

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
August 4, 2021

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, August 4, 2021 at 6:00 pm via **Zoom Virtual Meeting**. Present were: Patti Kelleher, Milo Martinez, Larry Spang, Mark Meche, Vijay Joyce, Rebecca English, Stacey Norkun, Mark Pattison. Not present: Reed Cutting, Erin Schaeffer.

Salem Common -- continuation

The City of Salem submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for installing benches.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/6/21
- Photographs
- Specs/drawings
- Site plan

The city is proposing to add additional benches to the Common which are more accessible. Raymond Jodoin was present on behalf of the city. Mr. Jodoin specified that four benches from Dumor series 492 are intended to be installed along existing ADA pads. The locations were marked in green on the spec/site plan. The benches will have no railings; a stone dust path will be available to access them, particularly for persons with mobility issues. Existing benches pictured in yellow would be moved and spaced accordingly and equally. The new and existing benches are of the same style as the Dumor 492 series, with the exception that there are no handrails on new benches. Equally spacing the benches will make the benches aesthetically pleasing. The stone pathways to these benches will allow persons to transition themselves onto the benches. Chair Spang asked about paint color, to which Mr. Jodoin noted that traditional black would be used for railing and the wood type would be ipe, a natural hardwood. Mr. Meche and Mr. Joyce expressed favor towards the design and longevity of the benches.

Mr. Meche inquired as to the cost of the benches, to which Mr. Jodoin noted that the expense was approximately \$1600 per bench.

Public comment:

Alan Hanscom, lives near Common, frequents the space very often and noted the popularity of the existing benches. Mr. Hanscom also noted seeing travelers in wheelchairs and speculated that the benches would be a welcome addition. Mr. Hanscom inquired as to whether the Commission on Disability was aware of these additions. Mr. Jodoin noted that no contact had been made as of yet, but that communication may take place in the future.

Milo Martinez (as a public commenter) noted that the Salem Common Neighborhood Association is very much in favor of these additions to the Common.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to accept the application as submitted for addition of Dumor benches. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez (abstained), Meche, English, Norkun, Pattison, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

18 Chestnut Street - continuation

Dorothy Kelleher requested a continuation for an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fence.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue the application to the next scheduled meeting on August 18, 2021. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Norkun, Pattison, Joyce, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

2 Oliver Street - continuation

Peter Pitman submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace rear addition.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/11/21
- Photographs
- Architectural drawings by Pitman & Wardley

Peter Pitman of Pitman and Wardley Associates was present. Mr. Pitman noted that during a past meeting, four board members had been averse to the perpendicular approach of the new design. One member was not supportive of either proposed option but rather keeping the structure as-is. Another member was less concerned about the perpendicular or angular orientation of the addition but rather about materiality. Mr. Pitman noted that Gayle has not been consulted as of yet to modify the plan. Mr. Pitman showed the existing conditions. A key point from past meeting was to preserve the far corners of the addition, enmeshing new with old in a practical manner. Preserving corners made the addition feel more additive than just tearing down and building new. Mr. Pitman noted that the new design shown reflects the original angle of building and reduced the size of the planned addition. An existing wall on the west end of the property will now be able to be left intact and completely preserved. The patio was also pulled back to leave space for planting, greenspace, and to foster a buffer zone between the fence and sidewalk. Mr. Pitman showed the addition's setback in an elevation drawing and noted that the original placement of the door would be maintained. The windows on the addition were also made larger. Mr. Pitman indicated that the owner is still inclined to keep the shutters, retaining brick, and remaining as close as possible to the existing brick. Mr. Pitman cited that other federal homes have brick additions while some have clapboard additions (and even some wood homes have brick additions). In keeping with the client's wishes and neighborhood's character, Mr. Pitman noted the intent to move forward with the planned use of brick on the addition.

