- Photographs

David Pabich of Renewal Ventures was present.

Mr. Pabich presented the history of the project. He replaced the roof and discovered the snow roof was in severely deteriorated condition with broken brackets. He received a quote of \$9,000 from Cassidy Brothers to replicate the fence. He was seeking permission from the Commission to not replace the fence.

Mr. Hart asked if he had considered a simpler pipe rail. Mr. Pabich replied that he could consider a simpler rail but it would be different than the original and the roof no longer has slate shingles.

Mr. Pattison asked if he had consulted other companies. Mr. Pabich replied that he has reached out to other companies but they were not interested in the project. He expressed his concern with liability of the fence in its previous condition.

Mr. Cutting noted that the snow fence was original and highly significant for the building.

Mr. Pabich noted that he has restored the exterior of the building including the ornate downspouts, the original flushboard siding and the windows.

Ms. English expressed her struggle with losing such an important architectural element of the building, even though it no longer serves a function since the slate shingles were removed. She noted that the original snow fence was beautiful and functional and while expensive to replicate, she wondered if there might be a compromise.

Mr. Hart recommended approving the certificate of hardship with the condition that if snow falls occur than the Commission could require a new simple rail be installed. He did note that the existing snow fence was very elaborate.

Mr. Cutting noted that there are other similar buildings with no snow fence.

Mr. Pattison recommended reaching out to Lundy's in Lynn. Ms. Schaeffer suggested DeAngelis Iron Works.

Mr. Cutting recommended that the application be continued so the applicant can continue to research other companies for estimates to replicate.

Jeremy Peterson, Washington Square, expressed concern about losing the historic snow fence and the danger of snow falling off the roof.

Ms. Kelleher reported that she did a quick search of other buildings in Salem and did not find a similar elaborate style snow fence.

Ms. Schaeffer noted that while the estimate of \$9,000 may seem like a lot, she expressed her opinion that it was worth the investment. She recommended reaching out to DeAngelis Iron Works who is recasting the Salem Common fence. She also suggested the possibility of recasting in aluminum.

Mr. Pabich stated that the cast is the most expensive component of the project, costing \$1,000. He had not considered recasting in another metal.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue to July 3rd meeting. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor (excluding E. Schaeffer) and the motion so carried.

Mr. Pabich asked if the Commission approves chimney caps for gas fireplace vents. Mr. Pattison asked if the vent would be round or square and if it would extend above chimney. Mr. Pabich stated that the company said that it had to extend and could only be round, although he would prefer square. Mr. Pattison suggested that there may be other options to consider. The Commission agreed that the preference would be for a square cap.

266 Lafayette Street - continuation

Tyna L. Hull and Paul F. de Napoli submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to rebuild front porch.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:
- Photographs

Tyna Hull was present.

Ms. Kelleher presented the history of the project and the owners' previous approval for fiberglass gutters. She also noted that the owner of the other half of the building was already approved for a redesign of their porch. Ms. Kelleher reported that she spoke with neighbor about their design.

Ms. Hull noted that she would like to change the design to include wider boards below the porch post to frame the lattice but did not think the neighbor would be interested. Ms. Hull presented the application to rebuild their section of the front porch. She stated that they would like to install square lattice under both the porch and the staircase to be painted gray to match body of house. Ms. Kelleher noted that the other owner received approval to install either vertical slats or square lattice. Ms. Hull explained the history of property and the porch. She noted that she will not be changing porch balustrade this year.

Ms. Hull presented a mockup drawing showing square lattice with wider framing boards. Mr. Cutting expressed his opinion that the square lattice would be an improvement. Ms. Kelleher noted that this design would be different than what was approved at #268.

Mr. Cutting asked the Commission if there was concerns about matching the porch design to the design at #268.

Ms. Kelleher noted that previously the Commission's concerns were particularly focused on the balustrade and balusters. The other owners received approval to raise the height of the railing to meet code. Ms. Hull is not proposing to replace the railings at this time but when they will be replaced, they will match #268.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the application as designed and presented in the application. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

23 Chestnut Street - continuation

Otis and Susan Edwards-Mistler submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter rear addition.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:
- Photographs

Otis Edwards and Lee Dearborn, Derby Square Architects, were present.

