

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
July 21, 2021

A special meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, July 21, 2021, at 6:00 pm.

VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING. Present were; Mark Meche, Reed Cutting, Milo Martinez, Stacey Norkun, Mark Pattison, and Larry Spang. Not present: Rebecca Cutting, Vijay Joyce.

60 Derby Street

Louise Brown submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new paint color.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/6/21
- Photographs
- Paint color chip

Louise Brown was present to discuss the project.

Brown requested to repaint her front and rear door from a brick red color to California Paints - Plum Island in a gloss finish for longevity.

Mr. Martinez noted that Plum Island is a blue-ish purple and very saturated. He stated that he spoke to Mr. Joyce about the appropriateness of the proposed color prior to this meeting, and this color wouldn't have existed in the 1800's. Ms. Brown disagreed and replied that purple was being imported at this time. Ms. Norkun agreed with the deep saturation but noted that it's within the Historic Colors of America fan book. Mr. Martinez asked whether this would set a precedent and if this color could then be used as a full body color in the future. Ms. Kelleher replied no.

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

Ms. Brown suggested Muted Mulberry as a second option or India Trade to ensure that the door color makes a statement next to the pumpkin color of the house. Ms. Norkun replied that it was too grey. Mr. Martinez noted the importance of the base color in the proposed color. Ms. Brown suggested China Astor which is more blue-gray although Plum Island is her preference

VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to approve California Paints Historic Colors of America "Plum Island" P10 or "China Aster" L10 for front and back doors only. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Pattison, Norkun, Meche were in favor, Martinez – abstained, and the motion so carried.

Chair Spang arrived at this time.

Salem Common

City of Salem submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install benches

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/6/21

Ms. Kelleher stated that final application material had not been submitted and recommended continuing application to the next regular meeting.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue to the August 4, 2021 regular meeting. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Pattison, Norkun, Meche, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

18 Chestnut Street – continuation

Dorothy Kelleher submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fence

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/31/21
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant has not been able to get a sample on site for the Commission to see and has requested a continuance.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue to the August 4, 2021 regular meeting. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Pattison, Norkun, Meche, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

90 Federal Street – continuation

Carrie Cabot submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new fencing.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/10/21
- Photographs

The applicant was not present to discuss the project and was moved to the end of the agenda.

Mr. Martinez stated that he spoke with Ms. Cabot who agreed with him on the design of the proposed fence to include a new fence along the same run as previously proposed and with the Commission's suggestion to create a level fence that connects to the existing retaining wall. She requested adding two gates, one at the bottom of the steps and another for egress to the driveway from the rear yard. She proposed a fence similar to a McIntire style fence on Cambridge Street with a 1" gap between the pickets, but he suggested 3/4" gap and the gates would be built to match the style of the fence. Mr. Meche suggested 3 to 3½" wide pickets. Mr. Pattison suggested 3" wide pickets since it's a low fence. Mr. Martinez noted the very limited visibility and that the post would also have matching post caps. Mr. Spang asked if the framework would be hidden from view. Mr. Martinez replied that the metal posts will be sunk into bluestone with rails attached to that, all hidden from view.

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

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve the application with the fence posts set into bluestone behind the fence, the pickets to be 2 ½" – 3 ½" wide, with ¾" spacing, a continuous top rail, the finish height to match the height of the existing rear fence run, the fence to be painted to match the trim color of the house, and to install two gates as specified on the site plan - one gate at the bottom of the steps and another for egress to the driveway, gates to match the appearance of the fence and provide a seamless appearance. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Norkun, Pattison, Meche, Spang in favor and the motion so carried.

2 Oliver Street – continuation

33WSNS LLC submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace rear addition

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/11/21

- Photographs
- Architectural plans by Pitman & Wardley

Peter Pitman of Pitman and Wardley Associates was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Spang noted that some of the Commission members visited the site on July 20th, 2021 and met with Sara Biello.

