

DRAFT
SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
August 1, 2018

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, August 1, 2018 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, David Hart, Mark Pattison, Larry Spang.

245 Lafayette Street - continuation

Continental Condominium Trust submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for balcony alterations

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/1/18
- Photographs
- Drawings by Gray Architects

Colleen Brewster of Gray Architects and Robert Polanski of Gibraltar Management were present.

Mr. Polanski discussed the replacing the cantilevered balconies versus replacing with columns. He relayed his experience with cantilevered balconies, noting that the support members extend twice as far into the building as they extend outwards. In order to re-support cantilevered balconies, the contractor would have to go into the units. He noted his concern about OSHA and building codes. He wasn't sure if residents would have to be located in that scenario but noted it would be at a minimum highly disruptive. To replace the existing cantilevered system would be extremely expensive. The building owner was seeking an economical solution that was also aesthetically appropriate.

Ms. Brewster presented two options: one with columns/post supporting balconies at the balcony corners and the other option to set back the posts under the balcony. Mr. Polanski noted that the recessed option would be more beneficial for plowing the parking area.

Mr. Spang asked if the balconies would be rebuilt or renovated. Mr. Polanski replied that they would be entirely rebuilt.

Ms. Bellin asked if the bollards in the parking area would be in the same locations in both options. Ms. Brewster replied that they would be in slightly different locations as shown in the two plans.

Mr. Spang asked if finished posts will be 4x4 in both options. Ms. Brewster replied that they may be 6x6.

Ms. Herbert asked if posts will be metal. Ms. Brewster replied that posts will be metal wrapped in PVC material and painted. The posts will be 3x3 steel columns wrapped.

Mr. Pattison asked if the beams could be supported through the basement then no support would be required at grade. Mr. Polanski replied that it might be ok for first floor balconies but upper floors would still need support posts. Mr. Pattison asked if heavier steel could be used. Mr. Polanski replied that it would be expensive and would still need posts. Ms. Brewster stated that a structural engineer would be required to determine whether the support would be adequate. Ms. Herbert asked what the gain would be for that option. Mr. Pattison stated that the option would allow the elimination of the bollards in the parking area. Ms. Herbert noted that would still have parking driving into area of first floor balconies.

Mr. Spang suggested that by recessing the posts it might give the illusion of a cantilever. He agreed that it was unlikely the balconies could be rebuilt as they were originally designed. He noted that in option 2 the drop beam could be recessed into the roof above which would eliminate them from view and suggested that the thickness of the posts be increased as they appear undersized.

Ms. Herbert suggested the posts match the existing posts on the front of the building.

Mr. Polanski noted that the posts will be 4x4 once wrapped.

Ms. Kelleher suggested that handrail wrap around the posts to provide the same appearance of a visual balustrade as seen on the existing cantilevered balcony. Mr. Spang agreed. Ms. Brewster asked whether railings should bump out or if posts should be recessed to accommodate a continuous handrail.

Ms. Herbert suggested that the posts be painted out to recede. Mr. Pattison asked if they should be painted brick color.

Ms. Herbert suggested the following: recess beams and hide in decking above, continuous railing, paint out posts to match railing color, and posts at grade to match color of foundation.

Mr. Spang asked if current balconies have finished ceilings. Ms. Brewster replied that originally, the balconies did have finished ceilings but they were removed due to deterioration.

Mr. Polanski stated his preference for staining the pressure treated beams dark or to match the trim color and that the ceilings remain open.

Ms. Herbert asked if the open ceilings allow water to drip from balcony above. Mr. Polanski replied yes.

Mr. Spang asked for the deck material. Ms. Brewster replied Trex decking. She noted that a perforated ceiling could be used to allow water drainage. Ms. Herbert suggested that this option would look more finished. Mr. Polanski asked if it should be the same color. Mr. Pattison suggested a darker color. Ms. Bellin asked if the tenants would prefer a lighter color. Mr. Pattison agreed that a lighter color for the ceiling would be a more aesthetically pleasing for tenants using the balconies.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment and asked tenants in the audience if they were in support of the proposed plans. Tenants in the audience expressed their support.

Mr. Spang suggested that the applicant provide updated drawings and continue to the next meeting.

Ms. Bellin noted that the Commission would only be able to approve in concept without revised plans.