Mr. Dearborn presented the plans to alter windows, remove a chimney, and enlarge a skylight on the rear ell. He stated that there was evidence that the first half of the ell was original and known as a garden

house and it was later extended. He presented a second design option based on comments received at the last meeting. This option includes a different window configuration that would keep view from a public way the same. He also presented a new rendering that provided more context – indicating that the window configuration on this building was different than the window configuration on the other half of the rowhouse at 21 Chestnut Street.

Ms. Schaeffer asked if it was possible to support chimney from roof up. Mr. Dearborn responded that it could be done if supported by steel, but it would be more costly.

Ms. Schaeffer expressed her opinion that it was important to focus on what is visible from public way – top of windows, skylight and chimney only. She stated that she was not supportive of the chimney removal and the extension of the skylight but not the window changes. However, she is unable to vote since she was not present at the previous meeting.

Mr. Pattison noted that the chimney matches others on building. He asked how high the skylight extends above the roofline. Mr. Dearborn replied that it was going to match the existing height – 6” to 10” tall. The Commission debated whether it would be visible from a public way.

Ms. Schaeffer asked if the finish was going to be the same. Mr. Dearborn replied yes, it would be copper. She expressed her support of the skylight since it would have very limited visibility.

Mr. Hart expressed concern that the Federal style house is brick with wood windows. He expressed concern with removing the wood windows to install metal windows. He also expressed concern with the introduction of metal doors.

Mr. Hart asked for public comment.

Mr Hart summarized a 6-page comment letter from Stanley Smith, 4 Pickering Street expressing his concern about the proposed design changes.

Vijay Joyce, asked if the view of building showed 2/2 or 2/6 configuration. He said that he would prefer to match the existing configuration so it would appear the same.

Rich Jagolta, 41 Chestnut Street, stated that he believed it was a stretch to say that the changes are visible from a public way. He expressed his opinion that someone would really have to look for the changes from the street view.

Mr. Rafael Crespo, 25 Chestnut Street, stated that the rear ell is visible from his rear yard and the proposed changes would be drastic. He noted that the changes would be visible from a public way if the boundary fence came down in the future. He stated his opinion that the commercial look of the black metal doors does not match the historic Federal houses on Chestnut Street. He expressed concern about the changes to the building’s historic integrity.

Joe Pyfrin, 21 Chestnut Street, stated that he would like the proposed windows to be reduced in size, constructed of wood and painted white – more like a French door system. He stated that he would not like to see them constructed in metal as proposed.

Ms. Kelleher noted that only four members were available to vote – Mr. Hart, Mr. Cutting, Ms. English and Mr. Pattison.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve Option #2 with the enlargement of the skylight, changes to the doors and windows but denial of the chimney removal. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Three were in support and one (Mr. Hart) was in opposition. The motion does not carry.

The Commission discussed the process for voting with a bare quorum.

VOTE: Ms. Schaeffer made a motion to reopen the public hearing to continue discussing and reconsideration. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Phil Gillespie, 35 and 37 Chestnut Street, asked if the concern was about color only.

Mr. Hart expressed his opposition to the use of black metal with the changes to window configuration. He stated that the renovation of an existing historic building. If it was a new addition, he would feel differently.

Ms. Schaeffer asked if the applicant was amenable to a wood window.

Mr. Dearborn stated that all profiles would be the same as viewable from the street.

Mr. Hart stated that his objection was the use of metal and not wood.

Mr. Joyce asked if the addition is more than 40' away from the street, would it be possible to determine the material from this distance if the color was the same.

Ms. Kelleher reported that she spoke with the MHC on the question about whether the presence of a fence can restrict public view. MHC stated that because the fence is considered a structure subject to Commission review, any elements screened by the fence would not be considered visible from a public way. Vegetation is not considered a barrier.

Mr. Cutting expressed his opinion that the change in material would be imperceptible from public view.

Mr. Hart stated that if the window would be painted white, then visibility would be indistinguishable.

Mr. Dearborn noted that brick mold will be in white to match existing profile. But the owner prefers the windows to be in black.

Mr. Cutting expressed his preference for black windows.