Mr. Pitman provided an update to note that nothing will be done with the existing fence, though there is a plan to come back before the Commission with a more modest presentation in the future. The existing fence may be better to leave in place during construction to limit dust, debris, and other materials from leaving the site.

Mr. Pitman showed the existing skew. One window had not been accurately represented on a past presentation but was remedied in the new images.

Mr. Joyce asked if Mr. Pitman is looking for conditional approval so that the client can move forward to the Zoning Board. Mr. Pitman responded to note that general approval was being sought regarding the massing, character, and overall materiality of project, with the understanding that Mr. Pitman will return with handrail, shutter, and door/window catalogs to discuss more specific details at a future meeting. Mr. Joyce noted that the progress has come a long way, particularly lauding the summer kitchen alterations, shutters, and so forth. Mr. Joyce expressed general approval but was open to discussion from other board members.

Mr. Meche agreed that the geometry of what is being proposed has moved forward nicely. Mr. Meche did not feel strongly about materiality and did not mind the bricks used on the new addition. Mr. Meche drew attention to the size of the summer kitchen door(s), noting that he would rather not see columns or plasters flanking them, or a balustrade. Mr. Pattison expressed curiosity as to the extent of the projection of the doorway on the addition, asking how far it will come out (to which Mr. Pitman noted "about four feet"). Mr. Pattison also expressed approval for the shutterless buffer zone between the two parts of the house. Mr. Pitman noted that the back wall is a party wall.

Mr. Joyce asked for clarification on the conditional approval: in terms of massing, Mr. Joyce asked if the board would be approving the patterns and sizes of windows; or was the board simply being consulted as to forms and shapes at present. Chair Spang was under the impression that Mr. Pitman was looking for approval on each of the

criteria Mr. Joyce mentioned. Mr. Pitman stated that he is seeking approval so that angles of the addition do not need to be remade, or that certain windows be removed from the design. Chair Spang noted the importance of making sure that the addition is more utilitarian. Chair Spang drew attention to the intriguing condition of the kitchen door; it is not observable that the kitchen door comes out four feet. Chair Spang raised the prospect of making the addition more of a greenhouse or conservatory, possibly made of wood rather than brick. Mr. Meche expressed openness that the wall with one lite could be moved left. The wall that is projecting towards Oliver Street could be moved further to the left. Doing so would not change anything happening upstairs. Mr. Pitman was amenable to this change on behalf of the owner. The owner was concerned about making the entrance to the addition become too elaborate, and desired avoiding having that entrance compete with the front/main entrance. Mr. Meche asked if the elevator overrun will pop through the roof. Chair Spang asked for clarification if Mr. Meche was desirous of making the door to the addition moved two feet over to the left if the materiality mattered. Mr. Pattison expressed interest in seeing a drawing of the new footprint. It was noted that the Zoning Board meets the third Wednesday of every month and requires a two-week lead time. Chair Spang noted that the dining room door still feels somewhat ornate in the context of the entire building. Mr. Pitman requested a straw poll pending certain conditions being altered such as moving bricks over to the left for the addition and two feet over for the raised brick patio area. Mr. Meche called attention to the thickness of the new walls. Mr. Pitman noted that the anticipated assembly is a 2x6 frame with an airspace frame and the width of a brick, equaling roughly one foot.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to continue the application. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Norkun, Pattison, Joyce, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

19 Chestnut Street -- continuation

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 drawings by PionArch architecture

Lidia Syzdlowska of PionArch Architecture and Interiors was present on behalf of Ms. Binney.

