

DRAFT  
SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
July 5, 2018

A special meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Thursday, July 5, 2018 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Laurie Bellin, David Hart, Reed Cutting, Joanne McCrea, Larry Spang and Jane Turiel.

268 Lafayette Street - continuation

In a continuation from the previous meeting, the Commission heard the application from Jamuna Reppert for a Certificate of Appropriateness to rebuild front porch and stair.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/4/18
- Photographs
- Work proposal from Osgood Construction

Dr. Jamuna Reppert and Matthew Reppert were present.

*Mr. Hart recused himself from the discussion.*

Dr. Reppert provided photographs of the railing at 266 Lafayette Street.

Ms. Herbert noted that current height is 27 inches so would only need an additional 9” to meet building code requirement. She suggested that the railing be raised with a platform below. She presented an example of baluster at \$50/baluster versus the \$47 quoted by applicant’s carpenter.

Ms. McCrea asked if there was a concern about weathering of the bottom rail.

Ms. Herbert noted that the bottom rail would be 3” high with an approximate 1” gap from decking.

Dr. Reppert stated that neighbor’s railing had a 3” wide baluster and they are proposing 4” balusters.

Mr. Reppert asked what the Commission’s concerns were.

Ms. Herbert stated that the concern was the matching of the railings on both halves of house. The Commission wants balusters to remain the same height as original. She noted that if the applicant did not want to seek a waiver for building code, she suggested the alternative. She also suggested that the design pick up on band molding in the quoins.

Ms. Bellin asked for confirmation that Ms. Herbert was suggesting the neighbor retain railing and just raise it up from the bottom. She asked Mr. Mark Pattison, a restoration carpenter who was seated in the audience, for his comments on the proposal.

Mr. Pattison asked for the length of the balustrade.

Mr. Reppert replied approximately 12’.

Mr. Pattison asked if the lattice will be changed and, if so, the balustrade base should break to coincide with break in the lattice below.

Ms. Herbert asked about how the railing should intersect the vestibule.

Mr. Pattison recommended adding another section to the railing to make it look intentional. He also recommended leaving approximately 3” between the bottom on the balustrade and the decking to allow space to shovel snow off the porch. He also recommended making bottom of the post bases taller.

Ms. Herbert asked if Mr. Pattison was willing to provide a sketch.

Mr. Pattison agreed and recommended that the lattice not be diagonal.

Dr. Reppert asked the Commission to make a decision at this meeting and not continue to the next meeting.

Ms. Kelleher asked for clarification on whether Ms. Herbert was recommending the Commission continue discussion to the next meeting or make a decision this evening.

Ms. Bellin suggested that the Commission could approve in concept with a drawing to be provided by Mr. Pattison.

The Commission discussed the details: the current height of railing is 27”, requiring an addition 9” to meet building code. With a 3” gap between bottom rail and deck, this would leave a 6” base.

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve in concept with a drawing to be provided by Mr. Pattison, noting the following details: raise by 9” to include a 3” gap with 6” base with molding similar to bandmolding on quoining. Balusters to match balusters on front of #268. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 67-69 Bridge Street - continuation

In a continuation from the previous meeting, the Commission heard the application from 71 Bridge Street, LLC for a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish a barn.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/12/18
- Photographs
- Drawings by Derby Square Architects 5/8/18

Attorney Steven Lovely of Lovely Law Group, the owner of the property Mr. Nabbout, and the project architect Richard Griffin, 10 Derby Square, were present.

Mr. Nabbout stated his address as 51 Vale Street.

Ms. Kelleher noted that only three members were able to vote on the application, which was not a quorum.

Attorney Lovely stated that does not need a vote for the demolition. Could this be considered consultation on the design of the new development.

Ms. Herbert stated that Mr. Spang will want to review the design. She suggested the Commission continue to the meeting on July 18<sup>th</sup> and have it first on the agenda and ask the ZBA to put it later on the agenda.

The Commission agreed to discuss only the new design of the development and not the waiver of demolition.

Ms. Herbert suggested 2/2 windows for the buildings’ 1870s construction dates. She noted that the revised drawings are an improvement over original design, noting that the buildings will no longer be connected.

Mr. Griffin confirmed, stated that he addressed the Commission's previous comments on the awkwardness of the joined design. He also noted that without the connector, it will allow more light into interior. However, it will require restoration of stairwells in each building.

Ms. Kelleher asked if staircase in the side hall house was historic.

Mr. Griffin and Mr. Nabbout both replied that it was not historic and was very narrow and out of code.

Ms. Herbert suggested eliminating the transoms over the first story windows.

Mr. Griffin stated that he could remove the transoms, elongate the windows and raise up sills.

Ms. Herbert suggested added window boxes to provide some buffer from sidewalk.

Mr. Griffin stated that he could not pull back the dormer from wall plane on the gable end.

Ms. Herbert asked if the minor changes could be made on the plans and then she could share it with Commission members including Mr. Spang.

Ms. Kelleher asked if dormer on 71 Bridge Street could be pulled back from façade.

Mr. Griffin stated that it could be done.

Ms. Bellin asked if dormer on the 71 Bridge Street, the 5-bay house, could have 3 peaks and if 5-bay configuration could be retained instead of 3-bay as proposed.

Mr. Griffin stated that the Victorian era did have more variety in windows rather than the traditional 5-bay façade. The proposed windows would allow more light into the interior. The existing windows are small.

#### Review of Salem's Demolition Delay Regulations

The Commission discussed the proposed revisions to the Demolition Delay regulations.

Ms. Bellin asked for clarification on what constitutes demolition and asked if it could include 50 percent of building and removal of the roof.

The Commission discussed the definition of the fine, which as stated is odd. They discussed how to remedy situation, possibly adding a flat fine or a lien on the property. They also suggested a cap of "each day constitutes a separate offense". The Commission discussed who determines the remedy and whether there is a penalty for not securing building. They noted that there is only a penalty for not getting a permit, which makes it even more important to move penalty language to the beginning of the ordinance. They also suggested included language for expiration of permit to one year to be consistent with SHC certificates.

#### Preliminary Discussion on proposed Adaptive Reuse Overlay District

Ms. Herbert read an email from Barbara Cleary, from Historic Salem, Inc. regarding the proposed adaptive reuse overlay district.

Mr. Hart suggested looking at other examples for municipalities to see how they address the reuse of municipal and religious properties.

The Commission discussed how the overlay works with identified parcels. They also asked how the percentage of affordable housing was defined.

Mr. Hart expressed his opinion that it was premature for the Commission to comment on the proposed ordinance.

Ms. Herbert asked if the public hearing triggers a timeline. She asked about the schedule and whether the Commission could still provide comment once process begins.

Anne Sterling, 29 Orchard Street, expressed her opinion that the process seems rushed and the ordinance as written seems to be available to all buildings, not just the municipal and religious properties identified. She asked if there was a way to have an open meeting without triggering the 20 day review process as a public meeting.

The Commission agreed that more public comment is better since it provides more transparency.

Ms. Sterling asked if there was a way to define the properties to be subject to ordinance.

Expire certificate for rules of use signs on Salem Common

Ms. Kelleher reported that the certificate issued for new rules of use signs for the Common has expired. She asked the Commission to consider extending the certificate. The Commission agreed that the City should reapply when design and language is finalized.

Other Business

Ms. Herbert asked the Commission to consider defining regulations for screening of trash barrels and recycling. The commission agree to consider. Ms. Bellin asked if the Commission could require setbacks instead. She asked if there was a City ordinance about barrels on sidewalk.

Ms. Kelleher noted that there would only be a bare quorum for the next meeting. The Commission agreed to cancel the next meeting on July 18, 2018.

**VOTE: Ms. McCrea made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Turiel second the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Community Development Planner