Mr. Pitman stated that the following changes were made after a discussion with the owner; adding shutters on the window over right-side entry door, not elongating the window over the middle entry door, removing the herringbone design, eliminating the left-side entry door, and they will investigate other Federal balustrades in the neighborhood to help them refine their proposed balustrade and newel posts design. Brick is proposed with joints to match the existing because the owner is determined to maintain the regal brick aesthetic and elegance of the masonry and a well-qualified mason will be hired to recreate an historically accurate and appropriate façade. The neighbors noted their preference for window shutters to match those in the neighborhood, but not a herringbone design. They studied creating an offset on the building aligned with the road and the owner feels the askew relationship between the building and the road wasn't as noticeable as the angle on the house. The owner also wanted to maintain the angle but would not want to be repeating the mistake. They would lose 130 SF by removing the addition to straighten the wall which would also reduce the crowding.

Chair Spang asked if any of the existing brick openings at the end of the façade would be maintained where the addition is proposed. Mr. Pitman replied that the owner is focused on receiving conditional approval from ZBA and wants to review interior elevations and associated costs before he would commit to it.

Mr. Pattison stated that at the large doorway with the herringbone balustrade, the panes of the upper transom seem to be oriented the wrong way. Mr. Pitman agreed and noted that they will implement a vertical orientation.

Mr. Pattison agreed that the newel posts could use a cap to make it look more substantial. Mr. Pitman replied that other in the district included urns and flat caps, which the owner is not interested in incorporating. The newel posts are also too shot so they may be heightened by one or two brick courses.

Chair Spang noted that Ms. Biello mentioned replacing the wood board fence with an iron fence. Mr. Pitman replied that the fence is substantially rotted, and the owner wants to install a new 6-foot-high fence. They are seeking a conditional approval for a new 6-foot-high fence prior to their review by the ZBA and are working with Atty. Scott Grover on the zoning package.

Mr. Meche stated that while has no issues with the floor plan and is glad it will return to the Commission for further review. He read a passage from <https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf> which stated in part that “new work that appears historic is not recommended when it comes from new additions, which change over time and reflect the period when the changes were made.” Chair Spang agreed that historic work can't be duplicated. Ms. Kelleher added that it is possible to see the changes in the current project already, which shows the history of the changes of the building. Mr. Pitman agreed that a new addition will never match it perfectly; however, the owner purchased this house for the brick and its aesthetic, and believes it is a reasonable request. Mr. Cutting noted that the proposed addition would be of the same medium but the changes to date haven't been drastically different. Chair Spang stated that this was a grey area and noted the proposal to align the existing planes of walls with new plains of walls, which will affect their building envelope and the patio. He suggested it be pushed 12-inches further away from the street, so it still reads as an addition, since the main block of the house has more formality in its details that turn the corner to face Salem Common, while the rear portion is more utilitarian. Mr. Pitman noted that while they won't bring the full extent of the formality to the summer kitchen, it will have simpler details and no shutters. He agreed to create subtle off-sets and stepping back the proposed addition.

Public comment:

Jessica Herbert, 70 Webb Street, suggested a consultant with tax credit experience review the project and provide an opinion on what would be appropriate for a tax credit situation. Chair Spang suggested MHC be consulted. Mr. Pitman replied that while they are not doing any work to the carriage house, they can speak to the consultant to review the level of standards and what would be allowed.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Spang noted his concern with replicating vs. creating something different when it came to the proposed addition. Mr. Pitman suggested stepping back the kitchen door, continuing to research the newel posts and adding shutters to the main structure.

Mr. Meche noted his concern with providing an approval of the zoning envelope without knowing “the ask” which may include increasing the non-conformance without the Commission knowing the building setback, since the purpose of a Special Permit is to extend an existing non-conforming condition. That will need to be clarified by Atty. Grover. Mr. Pitman replied that Atty. Grover requested they seek a conditional approval from the Commission for overall massing, window, and door locations, with the details to be determined.

Mr. Pattison asked if that would include approving a new 6-foot-high iron fence with an unknown design and length. Mr. Pitman replied that no front fence changes are proposed, and they could eliminate that request from the application, so it could be re-assed and re-evaluated. Chair Spang noted his preference to determine the details and whether they are comfortable with replicating the façade or trying something different. He was not in favor of the massing and changing the footprint to this extent and the effect it would have on the property. His preference would be for something of the same size to preserve it as closely as possible.