The project is for 1805 Federal style house and barn behind. Based on the Commission's comments, Ms. Syzdlowska and client worked on revised plans: an 8' x 9' door which can go with or without the planned hardware. The client had selected a paint from Benjamin Moore; chocolate candy brown. Further, the trim around the door was simplified to a white wood trim with no keystone. Additional alterations as follows: design for the door was simplified to match previously proposed door; the side door was eliminated; and the new door was decided to be a remote operating door. Mr. Meche asked if the door would be overhead or swinging, which Ms. Syzdlowska noted was overhead. Chair Spang requested seeing an image of the previously proposed drawing. Mr. Meche asked if there is any standard door to exit the building. Chair Spang noted that the June 2 application materials showed two separate doors and pointed out that the new drawing looks a lot simpler and cleaner. Chair Spang asked if a building inspector would have any concerns about the structure having no person door. Garage doors are not typically used for egress purposes, but a building inspector would need to be consulted. Ms. Syzdlowska noted that a door (or doors) for egress may be added to the back of the garage. Chair Spang noted that if such doors were not visible from the street, the Commission would have no issue, but nonetheless called attention to any potential building code issues that may arise. Mr. Pattison asked if the existing garage looks like the drawings, noting a discrepancy between the picture and the drawings. Mr. Joyce was not keen on using fake strap

hinges for hardware, but perhaps reusing existing strap hinges? Ms. Syzdlowska was open to checking on whether such existing pieces can be reused.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez moved to accept application as amended with the door to be painted to match. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Mr. Martinez amended his motion to strike the fake hinges as shown in the elevation drawing. Mr. Joyce seconded the amended motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Norkun, Pattison, Joyce, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

1 Forrester Street - continuation

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

Ms. McGregor noted that the applicants would like to withdraw the application due to other priorities concerning their home this summer.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Meche moved to accept the applicant's withdrawal of the application without prejudice. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Norkun, Pattison, Joyce, Martinez (abstain as abutter), Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

381-385 Essex Street - continuation

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:6/30/21
- Photographs
- Drawings
- Sign design by Concept Signs

Eric Wagner, Grace Church and Ken McTague from Concept Signs were present.

Mr. Wagner noted that at the last meeting he was asked to provide more detail on the site as well as sign construction itself, hence Ken's attendance to speak about posts. The plot plan/hand drawing was first looked at, created with a ruler and a pencil. The space for the sign is 100 inches wide across sidewalk; the sign will be centered on pure buttress. From outside edge to outside edge of posts, the sign is approximately 40 inches. A wood mockup was created in order to demonstrate the size of the sign on the site. Ken showed a sign for Prospect Hill Condominiums which will have same posts. Simple peaked caps would be used on the posts in question. Chair Spang wondered if this was a hidden cap that sits on top of the post. Mr. Wagner noted that custom brackets are being made to emulate the hinges on the door of Grace Church. Mr. Meche asked for confirmation that the sign is flat, and Ken noted that the lettering is carved in. The emblem for the church ("church logo," "crest,") is a half-inch raised panel. Mr. Meche asked about the material for the emblem, which Ken noted was high-density urethane as using wood is not customary by today's standards. Ken noted that urethane is better than wood; will not rot away, succumb to the elements, etc. Mr. Pattison asked if the sign's dimensions are accurate. Ken retrieved and showed off a prototype of the planned hardware being used. Mr. Meche expressed surprise that urethane hangs on to paint. Mr. Pattison noted that urethane does accept paint quite well. The size of the stalk on the straps is about 1/16". Chair Spang asked if the bolts and screws will be black as well, which Ken affirmed. Mr. Martinez noted

that the photo of the posts showed galvanized bolts as being quite visible. Looking at the mockup, Mr. Martinez asked if the bolts could be made to look longer, mounted to the inside of the U so that they are not external to brackets themselves; thus bolting the bracket to the post and then sliding the sign in. Ken noted that the brackets could be modified to accommodate this change. Ken raised a potential issue that a very flat fastener would be needed to comply with Mr. Martinez's idea; and would involve adhering only one fastener to the post. Mr. Wagner expressed concern regarding high-wind area of Grace Church. Ken also expressed concern about connections to the posts. Mr. Meche proposed having a throughbolt to the post, though throughbolting two sides of the post may expose a nut with a washer. On the other hand, a head of bolt or head of screw would be seen painted black. Ms. Norkun asked if the posts will be steel because of the wind issue. Ken noted that steel is preferred for durability. Mr. Wagner also noted that steel matches existing railings on the grounds.