The Commission debated the visibility of the doors from the public way. All agreed that doors were screened from view.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to accept Option #2 to extend skylight and to modify windows with the condition that metal doors and windows be white. The request to remove chimney was not approved. Mr. Cutting second the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

39-41 Washington Square – continuation

Jeremy & Leah Peterson, Barbara Pervier, David & Lacy Coviello, Jane May, Nikolaus Sucher, Maria Carles submitted an application for a Certificate of Hardship to replace slate roof with asphalt shingles

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/16/19
- Photographs
- Roof condition assessment

Jeremy Peterson, Barbara Pervier and David Coviello were present.

Mr. Peterson stated that the condition of the roof has become a safety hazard. Two estimates for slate replacement were provided.

Mr. Hart noted that the Commission does not consider cost in its decisions. However, the assessment notes that slate is “squishy” with a majority needing replacement.

Ms. Schaeffer asked for specifics on slate removal elsewhere in the Washington Square district. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission previously approved slate removal at 21 Washington Square in 2018.

Ms. Schaeffer asked if the slate will be retained on the sides of the dormers. Mrs. Pervier replied no, they were proposing to use clapboard on side. The Commission agreed that retention of slate on the side walls was preferred.

Mr. Peterson explained the request to replace a skylight. Ms. Pervier noted that they will be replacing soffit as well in-kind repair. Will retain slate on gabled addition.

Mr. Joyce asked if there was a snow guard. Mr. Peterson replied yes, but they will be replacing.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the replacement of slate shingles with GAF Slateline architectural shingles to match gray color of existing slate, replace skylights and repair soffits in-kind. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All four members were in favor and the motion so passed.

39-41 Washington Square

Jeremy & Leah Peterson, Barbara Pervier, David & Lacy Coviello, Jane May, Nikolaus Sucher, Maria Carles submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new paint color for front door.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/16/19
- Photographs

Jeremy Peterson, Barbara Pervier and David Coviello were present.

The Commission discussed the proposal to change the color of two front doors. The applicants presented several color options.

Ms. Pervier noted that the doorway is dark and so would prefer the more intense color. The color is similar to the door at 13 Chestnut Street. The stairs are currently pale gray with inside walls to be painted to match original color. The trim will be “Mainsail” to match rest of trim.

Mr. Cutting expressed his opinion that a black or dark green would be preferred.

Mr. Pattison noted that 13 Chestnut Street was more blue and the proposed color for this house is more teal. Ms. Pervier stated that she thought teal would be preferable with the brick.

The Commission agreed that paint Benjamin Moore #754 with Mainsail was the preferred combination. Finish to be in satin.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve paint colors as discussed - #754 and Mainsail in semi-gloss or satin. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

89 Federal Street - continuation

T. Jane Graham-Dwyer submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install HVAC unit

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:
- Photographs

Jane Graham-Dwyer was present.

Ms. Dwyer reported that units are set on a platform 11" off ground. Pipe will touch chimney all way up. Unit to be 35 7/16 wide x 32 11/16 high.

Mr. Hart asked if the unit would be screened by a fence or vegetation. Ms. Graham-Dwyer responded that she could do either a fence or landscaping to screen the unit. She stated that she could consult with neighbors to see which option they preferred.

The Commission discussed screening, with arborvitae preferred. Ms. Schaeffer expressed concern with putting in fencing so close to property line. She recommended that landscaping would be a better option for screening.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Ms. Schaeffer made a motion to approve as presented with location and description as provided by contractor. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

254 Lafayette Street Unit 3R – continuation

Barbara Bowker submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:
- Photographs

The applicant was unable to attend the meeting.

Mr. Pattison reported on the site visit noting that the applicant was to provide more information on the windows to be installed.

The Commission asked for more information on the request

Ms. Kelleher noted that the 60-day deadline for acting on the application was approaching.

VOTE: Ms. Schaeffer made a motion to deny the application without prejudice due to the fact that the application's 60-day expiration. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

144 Federal Street – continuation

Robert Ouellette submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install an exterior HVAC unit

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:
- Photographs

Bob Ouellette was present.

Mr. Ouellette presented a photo showing a mockup of mini-split unit and pipes placed on the rear wall of the rear ell in the approximate location where they will be installed. He noted that the system was not installed yet.

The Commission discussed whether it would be better to place the duct pipe as close to the window trim as possible. Mr. Ouellette replied that it would be better to install a little distance from trim to allow painting of the trim.

