

**DRAFT**  
**SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES**  
September 2, 2020

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held virtually on Wednesday, September 2, 2020 at 7:00 pm via Zoom. Present were: Milo Martinez, Reed Cutting (Acting Chair), Vijay Joyce, Stacey Norkun, Rebecca English, Mark Pattison and Erin Schaeffer. Not present: Laurence Spang

10 Hamilton Street - continuation

Lee Bresnahan submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to enclose a porch.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/7/20
- Revised elevation by M. J. Tavares

Lee Bresnahan was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Joyce provided an overview of the site visit and deliberation of the proposed redesign. The project's architect was unavailable to meet at the time so only a mock-up design could be provided. The columns and railings will be retained with the enclosure position behind similar to enclosed porches at the Phillips House and 30 Warren Street.

Ms. Norkun suggested the use of Brosco, 12-lite all wood windows and explained how the profile of the moldings and detail of panels should match panels elsewhere on the house - either the current bay window panels or window. The applicant proposed incorporating panels on the front of the house/bay window.

Mr. Cutting questioned if the enclosure would be removable and Mr. Pattison wondered how the proposed plan would relate to the columns. Mr. Joyce explained that the panels would all be set behind the columns.

Public Comment:

Joyce Kenney expressed concern with how the handrails would be treated and voiced support of the project overall.

Mr. Joyce explained that the present handrails would remain.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to accept the application with the following conditions: enclosure be recessed behind the existing porch elements and Brosco windows be used. Final design plans to be reviewed and approved by Commissioners Joyce and Norkun before the issuance of a building permit windows. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

19 Chestnut Street - continuation

Nathalie Binney submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/7/20

- Photographs
- Marvin Window specification

The plan proposes to change existing replacement windows with new all wood Marvin Ultimate windows. Mr. Pattison, Mr. Martinez, Mr. Joyce and Mr. Spang all attended the site visit to view the subject windows and to see proposed replacement window sample.

Mr. Pattison, Mr. Martinez, and Mr. Joyce expressed belief that the revised proposal is an improvement over the existing replacement windows.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to accept Marvin Ultimate all wood SDL with 1/2 screen. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 2 North Pine Street - continuation

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant has requested a continuation to the next meeting,

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the next meeting. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 34 Summer Street - continuation

Jessica and Chris Bombadier submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install rooftop solar panels.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/29/20
- Image of panel snow guard
- Drawings by the Boston Solar Company

Owners Jessica and Chris Bombadier and solar representative Nick Picariello were present.

Mr. Picariello noted that based on comments from the Commission at the last meeting, the plans had changed to have the conduit extend across the roof ridge and the exterior switch to be located in rear yard.

Ms. Schaeffer questioned the use of a “critter guard” – a black aluminum perforated guard under the panel/module. Mr. Picariello explained that the plan would include both a critter guard and a snow guard. The modules would be 4” - 5” off the roofs with all black elements and module attachments. The modules will be set in 1’ from the edge of the roof.

Ms. Schaeffer asked for clarification on whether the existing snow fence will remain. Mr. Martinez inquired if the ice shield will remain as well. Ms. Bombadier explained that the ice shield would be replaced by shingles. Ms. Schaeffer voiced support of the placement of the smart meter in the house’s basement and the placement of remaining electrical equipment in the rear.

Mr. Joyce commented that none of the new elements would be viewable except for the modules. Mr. Picariello confirmed this. Mr. Joyce wondered if there would be a cover to the metal sheathing and Mr. Picariello explained that there would not - as it would be set back onto the asphalt roof.

Ms. Kelleher questioned if the vent pipe was the cause for the missing panel. Mr. Picariello confirmed this and explained that the pipe could not be moved. He noted that the owners are seeking to change the roof color to all black.

Mr. Cutting commended the applicants for responding to the Commission's concerns. Ms. Schaeffer agreed, noting the relocation of the conduits so they were not visible and moving the array back from the edge.

Mr. Martinez questioned the use of a snow guard in addition to the current one and Mr. Picariello expressed that he was unsure if the existing would remain. Mr. Bombadier and Ms. Bombadier stated that they will retain the existing snow fence. Mr. Picariello stated that he will confirm whether the existing fence is sufficient on its own and how far it needs to be placed from the panels. He shared an image of the panel snow guard, which sits 2" above the edge.

Ms. Schaeffer suggested making it all black. Mr. Picariello explained that they were being cautious with the use of the snowboard due to the close proximity to the neighbor. Ms. Schaeffer proposed having the snowboard on a panel and painting it if highly visible. She noted that at a height of 2", it would not be overly visible but the silver edge would be noticeable.