No public comment.

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to accept the application as originally submitted with custom brackets, steel capped posts, and urethane sign. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Mr. Martinez amended the motion that all parts to be painted black and all nuts concealed. Mr. Pattison seconded the amended motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Pattison, Joyce, Martinez abstained, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried. Norkun voted no.

2 North Pine - continuation

Theodore Cowan submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install an HVAC mini-split system.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/7/21
- Photographs

Theodore Cowan was present.

Mr. Cowan noted that the original plan was for condenser unit to be placed to the right of front door under window. The Commission had proposed placing the unit near porch by back fence during a previous meeting. A mockup wood box the size of the intended condenser unit was placed in the desired space for exhibition, which Mr. Cowan noted would come in at less of a height than the stone wall. Mr. Cowan was advised by installer that the unit needs to be out of arms reach of children under ten, and that orienting the unit against the stone wall needs to be done for safety. The applicant also noted that lattice fencing existing on the property (which features a diamond pattern) would be used to screen the condenser unit. Chair Spang noted that lattice would typically be square, which Mr. Cowan was amenable to. Mr. Meche asked for clarification that both the existing and new lattice would be wood and not plastic. Chair Spang asked whether the lattice would be an enclosure or simply a standalone fence in front of the unit. Mr. Cowan was open to using lattice as an enclosure and having the lattice return to the wall if the Commission deemed doing so necessary. Chair Spang asked about the height of the lattice, which Mr. Cowan noted would be such that the unit could not be seen from the street. Mr. Joyce noted the desire that the lattice not be taller than the wall to maintain continuity of view from the cemetery. Mr. Cowan indicated planning to make the lattice the same height as the converter, unless the lattice needed to be higher to better screen it. Mr. Meche noted that the trim around the lattice is sometimes an issue in such applications. Mr. Cowan noted that according to the board members' suggestions, both diamond and square lattice would be coexisting on the property. Mr. Pattison was in favor of adding square lattice, as were Mr. Martinez and Ms. English.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to approve the location and general dimensions of screening for the heat pump/condenser unit, approving the location of condenser and specifying that the screening would be approximately as high as equipment but no higher than adjacent stone wall; screen would be wood lattice with vertical/horizontal configuration as shown; trimmed out with 1-by material to be coordinated with members of the mission; and painted to match existing approved color of near white existing lattice. On the issue of paint color, Mr. Cowan noted having a previous existing application for door paint color. Mr. Meche amended the motion to note that paint should be existing white to match. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Norkun, Pattison, Joyce, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

262 Lafayette Street Unit 2 - continuation

Justine Kolsky requested a continuation on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the next meeting on August 18, 2021. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Joyce, Martinez, Norkun, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

33 Carlton Street Unit 3

John Osborne submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an HVAC mini-split system.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/6/21
- Photographs
- Product specifications

John Osborne was present.

Mr. Osborne has a balcony porch and lives on the second floor of his building. The porch faces Derby St. The applicant indicated desiring to place a mini-split system on the porch/balcony which has a railing and which would be fairly hidden from the street. A street view of the balcony was shown. Chair Spang asked if the mini-split would be against the house or against the railing. Mr. Osborne noted that the condenser has to be about a foot away from the wall to the installer's specifications. Chair Spang asked if the balcony is used much, to which applicant noted that it is used on occasion. Chair Spang asked if the unit could be placed on the roof with piping running down into the unit so as to avoid taking space away from the balcony. Chair Spang clarified that the property is a condo association and asked if a flat portion of the roof shown is part of the same association. Chair Spang wanted to avoid placing a unit on a neighbor's property. Chair Spang proposed setting back the unit on the roof a little way so as to avoid visibility from the street. Chair Spang noted that neighbors in the condo association would likely need to be consulted in order to add the unit to the roof. Mr. Meche supported Chair Spang's plan for placement of the unit on the roof. Mr. Pattison asked if lines would need to be run through any neighbors' units. Chair Spang noted the probability of running piping through an abutter's unit; suggesting that pipes would likely otherwise need to run up the side of the building. Mr. Osborne noted that an existing drainpipe runs from the bottom to top of building and expressed wonder as to whether the piping for the unit could ride alongside the existing drainpipe. Chair Spang proposed that the applicant speak to the installer as well as condo association owners in the event that approval is needed. Mr. Martinez noted that it may be a matter of time before the rest of the association may also want units installed to service their properties. Mr. Meche encouraged looking for vertical pathways in the inside of the building that could be explored and shared with neighbors.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting on August 18th. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Norkun, Pattison, Joyce, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

110 Derby Street Unit 1

Pamela Joy Barton submitted an application for a Certificate of Hardship to modify new fence (after the fact).

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/12/21
- Photographs
- Previous certificate/application from 10/17/18

Ms. Kelleher noted that the fence was supposed to be unpainted (upon painting or staining, the applicants would have to come back before the board) and has recently come up in other fence applications on the same street. Ms. Barton explained that the fence was installed in 2019, and that she had since become aware it was supposed to have been left unstained. The applicant was amenable to making the necessary changes next year but indicated not having the budget to make alterations this year. The past certificate also stipulated that the fence posts were to be beveled, though the existing posts have caps. The applicant was open to removing the caps (though was otherwise particular to keeping them), expressing desire against putting in a new fence. Ms. Barton inquired as to whether the fence needed to be painted and, if so, whether this could be done next year. The existing caps were identified as copper weathering. Mr. Pattison noted that painting the fence a dark color may be a suitable option, and either changing out caps for something less modern-looking or just beveling the tops. Ms. Norkun supported Mr. Pattison's view in terms of painting a dark color to match the house. Ms. English also agreed, as did Mr. Joyce who advised the simpler, the better. Mr. Martinez asked if the Commission would be approving the certificate of hardship as-is or needing to nail down a paint color. Chair Spang noted that a paint color to match house would need to get pinned down. The applicant noted that a paint color could not be sorted out at present as other condo members would need to be consulted. Mr. Spang stated that the applicant could come back to the Commission if needed after speaking with other condo members.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to require caps to be removed to expose beveled posts and the color painted to match the color of the body of the house. Mr. Pattison amended the motion to stipulate that the fence be painted by August 4, 2022. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Norkun, Pattison, Joyce, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Barton asked the Commission for further clarification on roof repairs at the property. She stated that structural changes are needed to stop ongoing water infiltration and while she believed work would not be visible from a public way, she would like to Commission to confirm. She offered to have contractor install a mockup on roof where work will occur. Ms. Kelleher noted that a Certificate of Non-Applicability has been issued for this work as not visible but Ms. Barton was concerned that Commission may reconsider visibility once work is completed. Mr. Pattison and Mr. Meche volunteered to visit property to determine if work will be visible after mockup is installed.

111 Derby Street

Mo-Marr Realty Trust submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for building modifications.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/19/21

- Photographs
- Architectural plans by L-Arch

Steve Livermore, project architect from L-Arch, was present, as well as Gary Blattberg, the property owner. The project is to convert a first-floor office at 111 Derby Street into apartment/condo unit. As part of the modification, the applicant wants to relocate window from left-side elevation to the Derby Street side elevation, as well as add another window on the left side in a new location that is for a kitchen window. This added window would be slightly smaller than the existing. The window's relocation to the Derby Street side would also involve removing two through-wall AC units as part of replacing with a forced hot air system or mini-split. Windows are being added in bedroom. The HVAC condenser unit would be added adjacent to Turner Street. Front elevation of Derby Street was shown to indicate the relocated window from the left-side elevation.

Mr. Meche noted that the new lower window on left-side elevation would match the upper windows. Chair Spang asked if these are historic windows or replacements that were done recently. Mr. Livermore noted that these are older muntin windows with storms. Mr. Livermore's preference is to match clapboard siding. Ms. Kelleher noted that this building has been heavily altered and renovated over the course of its history. In the 1980s and 1990s there were not windows on first floor. Mr. Meche noted that 2/2-style windows used to feature on the second floor. Mr. Pattison expressed hesitation to add a window to a wall where one has never existed. Ms. Kelleher noted that the building was originally a residential property but was altered to a storefront. Mr. Meche expressed favor toward removing the through-wall AC units. Mr. Livermore noted that the new condenser unit would likely be screened with lattice.

Ms. Norkun pointed out that windows all line up with one another except for the new window on first floor of left elevation, the placement of which was suggested as seeming very off. Ms. Norkun proposed making that window vertically align with one of the upper windows. Chair Spang asked if Turner St is in the Commission's jurisdiction. Ms. Kelleher confirmed that the side of this property facing Turner St is outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. Ms. Norkun expressed desire to obtain drawings showing window moved. Mr. Pattison expressed concern that the other window is not the same size as the existing, and also questioned who will make the window and what it will be made of. Mr. Livermore noted that the window would be created to match the existing, likely a Brosco type window with muntins and a storm screen system. Mr. Pattison expressed interest in seeing single glazed with storms. Chair Spang clarified that the new window on Derby St would match the second-floor window in size, details, sash which is 6/9; and that the existing window from left side would be reused or remade to match existing. Mr. Pattison wanted to ensure that the Derby St window would be single glazed.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve the application as presented with following changes: new Derby Street window to match the second-floor windows, either by reusing left-side window or creating new one to match single glaze (with same dimensions); on left elevation, first story sash to be removed for a new shorter 6/6 window in the existing opening; AC units to be removed. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Norkun, Pattison, Joyce, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

Mr. Cowan identified a potential violation in the McIntire District: twelve sizeable planter boxes on Chestnut Street. Mr. Cowan inquired as to whether the city of Salem requested any kind of certificate of applicability/appropriateness for the planters. Mr. Cowan stated that the planters are incredibly distracting to the historical integrity and aesthetic of the street. Mr. Martinez expressed concern as to whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the street. Ms. Kelleher noted that the city had been advised that even infrastructure projects

should be run by the Commission. Chair Spang expressed interest in adding the Chestnut Street planters to the agenda for the next meeting. Ms. Norkun noted that faux bricks painted onto Chestnut/Flint ought to also be discussed. Ms. Kelleher stated that these projects are likely attempts at traffic calming. Chair Spang stated that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over paving. Mr. Cowan also pointed out that different style and material planters exist on Chestnut Street at present than existing images shown on Google Maps, indicating that the planters were altered at some point.

Mr. Martinez noted that stanchions have been installed around the Common and one has already been destroyed by a motorist.

Ms. Kelleher and Mr. Pattison discussed the effectiveness (or lack thereof) of bumpouts being added/installed on Chestnut St in the future.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the owners of 23 Chestnut have an expired certificate and would like the Commission to consider extending it another year. The owners had wanted modifications done to the rear ell. The applicants have since decided that they would like to paint the alteration black instead of white. Given the breadth of public comment that this property/application had garnered in the past, an alteration in paint color should likely be subject to another public hearing. Mr. Martinez proposed bringing the applicants back only to alter the paint color. The applicants are likely not pursuing a pergola any longer. An outdoor kitchen/dining area was an additional component of the planned modifications. Ms. Kelleher noted that the visibility of proposed changes on the site would determine whether a Certificate of Non-Applicability could be granted. Mr. Pattison and Ms. Norkun volunteered to visit the property in person to assess.

Members discussed the logistics of a hybrid meeting moving forward.

Adjournment

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:39PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Dan Graham, Historical Commission Clerk