There was no public comment.

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

21 Flint Street

David Kaytes submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace rear fence.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/15/19
- Photographs

David Kaytes was present.

Mr. Kaytes presented his proposal to relocate the fence to tie into the existing fencing. He presented the site plan indicating where fence will be located. The fence height will stay the same but the design will be different with fence boards installed on the front to hide the fence posts.

There was no public comment.

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

15 Chestnut Street

Peter Gordon and Karen Hayes submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for architectural roof shingles and chimney repairs.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/13/19
- Photographs

Peter Gordon was present.

Mr. Gordon reported that he is withdrawing the request to change the chimney as they are reevaluating the condition of the chimney which may need rebuilding. He is only seeking to change the 3-tab shingle roof to GAF Slateline architectural shingles. The flat roofed sections of the roof would remain as existing.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve the GAF Slateline architectural roof shingles as proposed. Ms. Schaeffer seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

159 Federal Street

Peter Abbruzzese submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new AC condensers.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/20/19
- Photographs

Peter Abbruzzese was present.

Mr. Abbruzzese presented his proposal to install three units next to a Kelleher Way, public way. The units will be screened by yews. Ms. Kelleher noted that units will be AC condensers only; it is not a mini-split system that requires placement on raised platform.

The Commission discussed whether the landscaping would be installed in place of the existing asphalt or will be installed in planters.

Ms. Schaeffer expressed concern about how three units will fit into this small, and highly visible space. Mr. Abbruzzese noted that units are 2x2 and would not be impacted by opening doors. Mr. Cutting suggested scheduling a site visit. Mr. Abbruzzese stated that they would be installed with 2 in back and 1 in front.

Ms. Schaeffer expressed concerns about the type of landscaping to be added to ensure that screening was adequate. Will units still be visible from Kelleher Way from the rear. The Commission suggested that screening be closer to Kelleher Way.

The Commission discussed the temporary nature of planters and the benefits of landscaping versus a permanent screening fence. Mr. Abbruzzese suggested a wood lattice screen in a square pattern with potted plants in front. To be 4' tall with 2 square posts and 4 lengths. Applicant to send in plan/sketch showing design and dimensions to staff for review. Ms. Schaeffer suggested applicant complete a mockup installation to show design and site.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Ms. Schaeffer made a motion to approve as discussed with three condensers, lattice screening and potted plants with the condition that applicant submit scaled site plans or drawing. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

1 Jefferson Avenue

Todd Waller submitted an application for a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish rear single-story addition.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application
- Photographs

Todd Waller was present.

Mr. Waller presented the request to Waive the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish a rear addition on an historic freight house, which was built in 1902. The addition was constructed around 1955. The building was used as a chicken processing plant for a while. There were once railroad lines on both sides of the building. The rear addition was originally a loading platform before it was enclosed.

Mr. Cutting asked if the granite block will be retained. Mr. Waller replied that it will be reused on site or reused elsewhere. There is approximately 8,000 SF of block. Will be rebuilding a new industrial building on the site of the addition. He presented plans of the new building.

Ms. Schaeffer asked for the intended use. Mr. Waller replied incubator space for small business including 8 spaces for start-up businesses. Ms. Schaeffer asked if he could reuse existing building. Mr. Waller replied no due to its present construction which is not ground level.

Mr. Pattison suggested new structure not mimic the original building. Mr. Waller replied no, the new structure will be more modern to highlight the industrial history of the site.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the request to demolish the rear addition, noting that it was not original, with the condition that the applicant submit the dimensions of the addition along with photographs, including ¾ view images. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

396½ Essex Street (Friends Cemetery)

The City of Salem submitted an application for a Certificate of Hardship to install a new interpretive sign in the Friends Cemetery.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:
- Photographs

Patti Kelleher presented the application on behalf of the City.

Ms. Schaeffer asked if the proposed design was consistent with the design of other signage in the City's cemeteries.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the proposed design was typically used for the City's parks and not cemeteries.

The Commission discussed changing the sign design to a simpler, smaller sign. They discussed moving the "established by" date further up on the sign and changing the font size of "Salem".

The Commission agreed to continue the application to the next meeting to allow time to research other sign designs.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Preservation Planner