Mr. Martinez stated that he agreed with much of what Mr. Cutting said in terms of moving it closer to the street. Houses of this time were built to follow property lines which were sometimes askew. Mr. Pattison agreed since Oliver Street does bend along the property line, disagreed with attempting to match the brick since this structure wasn’t designed to be a rambling structure, so a slight difference is appropriate. Mr. Pitman noted that the skew does show the history of the lot and they will hold off on fence discussion.

Mr. Meche reiterated that he is uncomfortable with an approval of basic elements with so many details to be determine. Chair Spang agreed noting that he is unsure what the ZBA would concentrate on, despite their typical focus on parking or creating a multi-family versus an addition to a house.

Ms. Norkun agreed with comments made and the new joints that wouldn’t match the original. The execution of these elements will create a disconnect and it won’t look original. Mr. Pitman noted that the askew rear corner faces the rear courtyard which is also the party-wall of the neighboring structure. Chair Spang proposed two alternatives footprints that allows as much of the original footprint to remain while also including an addition that is approximately 2-feet away from the outside corners rather than creating an entirely new addition. Mr. Meche noted that potential comments from the National Parks Service are an unknown and reusing existing wall openings rather than creating new openings would help. The Commission debated the potential location of interior circulation space. Mr. Pitman noted that the rear wall has no windows due to the party wall, so they are focused on moving it forward to incorporate a light source and the proposed patio. He requested a poll of the Commission and their guidance.

Mr. Pattison stated that he liked the angle along Oliver Street. Mr. Martinez agreed. Mr. Cutting noted his concern with a growth of volume rather than the angle of the structure along the street. Chair Spang noted his concern with replication versus differences that shows the evolution of the structure, he was in favor of following the angle along Oliver Street as well as maintaining some of the historic structure. Ms. Norkun noted her agreement with the architects on the Commission. Mr. Meche noted the reflected balance between making the new walls not parallel and a right angle to the rear wall would allow a better usable experience but would support either.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue to meeting on August 4, 2021. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Pattison, Norkun, Meche, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

19 Chestnut Street – continuation

Nathalie Binney and Henry Binney III submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter garage doors

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/3/21
- Photographs
- Architectural plans by PionArch architects

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant requested a continuance.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue to Aug 4th meeting. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Pattison, Norkun, Meche, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

1 Forrester Street– continuation

Joshua and Jennifer McGregor submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for rear pergola

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/17/21
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant was not present and recommended Commission continue to the next meeting.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting on August 4, 2021. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Pattison, Norkun, Meche, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

9 North Street

Historic Salem, Inc. submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to modify chimneys and install new roof vents

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/11/21
- Photographs

Caroline Watson-Felt - HSI President, Paul Wright – Roof Replacement Project Manager, and David Hart – Project Coordinator, were present to discuss the project.

Chair Spang stated that this is the reconsideration of a project heard at the June 30, 2021, special meeting; however, there were some conflicts of interest so it should be re-heard and there was an additional piece of the project that was not included in the original application. Ms. Kelleher added that it was part of the original notification, but it was not publicly noticed and due to the conflicts of interest concerns the project has been entirely readvertised and this will be treated as a new application.

Chair Spang requested Mr. Martinez recuse himself as a board member of HSI. Mr. Martinez recused himself. Ms. Kelleher noted that a quorum remained.

Chair Spang disclosed that he worked on the renovation at the building over twenty years ago.

Ms. Watson-Felt stated that the veneer chimney was discussed two weeks prior, but they now have photographic samples of a Glen-Gery Thin Tech Wall System brick with an interior drainage system proposed by the contractor. The original chimneys were lost when the structure was moved. Chair Spang noted that the original chimneys were lost when the structure was moved over twenty years ago, and replicas were constructed due to the lack of masonry within the structure to build upon and HSI's financial constraints and inability to construct new chimneys down to ground. He asked if the new faux chimneys would look the same. Ms. Watson-Felt noted that there is a slight differentiation with the samples, although both have a historically accurate look and feel. She compared a photo of an 1844 Federal structure to the two the sand and water struck thin brick samples and noted that the overall preference for the water struck to match the current modern brick.

Chair Spang noted that the balustrade at the perimeter of the roof will help conceal it. Ms. Watson-Felt noted that they will be more visible from the rear public ways. Chair Spang noted that the thin brick system has pre-made corners and asked if the chimneys width will grow due to the addition of the drainage system. Ms. Watson-Felt replied that the width of the new chimney was never discussed. Mr. Martinez believe the chimneys would be fully rebuilt and would match in size. Mr. Hart added that the chimney size will remain, but they will let the Contractor make that call. He noted that Paul Holtz of MHC has approved the construction of two new chimneys. Ms. Kelleher stated that she will reach out to Mr. Holtz for an official approval letter.

Public comment: No one in the assembly wished to speak

Mr. Pattison stated his preference for water struck brick with corner bricks.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve as presented with the use of Glen-Gery water struck brick. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Pattison, Norkun, Meche, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Roof Vents:

Ms. Watson-Felt stated that a meeting was held instructing the Contractor that the installation of the chimneys and roof vents must wait until the Commission has reviewed and approved them. The Contractor urged them to install the vent bases to make the openings weather tight and they agreed; however, the entire vent was installed prior to their approval by the Commission. The two vents are similar to the one on the Ropes Garden shed and Peirce-Nichols House. They are copper and will patina, but are visible from the rear, Summer Street and minimally from North Street. The power vents are no longer proposed since they aren't historically accurate.

Mr. Pattison stated that he is in favor of these types of vents. Ms. Kelleher noted that this type of vent was approved on North Pine Street for being historically appropriate.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve the two turbine vents as installed at the rear roof as indicated. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Norkun, Pattison, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so passed.

Front Façade:

Ms. Watson-Felt stated that an application was submitted to paint the front façade of the building using the original paint color. Ms. Kelleher confirmed that it was the case.

381-385 Essex Street

Grace Church submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new sign.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/30/21

▪ Photographs

Eric Wagner, property manager for Grace Church, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Wagner proposed to replace the sign from the 1950's which is $\frac{3}{4}$ plywood attached to painted sheet steel. The new sign would be to the right of the entry door and placed parallel to the street and they are open to any distance away from the newly installed granite curbing separating their planting bed from the brick sidewalk. Chair Spang suggested 12-18-inches. Mr. Meche asked if the sign will conform to Salem's Signage Ordinance. Mr. Wagner replied that Ken McDagg of Concept Signs will make the sign and he is well informed of the ordinance requirements.

Mr. Wagner stated that the posts are proposed to be black painted steel, with steel or possibly cast-iron brackets. The sign would be a urethane board 38-inches-high x 27.5-inches-high, using the same color proposed for their July application to paint the entry doors. The shield will be the same as the sign surface. The lettering will be cut into the sign surface with high metal content gold paint. Chair Spang asked how the rear of the sign will be treated. Mr. Wagner replied that the rear will be painted red and sealed on the sides. Mr. Meche asked if the posts would be round or square. Mr. Wagner replied most likely round and painted a high gloss black and the curvature of the sign will mimic that of the doors. Chair Spang noted that the sign shape was flipped rather than having the more traditional shield shape.

Mr. Martinez asked if the street sign remain or be eliminated. Mr. Wagner replied that it will remain, so there will be two signs total. The street sign is the standard Anglican welcome sign and all Episcopal churches have one on a telephone pole as part of their brand.

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

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve as presented. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion.

Mr. Martinez noted that there are several unknowns; the post shape – are they square or round, bracket material – are they iron or steel, the red in the shield doesn't match the red of the sign, and he's not sure that the Commission has approved a urethane sign. Mr. Wagner replied that the Pantone is not 193C. Ms. Kelleher noted that the sign for Salem Arts sign was urethane and not wood. Mr. Wagner noted that proposed paint bonds better with urethane signs than wood, making them very durable.

Mr. Martinez stated that the post should not be round. Mr. Pattison not concerned with post size, if it will require a cap or a finished look, how a round post would work with a bracket because he does not want a bracket that must grip the posts. Mr. Wagner replied that it's possible that a 1-inch-high caps will be used. Mr. Pattison suggested welded metal caps be added and painted to limit their visibility. Chair Spang agreed and noted that he assumed the posts were square but would be comfortable with either given the arched sign.

Mr. Meche stated that while he is in favor of the sign, the application lacks detail and not enough information has been presented to the Commission. Mr. Martinez added that while he doesn't dislike the proposed sign, he agreed that details are missing. Ms. Kelleher suggested a continuance to allow the sign maker to provide more detail using the Commission's comments. Chair Spang suggested the applicant also include a plan view.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting on August 4th. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Norkun, Pattison, Meche, and Spang were in favor and the motion so passed.

2 North Pine Street

Theodore Cowan submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install HVAC mini-split system

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/7/21
- Photographs

Theodore Cowan, owner, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Cowan stated that they are proposing to install a Fujitsu system with an outdoor condenser, 13-inches-deep x 36-inches-high x 28-inches-wide, to be raised 10-inches above grade, and with a very small property they have few areas to place the unit. Their Contractor, Service Department South, has identified attaching a unit to the side of the house at various locations but the only area not attached to the house was to the right of the front door on the side of the house, under the window. He provided a framed box to show the size and placement of the proposed unit on a platform above grade. The rear foundation of the home is built into the rear cemetery wall so there is limited space to place it at the rear.

Chair Spang suggested it be placed further away from the window and front door. Mr. Cowan replied that this is his preferred location however the manufacturer informed him that the lines cannot be buried below grade. The Commission discussed a relocation of the unit to behind the home and the deck. Chair Spang suggested installing screening or placing it behind the porch and send the lines under the porch to conceal them since it cannot be placed along the rear cemetery wall.

Public comment:

Dan Graham, 0 North Pine Street, spoke in support of his neighbor about where he wants to place it since there are limited options for placement.

Jessica Herbert, 70 Webb Street. Stated that 7 Botts Court has a good example of a simple enclosure for a mini-split system that the applicant should review. Ms. Kelleher agreed and will share photos, although that unit is on the ground and not a raised platform.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Spang requested the applicant provide additional detail if screening is proposed. Mr. Cowan replied that he believed visibility from the cemetery would be one of the Commission's concerns since the unit needs to be high enough to avoid the snow line. Ms. Kelleher noted that buildings on North Pine Street are visible through the cemetery and a mock-up could be placed next to the wall to determine its visibility. Mr. Cowan indicated that placing it closer to the house and overhang would provide some protection that could allow them to lower height.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting on August 4, 2021. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Norkun, Pattison, Meche, and Spang were in favor and the motion so passed.

262 Lafayette Street Unit 2

Justine Kolsky submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/23/21
- Photographs
- Window Nation quote for replacement windows

Justine Kolsky was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kolsky stated that they have lived there since April and are proposing to replace 15 windows, only 3 are operable and many have limited visibility. Window Nation provided a quote to replace them. Ms. Kelleher stated

that the applicant owns the second-floor unit, and the windows were replaced in the 1986 with Marvin wood windows as part of the building restoration project. All windows are 2 over 2 except for at the front second-floor bay window that are 1 over 1. Ms. Kolsky added that there are also two 1 over 1 windows at the rear.

Mr. Meche stated that Window Nation has many similarities to Rite Window with their lack of detail on the profile of the window sash and frame, and they only provide technical information on the glass. He requested a sample window. Ms. Kolsky noted that she has seen a sample of the vinyl window, the windows are energy efficient, the windows would be custom made, and their proprietary sealant will also be used to seal around the window. She agreed to request local examples of these windows for the Commission to review.

Mr. Meche questioned how the windows will fit into the existing openings. Chair Spang requested the head, jamb and sill details be submitted. Ms. Kolsky stated that Window Nation has installed their windows in 26 homes in Salem. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Design Guidelines state that vinyl windows are not approved within the historic districts. Mr. Martinez noted that windows without externally applied muntins would not be approved by the Commission because they do not resemble historic windows. Ms. Kolsky requested window manufacturer recommendations because many of the newer windows resemble vinyl and noted that the quote she received for wood windows would be a financial hardship. The Commission suggested repairing the existing window. Ms. Kelleher to provide a list of approved options and addresses to the applicant to review. Mr. Meche requested addresses of the Salem location where the windows have been installed in Salem. Ms. Kelleher to coordinate a site visit and review of a sample window.