Leslie Niemi, Unit 1D, asked for confirmation on whether the underneath of the balconies would be covered or if the beams would be left exposed.

Ms. Herbert replied that beams would be covered.

Ms. Kelleher noted that to continue the application, the applicant would need to request the application be continued past the 60 day review period.

Ms. Brewster agreed to the extension request.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor (Mr. Hart abstained) and the motion so carried.

67-69 Bridge Street - continuation

71 Bridge Street LLC submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance application to demolish a rear barn.

Documents & Exhibits

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

Attorney Stephen Lovely representing the applicant of 71 Bridge Street LLC was present to discuss the project.

Chair Herbert stated that the Commission had discussed and received revisions over the course of this review which she has reviewed. She reported that she had researched the Victorian building for any missing details and made sure that any dormers were recessed from the edge. However, she noted that this house had no dormers. The house does have bay windows on the sides and after reviewing other Victorian homes in the City that had a mixture of details, she felt that a dormer connected to the bay window was a typical Victorian element. A typical design was a gable dormer on the left-hand side and a shed dormer on the right, which is what she suggested and what they included in their proposed design. This home had a lot of Victorian details which she recommended for the upper section of the design and hoods over the windows.

Chair Herbert reported that at 67-69 Bridge Street there was a complication with the expense of the dormers, so she suggested going up one more floor and adding a hip roof. The owners want to stay within their budget but prefer a product that would bring them more income. She noted her desire to make this project successful because of what else has occurred on Bridge Street that isn't within the Historic Commission's purview. Mr. Spang asked if the owner and builder were in favor of all the suggestions. Atty. Lovely replied yes and noted that the changes were approved by ZBA.

Chair Herbert stated that she has no issues with removing the barn which has been altered too much.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Hart requested photographs, dimensioned plans and elevations of the interior and exterior of the barn prior to its demolition.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish the rear barn. Mr. Spang seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

31 Broad Street

Matthew and Ellen Marshall submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter exterior for blown-in insulation (after the fact)

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/21/18
- Photographs

Matt Marshall of 31 Broad Street was present to discuss the project.

Chair Herbert stated that insulation was blown in by drilling holes in the existing shiplap siding. Most, but not all of the holes, are invisible and the Historic Commission would have requested that the clapboards be removed first. The remaining visible holes need to be finished better.

Ms. Kelleher asked if the added insulation occurred at the front façade only. Mr. Marshall replied yes, the work was done in April through the Mass Save program, and the work was completed in 1-day due to the cold temperature.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the plugs are more pronounced in person. Mr. Beauregard noted that well-seasoned wood such as Mahogany or Spanish Cedar, with a straight grain that runs sideways should be glued in place, instead of pine which appear to have shrunk. Ms. Kelleher asked if blown-in insulation was placed in the attic. Mr. Marshall replied no, the exterior walls only.

Mr. Spang asked if Mass Save would do the repair work. Mr. Marshall replied that he would hire someone else. Mr. Spang requested that a mock-up of a plug be installed for the Commission to review and approve first. Chair Herbert suggested a continuance until after a mock-up is done in the fall. Ms. Kelleher noted that this application is beyond the 60 days. Chair Herbert suggested they extend that deadline to November and stated that if a mock-up is completed sooner to let Ms. Kelleher know so the Commission can review it. Mr. Beauregard recommended to Mr. Marshall that a linseed oil primer be used along with a straight grain Spanish Cedar or Mahogany.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to extend to November. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Hart added that the attic should be insulated first since heat rises and less air leaks out the walls of a facades. Also, blowing insulation into a cavity wall without a vapor barrier means they run the risk of moisture getting in and the wood rotting. Ms. Kelleher stated that this insulation method should be added to their design guides.

126 Derby Street

Michael Giardi and Douglas Lowe submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter storefront.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/28/18
- Photographs
- Plans by Siemasko + Verbridge Architects

Brian Stein of Siemasko + Verbridge Architects, representing owner Ben Carolson, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Stein stated that their client wants to change windows that are currently 1-foot off the floor. The property use is residential, and they are proposing a Marvin 5' wide double-hung, similar to what currently exists. The initial application was for 2 double hung windows.

Chair Herbert noted the tremendous traffic in this area and questioned whether a resident would want to open the windows. She suggested whether the small windows could be operable instead or installing a double sash windows on either side of the house, one that overlooks the park and another on the porch facing the neighboring building, which would provide cross ventilation and not change the storefront at the front of the building, and this space could become a study or an extra bedroom. The first floor was converted to residential years ago.