**VOTE: Ms. Schaeffer made a motion to accept the proposal as revised with all visible elements in black. Mr. Martinez seconded this motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 34 Broad Street - continuation

Raquel Frisch submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for building renovations

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/3/20
- Mocked-up photos of the proposed skylights for the rooms without windows
- Image of damaged gutter (#2)

Raquel Frisch was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Joyce, Mr. Pattison, Mr. Martinez and Mr. Spang conducted a site visit.

Mr. Frisch explained that existing shutters stored in the basement will be reinstalled. The proposed skylight "Velux C04" has a lower profile than the current 5" tall skylight on the building. The building's chimney will be removed. The existing skylight's measurements are 18" x 34" (inside) and the new one will be 21" x 37". The black slate will be replaced in kind as needed. Mr. Joyce explained how the use of slate may further reduce the profile of the new skylights.

The Commission agreed to review each item separately.

#### *Item 6 - Remove existing post*

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to accept the removal of the post. Mr. Pattison seconded this motion. Four out of the four members present were in favor and so the motion carried.**

#### *Item 7 – New mailbox - not under jurisdiction.*

#### *Item 8 - Retain and replace wood square lattice in-kind*

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to accept items 7 and 8. Ms. Schaeffer seconded this motion. Four out of the four members present were in favor and so the motion carried.**

*Item 9 - Venting - Mr. Frisch will add a vent at the rear back wall, not visible, to be painted*

*Item 10 - Vent stack - to be installed between two dormers and not visible.*

Mr. Cutting inquired about the material and color. Mr. Pattison explained that if this element is visible than it should be covered with a copper boot. Mr. Joyce agreed with this suggestion for the existing vent.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to accept Items 9 (not visible) and 10 for a new vent stack with the condition that the copper boots be added. Mr. Pattison seconded this motion. Four out of the four members present were in favor and so the motion carried.**

*Item 13 - House numbers*

Commission agreed that it did not have jurisdiction over house numbers and therefore a vote was not needed.

*Item 14 - Renovate rear porch*

Ms. Frisch stated that she believed the porch was not visible from a public way. Mr. Martinez presented a Google street view indicating that the porch is visible from Warren Street.

Ms. Frisch explained that the porch's 30" railings need to be 36" tall to meet code. Ms. Schaeffer had a concern about the proposed changes. She questioned whether the required height for a 3-family is 42" tall. The applicant responded that she wanted to take the necessary measures to ensure proper safety and is willing for it to be in wood. Ms. Frisch also mentioned that it could match the existing design/details and the decking would not likely be visible. On the third floor there is currently no decking, just the rubber roof and an interlocking tree deck which is 5"- 6" from the edge of the roof.

Mr. Pattison asked if there was a railing on the current rubber roof and mentioned that if there is decking to the edge of the railing then it is not visible. Ms. Frisch responded that there is limited visibility from Warren Street.

A discussion on handrail and code requirements took place. Mr. Pattison suggested mahogany as a more affordable material than red cedar and offered Yankee Pine in Rowley as a suggestion to purchase material as the company can provide pre-made 36" balusters. Ms. Kelleher asked if they would be painted to match the existing details and the applicant noted that the railings are currently gray and would be kept unpainted to allow for a natural weathering process. Mr. Cutting and Mr. Pattison both made the strong suggestion that railings should be painted. The topic of the limited visibility of the decking was once again brought up in discussion. Ms. Kelleher mentioned how similar examples have been approved in the past.

Mr. Frisch proposed the use of composite decking in grey to match existing. The handrail would match existing style/details in wood. Mr. Joyce suggested providing images of possible examples. Ms. Schaeffer recommended adding a secondary handrail to match code requirements. Reference photos will later be provided.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to accept changes to rear porch with railing to match existing design with new secondary handrail, deck to be composite in gray to match. Mr. Pattison seconded this motion. Four out of the four members present were in favor and so the motion carried.**

*Item 11 - Exhaust wall fans on right side of house*

Mr. Joyce noted the high visibility of these fans. Ms. Schaeffer inquired about an alternative option that was not as visible, possibly placed on the roof. Frisch mentioned that this would be very difficult. A lowered vent could be painted to match and was approved for an existing house on 68 Derby St.

*Mr. Hart left the meeting at this point.*

Mr. Martinez was not concerned about the vent's possible placement near the second window in the back. Ms. Kelleher suggested that the vent be moved to the side of the window and not above but the applicant was unsure if that option would properly meet code. Mr. Joyce voiced concerns about the maintenance of painting the vent and Ms. Frisch reassured him that it would not sit on the trim. Mr. Joyce mentioned the option of shifting it towards the electrical vent which Mr. Frisch was in favor of.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to accept the painting of the vent to match the house color and the placement to be located as close as possible to the electrical conduit. Mr. Martinez seconded this motion. Four out of the four members present were in favor and so the motion carried.**

*Item 2 - Gutters*

Ms. Frisch presented a photo of an existing wood gutter with a hole. The fascia board was cut to accommodate the newer wood gutter. The plan is to match the existing aluminum gutter on the porch. The applicant looked into the possible use of fiberglass but found it to be the most expensive option.

Mr. Joyce made the suggestion to match the existing K-style gutters already featured on the house. While it may be more appropriate to have 1/2 round aluminum gutters, the K-style was already present. Mr. Martinez agreed that the K-style was not appropriate but it would make it more visually cohesive. Ms. Schaeffer preferred the shape that is more historically appropriate. Mr. Pattison introduced a discussion on cost. The Commission agreed that most of the house is now in the K-style.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to accept replacing the wood gutter to K-style aluminum gutters to be painted to match and the downspouts will remain. Mr. Martinez seconded this motion. Four out of the four members present were in favor and so the motion carried.**

*Item 3 – replace existing skylight*

*Item 4 – new skylights*

Mr. Frisch presented the Commission with mocked-up photos of the proposed skylights for the rooms without windows.

**Public Comment:**

Joyce Kenney, Heritage Drive, asked the applicant if a rain sensor would be placed on the on the skylights.

Mr. Frisch responded that they were not planning to due to cost and added visibility.

Mr. Joyce was most comfortable with the skylights on the right side roof slope and deemed it better than the option of a vent. Both Mr. Pattison and Ms. Schaeffer agreed. Mr. Joyce addressed how the rear left side should be located in alignment with the existing slate, which will be preserved and that the new skylight profile was lower than existing. Ms. Schaeffer was in support as long as it was in alignment and the size increase of 3" didn't differ too greatly. Mr. Martinez had some concerns with how far back it was

from the front and encouraged moving it as far back as possible. Mr. Frisch described how it was equal distances from edge to dormer and align with the windows below.

Ms. Kennedy recommended that positioning it close to the dormer could help to keep possible rain from coming in.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to accept items 3 and 4 to add Velux skylights C04 with the stipulation that the front skylight be placed back from front edge as far as possible. Mr. Pattison seconded this motion. Four out of the four members present were in favor and so the motion carried.**

#### *Item 5 - Remove Chimney*

Ms. Frisch described how this this feature was always used for venting and the house did not have fireplaces associated with the stack. Mr. Joyce expressed concerns with removing the chimney, especially since it is the only one on the house. He suggested a faux replacement be installed in its place. The applicant explained that it would cost \$3,000 to remove from the roof up and \$7,000 to remove the rest/interior. Mr. Pattison asked why the first and second floor were being removed. Ms. Schaeffer disagreed with Mr. Joyce on the voiced concerns. Mr. Martinez noted that every house in the immediate area features a chimney. Mr. Frisch found 162 Federal Street as an example of a faux chimney.

Ms. Schaeffer questioned if the replacement would match the existing. Mr. Joyce suggested the use of waterstruck brick, as opposed to sandstruck brick. Mr. Pattison addressed the color.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to accept the chimney removal with the condition that a faux chimney be installed to match all the details including flashing, dimensions, color and mortar color. The applicant to submit a detailed drawing to be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Ms. Schaeffer seconded the motion. Four out of the four members present were in favor and so the motion carried.**

#### 18 Chestnut Street

Victoria Kelleher submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter a basement entry.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/18/20
- Photographs

Victoria Kelleher was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Norkun voiced her confusion on how the roof slope would not alter the bump-out. Mr. Cutting asked if the roofline of the basement entry would fall below both sills. Ms. Victoria Kelleher responded that the contractor had confirmed this. Mr. Cutting also inquired about the roof material and the applicant answered that it was copper flashing. Mr. Pattison noted that the roof slope carries water away from the door and basement and wondered what would happen in the event that the water is directed into the basement. Ms. Victoria Kelleher said she would discuss this matter with the contractor. Mr. Pattison suggested an alternative way to flash the roof to prevent damage. The Commission suggested keeping the roof slope as is with flashing, ice and water shield.

A discussion took place regarding the use of the gutter and downspout. Mr. Pattison and Ms. Schaeffer agreed that the water should be allowed to run freely. Ms. Victoria Kelleher asked for further clarification on an ice and water shield. Mr. Pattison responded that it should be used on the house wall and the basement entry roof.

Public Comment:

Joyce Kenney of Heritage Drive expressed concern about the use of copper on the edge.

The Commission agreed that copper was not appropriate for roofing. Tin, slate or wood shingles was appropriate. Commission members also agreed that restoring the entry as is would qualify under a Certificate of Non-Applicability.

**VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve a Certificate of Non-Applicability to repair basement entry in-kind with an ice and water shield to be installed on house and entry with copper flashing and the option to use tin, black or dark gray slate, or wood shingles for the roof. Ms. Schaeffer seconded this motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

38 Chestnut Street

Denise Henkind submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to add new window openings

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/17/20
- Photo mockup by Pitman & Wardley

Project architect Peter Pittman was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Pittman explained that the project will add new windows to be custom to replicate the sill, lintel and trim detail, single-glazed thin muntins, rail and style of existing windows. The rear elevation window is not visible but the proposed window on the side elevation is visible from Chestnut Street.

Ms. Norkun asked what guide was used for the dimensions. Mr. Pittman responded that they will match the header height but the new window will be shorter by two courses of brick to accommodate interior kitchen cabinets. Ms. Norkun, regarding the rear window, questioned the choice of 6/6 and not matching the existing narrow windows on this elevation. She noted that this was not under the Commission's purview since it was not visible. Mr. Pittman explained that this was the only view into the yard and the larger window would provide more light and views. The new window would match other 6/6 windows on the building's rear addition.

Mr. Pattison expressed concern that the side window will in fact be shorter and Ms. Norkun agreed. Mr. Pattison noted that continuity of windows is very important for this particular building. Mr. Pittman confirmed that the window would be proportionally smaller. Mr. Pattison disclosed that if the new window was to be placed closer to the sidewalk, he would be in favor of denying the request but since the window would be located at a greater distance from the street he would be ok if it matched the height of the sill and header.

**VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to accept as presented with change of height of header and sill to match existing windows. Mr. Joyce seconded this motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

34 Summer Street

Chris and Jessica Bombardier submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for architectural roof shingles.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/2/20
- Photos

Owner Chris Bomadier and Tim Corell from John Dudley Roofing Co. were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Bombadier stated that the roof is now 3tab asphalt shingles and he would like to use the architectural shingle Owens Corning Duration in “Onyx Black” to match the color of the new solar panels.

Ms. Norkun stated that she preferred “Onyx Black” due to its low contrast in color variation. Mr. Corell described how the snow guard is a modern addition, the shingles would come down to the edge. They would later reinstall a snow guard and keep ridge vent as existing - same dimensions - now 2” high but would be placed a little higher. The chimney would also be re-leaded.

Ms. Kelleher explained that Owens Corning Duration had not been approved before in the districts, but its solid colors was preferred by the SHC. Ms. Norkun pointed out that the focus was less about the angle and more about the color contrast. Ms. Norkun suggested using this as a test sample. Mr. Martinez said that if the snow fence was removed and couldn't be re-installed, it would need to be replicated.

**VOTE:** Ms. Norkun made a motion to accept the proposal to use Owens Corning Duration shingles in “Onyx Black” with the conditions that the snow shield would not to be reinstalled; the snow fence is to be reinstalled or re-fabricated to match; proper flashing to be used and the low profile ridge vent to match existing dimensions (length). Mr. Joyce seconded this motion. All members were in favor and the motion so carried.

131 Lafayette Street – Request for Letter of Support for AAB Variance Request

Julia Mooradian from Seger Architects presented the request for a letter of support for an AAB variance request. She noted that in order to meet AAB requirements, they would need to remove an interior terrazzo floor and would have to add a new doorway, cut an existing door, alter a staircase and add a new ramp.

Ms. Schaeffer inquired about the addition of an elevator as a possible option. Ms. Mooradian explained that there would still be a need for a ramp and new opening.

Dan Ricciarelli was now present to discuss the project.

Mr. Cutting was in strong favor of preserving the historic integrity. Ms. Schaeffer was okay with the modification of the building for the accessible unit. Mr. Ricciarelli described how the plan would not eliminate the creation of an accessible unit but would instead transfer it to the school building. Mr. Ricciarelli also explained that the plan preserves the building’s interior in addition to eliminating exterior changes. Mr. Martinez expressed concern that supporting the subject request would not be equitable.

Ms. English explained that the PEM was a public building and that the subject proposal would still create the required accessible unit in the school building.

**VOTE:** Mr. Joyce made a motion to issue a letter of support and requested Ms. Kelleher to draft a letter for the Commission to review. Four out of five members were in support (Ms. Schaeffer was in opposition) and the motion so carried.



Meeting Minutes

**VOTE:** Mr. Joyce made a motion to accept the meeting minutes of February 5, 2020, May 6, 2020, May 20, 2020 and June 17, 2020. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and so the motion carried.

**VOTE:** Mr. Joyce made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Pattison seconded this motion. All were in favor and so the motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 10pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Preservation Planner