Public comment: No one in the assembly wished to speak

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting, August 4, 2021. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Norkun, Pattison, Meche, and Spang were in favor and the motion so passed.

143 Derby Street - Request for preliminary comment on proposed property development options

Ms. Kelleher stated that this is not a formal application, the applicant is seeking comment and feedback on how to proceed with their design proposal.

Andrew Crocker, architect from Crocker Architecture, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Crocker stated that his client owns Captain Dusty's, they are considering developing onto the existing building and the empty house next door and investigating the zoning, historic preservation, and other potential issues. The existing building has had several additions, but they want to add to the neighborhood and create strong urban design elements which will be a challenge with zoning, parking, and historic restrictions. Their preferred proposed layout would be to demolish Captain Dusty's and construct a larger building on the corner that allows for vehicular circulation and parking behind the building. Zoning requirements for a mixed use would include parking for the commercial use and the preferred layout includes 2 commercial units on first floor and residential units above. They generated three options that keep the existing building on site, but with such a small lot, vehicles would enter on Derby and exit onto Daniels Street, which are both one-way streets. Options 1 and 2 include constructing a new building at the corner of Derby and Daniels Streets, while Option 3 would be an adaptive reuse with an addition connected the existing building. Many exterior and interior details have been removed and what remains has so no historic value, so if the Commission were amenable to removing the existing structure it would give them the flexibility to redevelop the site. They would incorporate details from the neighborhood into the new development which would have a more residential style which is more consistent with the buildings on Daniels Street.

Mr. Crocker stated that the preferred scheme of demolishing the existing structure would allow them to start new on site and provides the most flexibility. The proposal would be to construct a three-story building with a flat roof and

cornice details that reflect those in the neighborhood. The portion of the structure along Daniels Street could have a smaller mass with a gable roof more consistent with Daniels Street.

Mr. Meche requested the unit count. Mr. Crocker replied 2 commercial and 5 residential units on the two floors above, although the unit mix is undetermined. Mr. Meche asked which zoning category they are seeking relief from with the ZBA. Mr. Crocker replied that the zoning code doesn't fit the neighborhood with respect to the setbacks which are 10-15 feet and all the buildings are on the property line along Derby Street. The number of residential units is also based on lot area, so two units is okay, but they want to add 3 more. Mr. Meche suggested they investigate aligning their back wall with the neighboring wall for uniformity. He presumed that as a corner lot, this site may have been three parcels at one time with the driveways next to the buildings and the structure should return to the edge of the sidewalk or be very close to it at the intersection, repairing the fabric of the neighborhood. He asked if the building has been moved. Ms. Kelleher replied that the inventory storm stats that the structure was constructed on the site in the mid-1800's.

Chair Spang stated that with so few exterior or interior historic resources left to salvage either within the structure, he has no strong argument to retain the existing look. He agreed that parking should be at the rear as opposed to the sides, and he would agree to a demolition and replacement, but they need to be mindful of proposed heights. Ms. Meche suggested they find a scheme that incorporates the original building, because it would be less of an ask than a new structure multiple parcels wide. He also suggested retaining the Derby Street scale and modularity and urged the applicant to review the neighboring structures on Derby Street where the first floors were used as commercial space. The structure should be retained rather than erased and find a scheme that supports including it. Chair Spang stated that he has fewer concerns with Options 1 and 2, than with Option 3. Mr. Meche suggested a one-way parking area to reduce the size of the driveway. Mr. Crocker noted their design to not have the building surrounded by a sea of asphalt due to the neighboring parking lot.

Mr. Martinez stated that with the current housing crisis and high-density mixed-use housing would be beneficial; however, he will also advocate for adaptive reuse rather than demolition and suggested that the Derby Street Neighborhood Association may advocate for retaining the existing structure and business because both have value. Ms. Norkun agreed with Mr. Martinez. Mr. Pattison stated that he does not mind if Captain Dusty's stays or leaves, he is concerned with whether the final design will look and feel right and make a good addition to the neighborhood. He agreed with the comments made by Mr. Meche and Chair Spang and that the building should come up to the sidewalk.