Chair Herbert noted that the existing second floor windows are 2/2 not 2/1 and asked if they will they be restored. Mr. Stein replied that they would remain, and no other replacement windows are proposed.

Chair Herbert noted that the supporting turn posts had been boxed in and if one doesn't exist that it would be important for a new one to match. Mr. Stein replied that Mr. Carolson had planned on leaving it as is, but they will look into it.

Mr. Cutting asked if the existing storefront windows were fixed and if the entire unit would need to be rebuilt. Mr. Stein reiterated the concern with the sills being 10-12" off the floor. Chair Herbert noted that there may have been pedestals to conceal heating elements, but the sidewalk is busy. Mr. Spang noted that the storefront reflects a change on Derby Street from the 1900-1950's when it was a commercial street. It shows the transition from residential to commercial and he can imagine it being restored instead of making it more residential which denies it's history. They should keep as much as it can the way it is with some minor tweaks.

Chair Herbert added the window paint is peeling but wood is in good shape. Ms. Kelleher noted that the owners of 107 Federal investigated adding double glazing into the existing framing and reusing the muntin bars. Mr. Hart stated that the existing storefront windows could be easily restored, and interior storm windows installed without changing the exterior appearance. This is a nice example of an 1870's renovation and adding side windows would be a good option to consider. Windows down to the floor or near it exists elsewhere in the city. Mr. Spang stated that operable front windows is counterintuitive since it would become a large window to move. He suggested the applicant check property code requirements for windows on the side. Mr. Stein noted that they can't change the angled windows and save the front facing window because it is all one unit. Chair Herbert noted the boxed-in post at the corner and the continuous sash. Ms. Kelleher indicated that the staff memo includes an image of the continuous trim. Mr. Spang stated that a Marvin window doesn't belong at the storefront.

Chair Herbert noted that the trash barrels could be moved elsewhere and not along the neighbor's home. Mr. Stein replied that the Mr. Carolson would seek permission to install a fence along the neighboring property along the rear of the walkway. Ms. Kelleher noted that the applicant will be heard at the next meeting for paint colors, fence, and shutters so the fence discussion can be continued. Chair Herbert note that two double-hung windows on either side of the building would be less expensive than oversized Marvin replacement windows in the storefront which will allow for cross-ventilation and the operable windows being off the street. She also suggested a new fence across the entire front to make the entrance more private and hide the trash barrels. Mr. Spang suggested the fence be set back from the street to create a streetscape. Brian noted that replacing the cracked concrete with brick pavers and replacing the concrete steps with granite will also be presented at the next meeting. Mr. Carolson has also requested to replace the flat rubber roof in kind before the next meeting using the same drip edge. Chair Herbert replied that replacement in kind is fine especially since it can't be seen. Ms. Kelleher stated that that work would require that an Application for Non-Applicability be submitted prior to the start of the roof work.

Mr. Hart requested that all future revised plans be dated. Chair Herbert requested that the upper level windows are shown as 2/2 and the owner explore opening the boxed-in post to see if the posts still exists. Ms. Kelleher shall provide the applicant with a list of window restorers. Chair Herbert reiterated that the period post no longer exists it should be replaced to maintain the period of the structure. Mr. Spang suggested that the previous post rotted due to contact and was replaced with a simpler post.

Ms. Kelleher suggested that historic tax credits be used for the renovation. Chair Herbert suggested the applicant check with the adjacent building owner and the property line to find an appropriate trash barrel location behind a fence and to bring the fence design to the next meeting, as well as period granite step photos. Ms. Kelleher suggested the tenants use its own's yard with no trash barrels.

Chair Herbert asked the applicant to bring photo of typical period granite steps, fence design details, fence door & location, fence height, materials & paint color to the next meeting. Mr. Stein stated that the shutters & sash will be painted "Kendall Charcoal", the clapboards "Coventry Gray", and the trim "Philipsburg Blue." All paint will be manufactured by Benjamin Moore.

Mr. Hart noted that the Mass Historic MACRIS website has two photographs from 1995 of the property showing the post as boxed in and it lists the dates of construction as 1870 and 1912.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue to the next regularly scheduled meeting on August 15, 2018. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

28 Carlton/100 Derby Street

Philip & Martine Shea submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a partial roof replacement.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/12/18
- Photographs

Philip & Martine Shea were present to discuss the project.

Chair Herbert noted the Historic Commissions preference for architectural shingles. Ms. Kelleher noted that it is unknown what shingles exists on the roof. Mr. Shea stated that the existing shingles are faded, buckling and rippling. There has been some water damage to the interior and the existing skylight will be replaced with the same skylight. The new shingle color will match the existing color. The shingles on the opposite side of the roof are the same color and the Contractors told them the architectural shingles on the other side are guaranteed for life so there is no need to replace them.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the proposed shingles haven't been approved in the past unless it was on the upper section of a mansard roof. Mr. Beauregard indicated the flair on the shingle. Mr. Spang noted that the shingle on the opposite side of the roof is architectural. Ms. Kelleher noted the three-dimensional profile on the opposite roof and the Commission has approved CertainTeed Hatteras and GAF Slateline which wouldn't match because of their flatter surface. Chair Herbert suggested the applicant match what exists. Ms. Bellin noted that the house currently has two different roof shingles that have looked this way for over 20 years and the applicant should stick with what is generally approved since the highly visible side of the roof as to not set a precedent. Mr. Hart agreed. Mr. Spang presented the CertainTeed Landmark shingle with a more angled cut. Mr. Hart noted that the Hatteras shingle has a straighter cut. Mr. Shea replied that he prefers the Slateline or Hatteras and requested to eliminate the proposed shingle.

There was no public comment:

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to allow replacement of the roof shingles with GAF Slateline or CertainTeed Hatteras in a dark charcoal color. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

34 Summer Street

Rem Lee submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to move a stone curb

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/18/18
- Photographs

Rem Lee, owner, was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the application is to remove the dressed granite wall similar to 14 Hodges Court where the applicant wanted to remove the fence to create parking. Chair Herbert stated this project has been discussed with the neighbors, asked for the available width to the neighboring building, and if the granite wall would need to be removed. Mr. Lee replied approximately 10-feet and yes, the wall would need to be removed. Chair Herbert noted that the space seems very narrow and may not be sized to fit a legal space with the front stairs in place. It would also be immediately next to the neighboring house. Mr. Lee replied that the Engineering Department recommended that he speak to some contractor's, but the stone curb would need to be removed. Mr. Spang asked if the property

line goes up to the house next door. Mr. Lee replied that the plot plan indicated the property line and the requirement is that the space must be two-feet away from the neighbor's property line. The walkway is 4.13-feet wide, the stone curb is 5.28-feet wide, totaling approximately 9 1/2-feet wide and 17-feet in available length. Chair Herbert noted that with the required 2-foot clearance the remaining 7 1/2 -feet width is enough for a legal parking space and neither is the length, a legal space is 9-feet wide x 19-feet long and the new space must meet code. Mr. Lee noted that other homes in the neighborhood have smaller spaces.

Mr. Hart asked if the parking space has been explored with the Engineering Department. Ms. Kelleher noted that they haven't reviewed it officially since they haven't received a finished plan, although they had some reservations on whether a legal space could fit. Chair Herbert stated that they don't need an official review, the granite is nice and fits the space, and a parking space would be inappropriate and won't meet code. Mr. Hart noted that what meets code is a higher priority to aesthetics. Chair Herbert asked Mr. Lee to check with the Building Inspector to determine what is legal. Mr. Lee noted that the Building Inspector referred him to Engineering and he wanted a space because it is difficult to find parking after snowstorms.

Public comment:

Janice LeBell, 1 Chestnut Street, stated that the property line is at the face of the brick and this parking space would be a dramatic encroachment of space in a very dense area and would allow exhaust fumes to enter her home and would create a health risk for her husband and his quality of life whose oxygen tanks abut that wall. She noted that the applicant purchased the property without a parking space and the proposal would be a gross derogation of the historic intent.

Chair Herbert read a letter sent by Dr. Richard LeBell opposing the removal of the stone curb to create a parking space.

Nina Anderson, 5 Chestnut Street, provided a letter opposing the creation of this parking space.

Ms. Kelleher noted that other letters in opposition were also submitted.

Bonnie Henry, 36 Summer Street, stated that the granite piece is continuous from the applicant's property to the LeBell property. Ms. Kelleher noted that these properties were once owned by one family.

Mr. Lee noted that he can hear a neighboring HVAC system running from inside of his house and wants to make a home for whoever purchases it by including parking. Chair Herbert added that the home was previously used by a psychiatrist who saw patients at the home who had no issue with there being no parking.

Mr. Hart stated it must be established whether a legal parking space can fit in this location. Dr. LeBell's letter indicated that he contacted the Building Department who said no and when Ms. Kelleher contacted the Inspector's office they indicated that there may be a problem, so it's premature to deal with the granite removal. Chair Herbert replied that the proposed driveway is not their concern, it's whether the granite should remain in place because historically it's an important facet to the property especially since it extends to the neighboring property. This decision could be overridden by the Building Inspector, but the Historic Commission would need a statement from the Building Department. Ms. Kelleher noted that they wouldn't provide a statement without a plan. Chair Herbert stated that the ZBA requires a variance for a smaller parking space but without more information this application shouldn't have come before them at all.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to deny the removal of the granite curb. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

182 Federal Street – requested to continue to the 8/15/18 Meeting

Krystal and Trevor Meek submitted an application for a Certificate of Non-Applicability and a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter the rear deck railings.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant submitted a Certificate of Non-Applicability stating that the new work. The new work is visible, so she changed the application to a Certificate of Appropriateness and if the Commission feels that the work is visible it will be added to the agenda at the next public hearing. The applicant installed vinyl sleeves around the wood posts on their deck, the applicant has changed the material. Ms. Bellin acknowledged that the photos indicate that the work is minorly visible. The Commission agreed that the new work was visible from Federal Street and would need to be heard at the next meeting. Ms. Kelleher stated that she will ask the applicant to provide as-built photos.

Other Business

Philips Library, (PEM): Chair Herbert stated that replacement of the Palladian window with a door in front of Plummer Hall may have been included in their presentation but was not indicated. The new walkways and opening the fence to provide gates also weren't discussed. Ms. Kelleher stated that the Philips Library project is before the SRA and DRB and submitted plans showing a elements. She listed to the recording and the minutes and Mr. Spang's motion was specific that the stairs go back in front of Plummer Hall and the changes to Daland as shown on the plans were approved. Chair Herbert noted that the balustrade on the roof were also discussed but were not covered in the Historic Commission's motion either. She spoke about this at the recent ZBA and DRB meetings. Ms. Kelleher noted that Mr. Monk informed her that their current design is what was submitted to Mass Historic, the SRA and the DRB. Chair Hebert noted that the revised summary calls for replicating the stairs rather than relocating the existing stairs in front of Plummer Hall and retaining the historic fabric. Mr. Spang noted that the previous plans indicate "Relocated, Restored or Replicated Brownstone Stair" so the applicant may have decided the stairs can't be moved and must be replicated. Chair Herbert agreed. Ms. Bellin requested that the applicant return to the Historic Commission to present the revised plans. Ms. Kelleher replied that several items presented to the SRA will have to return to the Commission for review; however, she will request that the applicant submit a new application and the associated changes, and she will provide the Commission with what they last reviewed and approved. Chair Hebert asked the Commission to consider whether the replicated stairs in front of Plummer Hall should go into the ground as they currently do in front of Daland House to indicate that they are no longer in use.

Superior Court and County Commissioners Buildings: Ms. Kelleher stated that Governor Baker has signed over the court buildings to the SRA but it will be a long process. The construction crew is currently repointing and replacing damaged bricks to make the building water tight, although they didn't specify a difference between the mortar color for the granite versus the brick. A cleaner did discolor the copper flashing but that was restored. The Planning Department will put out an RFP and there is a preference to include the Registry of Deeds as a tenant or purchaser of the space unless no developers include that as an option. Mr. Cutting about potential future uses for the building. Ms. Kelleher replied that DCAM did a study 1 year ago and residential was the most feasible use for the buildings. The City could do an RFI instead of an RFP without specifying a use to allow developers to determine a future use, but they want to keep the law library open to the public instead of a private use. Chair Hebert suggested a hotel/condominium use above and a restaurant at the lower level.

Chair Herbert stated that she wants to ask the Mayor to allow Ms. McCrea to stay on until the end of her term despite having moved out of Salem.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to adjourn at 9:02pm. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner