

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
July 7, 2021

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, July 7, 2021 at 6:00 pm via **Zoom Virtual Meeting**. Present were: Reed Cutting, Milo Martinez, Larry Spang, Mark Meche, Vijay Joyce. Not present: Mark Pattison, Rebecca English, Stacey Norkun. Preservation Planner: Patti Kelleher

4 Andover Street - continuation

George Beck and Karen Garvey Beck submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint colors.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/18/21
- Photographs

Karen Garvey Beck was present.

Ms. Beck reported that she had added paint samples to home as request to allow Commission to see options. Trim color was found in California Collection of Paints, and Sturgis Grey was selected to place over the present brown and was considered as giving the home a nice presentation with the storm windows. Mr. Cutting asked if the white will stay white. Ms. Beck noted that the existing white needed to be made more grey to mute the color so as to be more fitting with the entire look of the house. Mr. Cutting asked if any of the combination of colors could be determined to be historically inappropriate. Mr. Joyce conducted research to note that an 1820s paint palette he uncovered had featured a pea-like green (this would have been carried out in the Federal era after this home was built) which would have been extant up approximately 1900.

Chair Spang asked for additional comments and established that public comments had been taken during the prior Commission meeting. Mr. Martinez asked what will happen to the window sashes, i.e., if they will remain black. Ms. Beck noted that grey will be used on the portions of the window specified. Ms. Beck noted that the applicants had consulted old photographs of the home and found its previous look extremely different.

Ms. Beck asked for the committee's recommendation as to replacing fencing to cohere with a Federal look. She noted that Ms. Kelleher suggested continuing a fence along the street edge to be consistent with the historic streetscape. The applicant clarified that these questions pertaining to the fence are being made in advance of a future application.

Chair Spang asked for clarification as to the paint color of the window surround versus that of the door surround, to which Ms. Beck noted that the window surround will be Sturgis Grey. Ms. Beck noted that tinted primer will be used underneath final paint coats. Ms. Grey noted that a duller white will be used for the door surround, i.e., Jewett White.

Public comment:

John Carr, 7 River Street, has shared a rear lot line with the applicants as of 48 years ago: May 16, 1973. Since that date, Mr. Carr noted that he and his wife would have liked to have seen the house painted a historically appropriate color. The present chocolate brown was put on the house by previous owners in 1950 under the mistaken belief that this is a First Period house. Mr. Carr enthusiastically recommended

accepting the applicants' application. Mr. Carr asked if the cornerboards will be delineated with the Jewett White, to which Ms. Beck noted that Sturgis Grey will be used. Mr. Carr also spoke to the style of fence and voiced preference for a spindle fence rather than the existing picket fence.

Mr. Martinez suggested holding off on altering fence. Mr. Martinez expressed preference for having moving parts of the window be different colors than the window surround, citing existing guidelines that convey such guidance, i.e., moving parts of window should be a different color, typically to match the door (though in this case the door is a unique color). Chair Spang expressed openness to providing the applicant the option for a dark color - black or brown. Mr. Joyce cited 358 Essex (an all-red house where every color is the same, i.e., trim, sash, etc.). Mr. Joyce expressed openness to also providing applicant the choice.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the application for the following colors – clapboards in Wainscot Green, trim in Sturgis Grey (with option to paint window sashes Sturgis Grey or leave as-is), and door to be English Bartlett. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Meche, 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: 5/3/21
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant had asked for a continuation.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez motioned to continue the application to the next scheduled meeting on July 21, 2021. Mr. Reed seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

90 Federal Street - continuation

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

Ms. Cabot was not on the call and Mr. Martinez was unable to contact her outside of the meeting. Ms. Kelleher noted that Mr. Martinez had volunteered to work with applicant at previous meeting. The committee were open to waiting for Ms. Cabot to appear at the meeting.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting motioned to continue the application to the next scheduled meeting on July 21, 2021. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

5 Beckford Street - continuation

Robert Allen and Robert Soucy submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace steps and railings.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/21/21
- Photographs

Brendan Murray from Murray Masonry was present. Ms. Kelleher noted stairs will be granite, not concrete. Four steps will exist to address inconsistency of current staircase (there are currently three). Mr. Murray noted variable height and non-code compliance as prime issues to be resolved with existing stairs. Woodbury granite is similar to existing granite in the area, and Rockport granite is difficult to come by these days. Mr. Murray noted follow-up that only a top rail will be used to which Chair Spang clarified that the planned top rail style would be carried out as opposed to having pickets. Mr. Murray noted that the owner presented railing options. As of now, the owners have yet to select a fence. Fencing at 38 Chestnut Street is being used as an ideal template. The Commission previously noted that much simpler railings are preferred, which was conveyed to the owner as a potential option to consider.

Mr. Joyce asked for more information as to the width of the stairs (48 inches); how would this compare to current conditions? Mr. Murray noted that width is consistent; the concern and focus is making all of the risers uniform.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve application as submitted replacing concrete steps with granite and the new handrail such as has been approved matching design of 13 Cambridge and 90 Federal black cast iron design with no balusters. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

253 Lafayette Street - continuation

Craig Fletcher submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/2/21
- Photographs

Mr. Fletcher and window manufacturer brought sample window to the property today to allow Commission to view and see its visibility from Lafayette Street. Back bay windows are to be replaced; other windows are behind the house and not visible from the street, such as French-door style windows that open. Mr. Meche, Mr. Martinez, Mr. Cutting, and Mr. Joyce all visited the property to see the window location in person.

Mr. Meche was generally in favor of the composite window which does not have PVC material that have had issues in the past; good profiles were lauded, and the planned composite window was judged as being not very dissimilar from products of vintage mill shops. Mr. Meche additionally commented that the composites have wood fiber and fake divided lites. Challenges were noted: the applicant has already placed the order for the windows which have been delivered, the windows are not yet installed, and permitting issues have arisen, hence why the application has been presented to the Commission. Mr. Meche noted that contractors and window providers are potentially getting homeowners into trouble through lack of diligence in cohering with historic district guidelines and lauded the installers from

Andersen Renewal for catching this potential issue before it potentially became a violation. Mr. Meche detailed an existing image of the window which features storms on the outside with swinging doors with sashes (which are located behind storms further into the layered windows). Mr. Meche expressed grief as to getting rid of the existing windows. One window is quite prominent to be viewed from the street. A different window is much less visible and more obscured. Those two windows would be changed to a sizeable 4 over 1 arrangement.

Chair Spang asked if existing windows are in such shape that they should be stored on the property for potential later use or if they are beyond salvaging. Mr. Fletcher noted that it is hard to say until the window is opened up. Both Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Meche cited wood rot as a main concern. Mr. Fletcher noted screens could potentially be utilized but was uncertain as to salvaging the storms. Mr. Meche pointed out that the storms are in pretty tough shape, but maybe not hopeless. Swinging door sashes would be recommended for saving unless they fall apart upon removal. The fact that they are on hinges is a promising sign. Mr. Fletcher agreed as to the value of saving the swinging interior doors.

Chair Spang asked if the paint used will match the existing trim. Mr. Fletcher noted that Andersen has a stock color that matches the trim color (characterized variously as “yellow,” “cream,” and “canvas”). Ms. Kelleher noted that an ongoing question would be whether an interior or exterior muntin pattern would be used. Mr. Meche noted an installer’s comment that field application of paint is possible. Mr. Morin (who was present from Andersen Renewal) noted that they can field apply the color; and that simulated divided lites would be used. Mr. Meche asked if this is a standard size and noted that throwing away a sash seems like a heavy lift. Mr. Morin noted that this is not a standard size. One path moving forward is factory installation of replacing the sash and the other is field application. Mr. Joyce asked which application would last longer, to which Mr. Morin responded with the factory applied option. Mr. Meche again expressed reluctance as to throwing away existing sashes which are custom.

Mr. Martinez expressed concern that yet another grill pattern was being introduced into this house, and noted that it may be more cohesive to have 1 over 1’s. Mr. Meche agreed that many 1 over 1’s are currently in place. Some windows have “lozenge” shape (Ms. Kelleher’s description) in upper half of windows. Mr. Joyce clarified that a new window style is not being added; rather an existing window type is being replaced. As to the location of the window on the property, this was formerly a porch that once had no windows. A modern window was already put in in the 1930s or 1940s, and another modern style is being added. Distance from the driveway (50-60 feet away) was mentioned as a valid consideration.

Chair Spang clarified that the divided lite on inside is an applied muntin. Mr. Fletcher expressed openness to removing interior grills. Mr. Meche asked if this is a true vision screen, noting that it looks dark. Mr. Morin noted that plastic coating on the window is darker than what will appear. Ms. Kelleher noted that half screens must be used, to which the applicant agreed. Chair Spang wanted the paint to blend with rest of painted windows rather than agreeing to a crisp factory finish. Mr. Joyce agreed with Chair Spang on this point.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce motioned to approve the application with the exception that interior grills be removed to give the look of a 1 over 1 and that the exterior be painted to match the existing sash colors. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Spang were in favor. Mr. Meche voted against the motion.

9 North Street - continuation

Historic Salem, Inc. submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to modify chimneys.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/11/21
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher reported that concerns were raised about a quorum at the last meeting when this application was originally deliberated due to a potential conflict of interest. The City Solicitor confirmed concern and requested that previous decision be vacated. Therefore, the proposal to modify faux chimneys as well as install vents has been re-advertised as part of a new application for the July 21 meeting. Chair Spang asked if one or both chimneys will be modified. Ms. Kelleher was under the belief that both would be modified but will double-check. The contractor has installed roof vents; Ms. Kelleher asked Historic Salem to get in touch with contractor to see what will be involved should the vents need to be removed and/or those areas patched. Mr. Martinez noted concerns that the new chimney would not match the old. Historic Salem is also repainting as part of this project to paint in-kind to match colors approved by the Commission. Chair Spang asked if these colors have been extant for the past 20 years, which Ms. Kelleher confirmed.

23 River Street - continuation

Paschal Corrigan submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate building.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/8/21
- Photographs

The applicant has not submitted any drawings and was not present; this application has been ongoing for months. Ms. Kelleher proposed denying this application without prejudice given the amount of time that has elapsed with no progress. Public comments have been received regarding this application concerning applicant's lack of plans. Mr. Martinez noted that the applicant was given approval to removal siding in an exploratory manner.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to deny the application without prejudice. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

2 Oliver Street

Applicant submitted an application for 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. Mr. Pitman offered an executive summary, primarily concerning a summer kitchen in back of house, and discussed impractical dimensions of the space and staircase, i.e., summer kitchen is 8' 4" and features a staircase which renders it a dysfunctional wing coming off of the house. Mr. Pitman showed existing conditions and plan, pointing out additions that were added to the structure over time. A carriage house is also extant. Mechanical systems are screened behind a fence and will remain. The applicants want to remove wood fence and replace with cast iron to match existing with a taller version. A brick patio is also desired. Gail Smith's drawing was shown. Existing wood fence is in disrepair and rotted. Elevations and views from public ways were shown, as were the location of the planned addition is, which will involve replicating certain parts of the home. Some portions of the addition will be one story, others will be two story. Facia soffit bed molding assembly will feature. The plan is to bring kitchen to 24' feet, square it off with the rest of the house, and make the space much less narrow for use as a guest area or in-law suite. Existing conditions of second floor and lack of functional space were shown. The applicants do not wish to use lentils in remaining consistent with existing detailing. The proposed fence will aim to replicate existing fence. Clients also want to maximize light into kitchen area.

Mr. Meche asked as to the oblique angle of the edge of the addition, and whether or not the roof would be flat out over the addition/flat one-story portion. Mr. Pitman noted that this is an initial session to get any immediate feedback, responses, and reactions.

Chair Spang asked how to match brick masonry to existing. Mr. Pitman noted that Commission will be provided with 3' x 3' mortar and brick match. Bricks will likely not be salvaged and reused. Chair Spang pointed out the need for windows to match existing, single pane, true divided lites. Chair Spang asked about an existing garden out front, which Mr. Pitman suggested will be replaced with raised brick patio and potted plants.

Mr. Meche asked a special permit will be required. Mr. Pitman responded in the affirmative, noting that he wants to work through details with SHC first and then go to ZBA. Mr. Joyce expressed favor for the planned design. Mr. Joyce's preference for window is to leave as-is because taller window is calling out the main entrance in the proposal. Mr. Joyce advocated against making the various windows compete with each other and voiced the need for more detail on door surroundings. Mr. Joyce called attention to Ionic style door surround on the main entrance, and perhaps the need for Tuscan or Doric style for secondary entrances, which would be more fitting for utilitarian space. Mr. Joyce questioned whether incising of panels would be appropriate for the back part of the house. Noting that a panel baluster is too busy for refined Federal home, Mr. Joyce advised looking at roof balustrades on other homes in the area.

Mr. Meche asked about placement of shutters; some exist in the existing photos, but not in the drawings. Mr. Pitman noted that this was an error with the images presented; shutters *should* be on the drawings but are not. Chair Spang noted that this is a beautiful old house and one of Salem's finest, and advised caution as a Commission in responding to this plan given that this work would forever change a period piece. Chair Spang discussed the uses of old summer kitchens as integral to the function of old houses, and also questioned dichotomy between utilitarian and formal characters of the house; and stressed the importance of thinking about the back house as utilitarian because it was not the part of house at the front but rather a site of work and activity. Chair Spang also noted preference to keep wall of addition parallel to Oliver Street rather than more skewed as shown in the site plan.

Mr. Pitman noted that owner's intent is to have more right angles and would deliver Mr. Spang's perspectives regarding utilitarian versus formal characteristics of the home.

Mr. Meche noted that the new facade that is not parallel to street is actually parallel to the main façade. Mr. Meche asked if Mr. Pitman has tested the notion of an addition versus relocation of a wall.

Public comment:

Richard Hamel, lives directly across Oliver, was very supportive of the proposal and cited the favor of other residents in building in which he lives. Mr. Hamel was not in favor of panel balustrade over a tall building, and cited preference to see more of a classic look to match other properties in area. Favor was also expressed for shutters on the addition.

Russell Slam, Forrester Street, asked if the elevator was a dumbwaiter or a real elevator, to which Mr. Pitman noted that a real residential elevator is being proposed. Chair Spang asked if the override will be taken care of so that the elevator does pop up over the roof.

Mr. Pitman asked for clarification regarding the concerns raised over the addition being parallel to street versus square to the building, noting that the owner prefers that the addition is square to the building. Mr. Meche noted his fondness for trapezoids, and Chair Spang again drew attention to how the planned addition will front onto Oliver Street. Mr. Pitman noted the owners' desire to retain the elegance of brick.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to continue the application to the next scheduled meeting on July 21st and to schedule a site visit. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

19 Chestnut Street

Nathalie Binney and Henry Binney III submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter garage doors.

Documents & Exhibits

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

Lydia Syzdlowska of PionArch Architecture and Interiors was present on behalf of Ms. Binney. The project is for 1805 Federal style house and barn behind. The structure currently has big garage door and side entry, and the proposal is to change to two garage doors, as well as to carry out siding replacement in kind with no color change. Existing conditions photos were shown; barn-style looking door which is not operable. Due to a recent accident, the owner would like to replace with something more fitting to her needs, i.e., remote control-operated doors, potentially two doors. A demolition plan was shown to remove some interior walls as well as garage door and side entry door. An exterior elevation showed the desire plan for a northwest garage door, proposed to be white in color with black hardware (i.e., black powder coat finish). Ms. Syzdlowska looked at existing doors in the area with the applicant and did not find much consistency. The proposed door type is Eolos with no window.

Mr. Meche asked whether the doors being proposed would swing, to which Ms. Syzdlowska answered that they would be overhead doors controlled with a door opener. Mr. Meche noted that the planned door is a sectional door rather than cantilever. Ms. Syzdlowska elaborated that V groove standard vertical boards would be used within the doors, which would be obtained via Heritage Classic, with white trim color. Ms. Syzdlowska asked if Keystone would be an acceptable add-on. Mr. Joyce noted that the whole building is beautiful as a vernacularly plain structure, and that a plain approach should be maintained rather than Keystone. Ms. Syzdlowska expressed openness to going with two total panels on the doors rather than four. Mr. Joyce noted a need to revisit strap hinges as the ones shown seemed too small.

Mr. Cutting asked to see existing photos. Mr. Joyce noted that the hinges on existing doors match the hay loft door; continuing to match those styles would be ideal. Mr. Cutting asked for confirmation that the planned site is visible straight down the sidewalk from the street. Mr. Meche asked if barn was built when the building was built, to which Ms. Syzdlowska noted that the original is dated 1805. Ms. Kelleher noted that the inventory form is in the "Share" folder; and more to the point that all barns on Chestnut have been inventoried as part of a survey project. Carriage house says circa 1805, which would be contemporaneous with the house, according to Ms. Kelleher. Chair Spang cited photos from 1996 which appear different from visuals that the Commission was presented with. Chair Spang noted that faux garage barn doors are becoming more utilized and agreed with Mr. Joyce as to the need to stay simple and keep details basic.

Chair Spang voiced favor for solid paneling or windows, i.e., "C" series options in the catalog presented, some of which were solid panels (C000S) or (C006S). Mr. Meche noted that the existing door is taller than the one that applicant is attempting to add. Ms. Syzdlowska noted that the applicant has reduced the height to 7'6" and wants to go with pure white for the color of the door and trim (which would result in the alteration of one existing brown door to two white doors). Mr. Joyce voiced favor for retaining the existing color. Mr. Meche said it might make sense to trim it with one frame and a middle vertical. Mr. Meche proposed using more trim in the middle. Chair Spang also voiced desire for seeing a continuous lentil across the top.

Mr. Cutting voiced opposition against the proposed alterations to a very visible and pristine house, favoring the simplicity of the existing garage doors. Doubling out and bringing in faux modern items would be inappropriate to a structure that currently exists in perfect utilitarian simplicity.

Mr. Martinez noted a massing issue of changing one big door to two big doors and proposed perhaps doing one big door and reducing the size of the door on the right side of the garage. Mr. Joyce noted that two doors would be more appropriate than one door, and encouraged simplifying the doors, trim, model, and hardware. Mr. Joyce also questioned the value of having hardware on the doors.

Chair Spang noted that pending details make the board inclined to return having done revisions. Mr. Meche expressed openness to visit the site.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue the application to the next scheduled meeting on July 21, 2021. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

44 Derby Street

Kate Lerner and Adam Liebowitz submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fence and gate.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/7/21
- Photographs

Adam Liebowitz was present.

Mr. Liebowitz presented his application noting that he had original requested stockade design to his contractor who recommended that a board and/or picket fence be used instead. Applicant would prefer traditional board and showed catalog for Reliable fence. Chair Spang asked what heights are being proposed to which the applicant specified 4' high all around, posts 5'x5'. An existing quote for the project was shown. Mr. Meche asked if this will be painted or be left natural (to which the applicant answered "natural"); Mr. Meche advised using cedar. Mr. Meche noted that this may be the same dowel board, flat panel kind of fence recently seen in a recent application on Broad Street. Mr. Joyce asked if applicant knows how the fence will be constructed. The quote presented noted that trim would be 1x2 Dado. Chair Spang said height makes it less of a concern at 4' and advised the applicant to try to make panel read as a continuous flush surface. Mr. Martinez noted the need to avoid having the post(s) visible from the front of the property; and that they should rather be behind the fence. Chair Spang used 66 Derby Street fence as a model to emulate and to demonstrate Mr. Martinez's comments regarding making the fence read as a single panel.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve application to replace approximately 28 linear feet of fencing, solid board, 4' height with all supporting posts hidden behind run of fencing. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Mr. Meche motioned to amend motion to specify use of unpainted cedar. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

13 Chestnut Street

Nicholas Kiefer and Jennifer Rousseau Kieffer submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter rear deck.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/2/21
- Photographs
- Intex Millwork Hampton brochure

Nicholas and Jennifer Kieffer were present.

Applicants performed extensive exterior renovation in 2017. Due to exposure to sun and unnecessary use of ice melt and traction aids in wintertime, railings of decking have not lasted; Mr. Kieffer presented proof of damage over span of five years. The applicants want to obtain and use a product that looks the same but will endure. AZEK rail was mentioned as used by Walpole woodworkers; a solid PVC product

known as Intex that is paintable and indistinguishable from well-finished wood product. Mr. Cutting, Ms. Kelleher, and Mr. Martinez had conducted a site visit earlier in the day. Mr. Kieffer noted that the railings would be painted Navajo White to match existing paint and trim of the home. The garage was painted in 2015, and the homeowners are currently repainting and residing. Mr. Cutting noted that the Commission can accept the proposed material despite being faux item/product. Mr. Cutting further noted that the railings will be visible from the street and that they Commission should generally remain on guard against such products though they could be suitable for this particular application and perform better than wood products (without setting precedents). Mr. Martinez noted that the Commission has approved similar types of products in applications such as decking. Ms. Kelleher pointed out that unlike some other vinyl products with hangers, all fasteners and hangers on this product are hidden, and thus better replicate the desired appearance over other alternatives. Mr. Martinez affirmed that spacing of the balusters can match the existing spacing. The planned product is akin to a Hampton Extruded Rail System. Mr. Meche asked if the image/product shown is the only bottom rail available and expressed disfavor for opening in lower portion of bottom rail upon viewing in person.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve application to install Intex rail system at rear entry, flat rail, and peaked cap. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Mr. Meche moved to amend the motion to specify Hampton style. Chair Spang moved to amend to specify need to paint Navajo White to match. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

123 Federal Street

Paige Dunsmore submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for architectural roof shingles.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/15/21
- Photographs

Paige Dunsmore and Cali Fidopiastis were present. In back of house is area that is attic and was found to be leaking fairly substantially. The worker contracted for roofing put a piece of plastic in as a stopgap, but previous owner had to have known there was a leak. Ms. Fidopiastis noted that applicant was given option of replacing roof to both the main house and carriage house. The Commission was provided with samples that the contractor provided, Landmark Pro, and charcoal black was selected. The applicant expressed openness to whatever the Commission finds appropriate in terms of appearance and longevity of the house. Chair Spang inquired as to whether gutters and flashing are being changed. Shingles go up the side of the dormer, and applicant will be doing something similar. Ms. Fidopiastis noted that only the roof is going to be replaced, nothing else will be removed or replaced. Mr. Joyce noted that shingles ought to have an angular cut to replicate look of wood shingles. When angular cuts are added, they become prominent in the sunlight. Mr. Joyce noted that IKO Cambridge Line has been approved. Ms. Dunsmore noted that wood behind the gutter had been a huge problem and would perhaps need to be braced due to rot. Chair Spang noted that repairs in kind can be approved quickly when non-applicability is determined. Ms. Fidopiastis asked if preference was held between Dual Black or Charcoal Grey. The board had no preference between the two. Mr. Martinez proposed changing shingles to siding on the dormer in the future. Ms. Kelleher noted that alterations to dormer should be applied for and advertised for a future application and hearing.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the application with the change that new roof singles be IKO Cambridge in either Dual Black or Charcoal Grey color with final selection to be determined by owner. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

1 Forrester Street

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/17/21
- Photographs

Joshua and Jennifer McGregor were present.

Mr. McGregor noted that the applicants would like shade on their patio following an abutting neighbor having cut down a tree which had served as the sole shade for 1 Forrester. Mr. Meche noted that what is being proposed is more like a fence because it is vertical. Chair Spang asked for clarification as to the pergola's distance from the house as well as its dimensions, which were determined to be 10' x 13'. The space is free standing and does not touch the house. If a kit will be purchased, Mr. Meche proposed that the Commission would like to see it. The applicants' intent would be to have ivy grow over the planned pergola. Mr. Cutting asked how visible this would be from Forrester Street. Mr. Martinez noted having to recuse himself as an abutter to the property, though he did attest to the voraciousness of the ivy. Mr. Meche noted that the redwood kit was confusing; cedar would make more sense and be more readily available and indigenous to the area. Chair Spang established that natural over painted wood was planned, which Mr. McGregor confirmed. Mr. McGregor asked about the guidelines for putting up impermanent structures, for instance if the pergola was a disposable seasonal structure to be taken down in winter months. Mr. Cutting questioned as to whether a pergola has ever been approved during his tenure on the Commission. Ms. Kelleher noted that a property on Essex (which won a preservation award) had a pergola. Mr. Joyce spoke to the history of the pergola and advised that the applicants' approach be as simple as possible; creating a simple structure that exists to serve a singular purpose. Applicants noted concern as to keeping the structure painted white. Chair Spang noted that Walpole Outdoors make pergolas out of synthetic material which could be painted white. Applicants noted that they were given an \$86,000 quote for a historic fence. Mr. Cutting expressed the need for clearer dimensions. Mr. Meche noted that increased clarity in an applicant's presentation would make the application more effective.

Public comment:

Russell Slam, 9 Forrester Street, noted that he has a pergola in his backyard and that many exist throughout Salem, e.g., the Ropes Mansion was cited. Mr. Slam was understanding of the applicants' predicament with lacking shade on the property. Mr. Slam expressed the desire to see pergola painted white as an appropriate color, and voiced caution that the structure does not stand out too much.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue discussion of the pergola to the next meeting on July 21, 2021. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez abstained; Cutting, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Nomination of Mark Pattison to continue to serve as representative to Community Preservation Committee

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve Mr. Pattison's re-nomination. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Cutting, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

Mr. Martinez noted that the Commission does not currently have a vice chair. Ms. Kelleher asked if members would like to add this issue to the next meeting.

Ms. Kelleher spoke to the extent of work being undertaken in the city without approval.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the feasibility and logistics of hybrid meetings need to be addressed moving forward.

Adjournment

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Reed seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:37PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Dan Graham, Historical Commission Clerk