Ms. Kelleher stated that this building is within the Derby Street Historic District and she told them she didn't believe the Commission would support to demolish the historic building in a local historic district. The City Council just approved first passage of the revisions to the Demolition Delay Ordinance and so she would strongly advocate for saving this building because agreeing to its demolition would set a precedent. Saying that there isn't anything work saving goes against the Commission has said to applicants wanting to demolish an historic building outside of local historic districts. She strongly advocated for reusing the building since it's within their purview and that can save it. Mr. Cutting agreed with Ms. Kelleher. Mr. Meche and Mr. Martinez reiterated that they were not advocating for demolition.

Mr. Martinez asked if they have jurisdiction over the lot at 145 Derby Street. Ms. Kelleher replied yes, the Commission has jurisdiction over new construction within the historic district.

Chair Spang asked if access from Derby Street is driving the proposed layout on the lot. Mr. Crocker replied yes and without the small rear piece of land it would be even less function. The scale of Captain Dusty's is more in line with Derby Street and they considered moving the building closer to Daniels Street for even better circulation and more massing on Derby Street. Chair Spang noted that the Commission doesn't want to have the streetscape be drastically altered and suggested requesting the City of Salem make the first portion of Daniels Street a two-way street that ends at the back of this lot to access the driveway. Mr. Meche asked if space even further into the lot could be utilized. Mr. Crocker replied that the 20-foot x 15-foot area is not usable space.

Mr. Crocker requested the order of operations to move the project forward. Chair Spang suggested that review be done in tandem with the Historic Commission and the Board of Appeals. Ms. Kelleher agreed. Mr. Meche suggested the applicant meet with the Derby Street Neighborhood Association to discuss the project and neighboring lot where some people park, partially since parking is already a challenge in the neighborhood. Mr. Crocker noted that a meeting is being planned.

Mr. Martinez asked if Captain Dusty's will continue to operate. Mr. Crocker replied that they will likely be part of the project.

Public comment:

Alan Hanscom, SATV. Historic Salem, Inc. researched the building in 1980 and it doesn't look as old as it is, but it was built for mariner John Nichols Jr. in 1836. He hoped it can be save given its age.

Jessica Herbert, 70 Webb Street. Concurred with everyone advocating for saving the building. Even as a shell, it would be important to keep it, even if it were moved but kept on site.

Stan Franzeen, neighbor on Daniels Street. Was informed of this meeting tonight and people in the neighborhood is not aware of this proposed project. He was upset to see that two mature trees were removed, one of which was removed illegally, at a time when they are dealing with heat islands in urban areas and climate change. There is money to be made with the property. It's historic and it should be saved. He assumed they were moved because there is money to be made with redevelopment of the property, and he will alert the neighborhood of what's being proposed. The building is also historic and should be saved. Mr. Crocker replied that tree at the corner of Daniels and Derby Streets was planted by the owners when they purchased the property. It was oversized and the neighbor's complaints prompted them to remove it, and they realized after that fact that they should not have. They will comply with tree regulations going forward. Ms. Kelleher noted that the sidewalk tree may be part of the infrastructure improvement on Derby Street. She also stated that this is not a formal application, the discussion is for feedback only. When an applicant submits a formal application, the discussion becomes a public hearing and notices are mailed to all abutters and abutters to abutters. It was noticed on the meeting agenda.

Other Business:

Ms. Kelleher stated that the Demolition Delay revision went before the City Council, and they voted unanimously for first passage. Some changes were made to strengthen it even further and the Council will review it in September. She thanked HSI, City Council, OLLA and Historic Commission members for their work.

2 Oliver Street: Ms. Herbert provided the following public comment. She commended Chair Spang's great idea to allow a certain amount of the ell to remain exposed, which allows an observer to see the evolution of the structure over time.

Adjournment

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Norkun, Pattison, Meche, and Spang were in favor and the motion so passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55PM

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner