

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
November 18, 2015

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, November 18, 2015 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Kathy Harper (Vice Chair), Laurie Bellin, David Hart, Joanne McCrea, and Larry Spang, and Jane Turiel.

89 Federal Street

T. Jane Graham-Dwyer submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the roof with architectural shingles.

T. Jane Graham-Dwyer was present.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/22/15

Ms. Graham-Dwyer stated that she would like to install a dark solid color architectural shingle.

Ms. Harper showed the Commission full-size samples of two shingles; GAF Timberline and Certainteed Landmark shingles. The samples are basic architectural shingles. She continued that are only a few dollars more per bundle than the 3-tab. She stated that there are also designer shingles, which are more expensive.

Ms. Graham-Dwyer stated that her contractor said it will cost \$32 more to install the architectural shingles rather than the 3-tab. Her last roof did not make it 20 years. She wants the best roof she can get on her house.

Ms. Herbert stated that the Certainteed has less of an angle cut and the Commission would be more supportive because they are squarer.

Ms. Bellin asked if either of the samples have been previously approved.

Ms. Harper responded that the Commission has only approved Slateline and Hatteras.

Ms. Bellin asked if Ms. Harper had a picture of any roofs with the sample shingles installed.

Ms. Harper responded in the negative.

*Ms. Lovett left the room to retrieve a binder of roofing brochures.*

*Ms. Lovett returned.*

Mr. Hart stated that the guidelines state that 3-tab shingles are permitted and that architectural shingles are not. Traditionally roofing was slate or wood, which are horizontal and uniform. The 3-tab replicate the slate or wood shape, the architectural shingles do not. He continued that there are some 3-tab shingles that have a 25-30 year life. He stated that many architectural shingles

claim to have a lifetime warrantee, however that warrantee is only for the original owner, you need to retain a certain amount of documentation, and it is prorated after a number of years. He stated that he cannot support architectural shingles.

Ms. Harper stated that she feels neither 3-tab nor asphalt shingles replicate traditional shingles. However, the architectural shingles provide better roof coverage. She agreed with Mr. Hart that warrantee does to meet a lot after 20 years, but the extra material on the architectural shingles along with their lack of a cut make it so that they are less likely to curl. The architectural shingles has a wind resistance of 110 miles/hour, compared to 60 miles/hour for 3-tab. She added that we are seeing more and more unusual weather patterns and that it is important to take that into consideration

Ms. Hart stated that visually if you look at a 3-tab shingle roof is hums. The architectural shingles stand out at you. There are some Victorian roofs where the roof is a feature. He stated that there is one house across the street from Ms. Graham-Dwyer that has arch shingles and it really stands out.

Ms. Graham-Dwyer stated that she has counted 25 architectural roofs in the district.

Ms. Bellin stated that she agrees with what Mr. Hart said. The 3-tab looks like a slate in that it is flat. The architectural shingles replicate wood shakes, which would not be appropriate for most homes. She stated that the Slateline shingle better replicates the 3-tab or slate roof. She still has concerns about approving architectural shingles. She sympathizes with the cost and warrantee, but the roofs stay up for a long time, nearly 20 years.

Ms. Herbert stated that Ms. Harper shows the shingle prices to be as follows:

- \$51.50/bundle - Hatteras
- \$51.56/ bundle, Slateline
- \$29/bundle – 3-tab
- \$29.33/bundle – basic architectural

Ms. Harper stated that the Commission has approve the IKO Cambridge shingle in the past. She restated that she does not consider asphalt as a traditional look. In looking at the architectural shingle on the existing roof, she was surprised to see how many roofs have them but she didn't notice them until she was looking specifically for them.

Mr. Spang asked if the labor costs are the same for the roofs.

Ms. Graham-Dwyer responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Spang stated that it seems the conversation is focusing on the cost of the shingles. He asked Ms. Graham-Dwyer if main concern is the dollar value.

Ms. Graham-Dwyer responded in the affirmative. She added that slate wasn't used on roofs until about 1690 and her house was built in 1833. The look for her house probably would have been shake.

Ms. Herbert stated that the Commission approved the IKO Cambridge shingle for 40 Derby Street.

Mr. Spang asked Ms. Graham-Dwyer if she knew the size of her roof.

Ms. Hart stated that you can approximate squares by taking the square footage of the house and multiplying by 1.5.

Ms. Graham-Dwyer stated that using the 3-tab she will save 35 dollars. If she uses the Slateline it will cost \$1200 more.

Ms. Herbert stated that Ms. Graham-Dwyer's roofer has stated that he will not install IKO shingles because he feels they are of an inferior quality.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Ms. Harper made a motion to approve the Certainteed landmark architectural shingle in the color black or charcoal gray. Ms. Spang seconded the motion. Mr. Spang and Ms. Harper were in favor. Ms. Herbert, Ms. Bellin, Mr. Hart, Ms. McCrea, and Ms. Turiel were opposed. The motion failed.**

#### 170 Federal Street

Tim Obert and Matt Obey submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the driveway fence. The fence blocks access to the garage.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/2/15
- Photographs

Ms. Herbert stated that the application is to remove the fence down the driveway, along the side of the house. The previous owners must have blocked off the backyard for a dog or children. The new owners would like access to the garage.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Ken Wallis, 172 Federal Street, stated that the new garage doors that were previous approved are gorgeous. He spoke in favor of the application.

Joyce Wallis, 172 Federal Street, also spoke in favor

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the application, as submitted. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.**

#### 217 Essex Street – Section 106 Review

As a continuation of a previous meeting, in accordance to the Section 106 review process, EBI Consulting requested comments from the Commission on whether a proposed telecommunications facility at 217 Essex Street will have a potential effect to historic properties.

The Salem Redevelopment Authority and the Historical Commission both previously commented on the project and proposed different opinions on how the antennae should be concealed. The revised design proposes two antennae to be installed within a single 6'-6" x 6'-6" x 12' fiberglass chimney that will sit flush with the southwest corner of the roof. The third antennae will remain flush mounted and painted to match the penthouse.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Letter from EBI Consulting: 10/28/15
- Revised drawings: 10/28/15
- Letter from McLane Middleton: 11/3/15
- Renderings

Ms. Lovett stated that she did not hear from Andrew Shapiro, Economic Development Planner, whether or not the Design Review Board (DRB) approved the revised chimney with a 6" set back at their meeting last night. She stated that the Commission should continue their vote until they hear whether the project was approved by the DRB.

**VOTE:** *Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue the vote. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

#### 70-90 Boston Street

LAR Properties submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish 3 buildings. The property is going to developed into a new building and landscape

Anthony Roberto was present.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/9/15
- Photographs

Mr. Roberto stated they just purchased the property recently.

Ms. Herbert asked what will be built on the site.

Mr. Roberto responded that the project in the early phases. They will probably build a residential building.

Mr. Hart asked whether the brick building is one of the four being proposed for demolition.

Ms. Bellin asked for clarification whether there are 3 or 4 buildings being demolished.

Mr. Roberto responded that there are 4 building being demolished, however 2 of them are adjoined.

Mr. Spang asked what has happened on the site to date.

Mr. Roberto responded there were borings were previously completed. When the medical building had been proposed, they completed their environmental testing.

Mr. Spang asked if state or federal money was used for the cleanup.

Mr. Roberto responded that he believes it was all privately funded.

Mr. Spang asked if there are any plans for the building or a schedule for removal and construction.

Mr. Roberto responded that originally they were not going to take the building down immediately. They would have preferred to leave it until March 2016, just prior to construction beginning. They were advised however, that it would be preferred by the City to remove it now to stop vandalism. If they get approved they will remove it immediately.

Mr. Spang asked what the condition of the site will be for the interim and if the building has a basement.

Mr. Roberto responded that the site will remain fenced in. Most of the buildings have a slab foundation.

Mr. Spang asked Michael Lutrykowski, the Assistant Building Inspector, who was seated in the audience, whether the Building Department has requested that the slab be removed.

Mr. Lutrykowski stated that he believes Tom St. Pierre, the Building Inspector, requested the building be removed due to it being a hazard. There was no decision made on the slab.

**VOTE:** *Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the demolition with the pro viso that the applicant record the exterior horizontal and vertical dimensions of the building, provide color photographs of all exterior elevations, and provide a site plan showing the location of the buildings on the site. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

#### 5 Broad Street

The City of Salem submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the rear, handicap accessible, door.

Michael Lutrykowski, Assistant Building Inspector, was present.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/2/15
- Photographs

Mr. Lutrykowski stated that they have received some money to make repairs at the senior center. The rear door is in bad shape. It is not original to the building. The current door is made of pine and matches the door on the front of the building. It is used for both handicap access as well as for deliveries. There was question whether they needed approval from the Commission as the door is not visible from the street, however it is visible from the adjacent cemetery. They received prices of \$20,000 to replace the door with wood, which does not fit the project budget. They revised the specifications to a steel door, however the upper panel cannot be mimicked in steel. The contractor proposed to use fiberglass instead. The door will need to have a handicap lever, and an emergency steel bar. The door that is on the parking lot side is steel, though they are not sure if it was ever approved by the Commission. The back door is in much worse shape than the front door because it does not get much sun, and it gets beat up from deliveries. They can repaint the door to match the existing blue color, however they could also use a mahogany colored paint, similar to what was used on the windows at City Hall.

Ms. Bellin asked if the front door will remain blue.

Mr. Lutrykowski responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Herbert asked what color the side door is.

Mr. Spang asked if it would be simpler to replace the top section with glass.

Mr. Lutrykowski responded that the glass would be more expensive. They just trying to replace the door.

Mr. Hart stated that he is not a color person, however for consistency they should match the blue.

Ms. Herbert asked if there is brownstone around the door.

Mr. Lutrykowski responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Herbert stated that she is not fond of the blue.

Mr. Spang agreed, he would prefer to see the door painted black. However, he is OK with the blue if everyone else is.

**VOTE:** *Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve with fiberglass door, repainted to match the existing blue. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried. Ms. Herbert abstained.*

**VOTE:** *Ms. McCrea made a motion to thank Ms. Lovett for her work with the Commission. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

#### Other Business

#### *Correspondence*

The Commission was copies on a letter from the Massachusetts Historical Commission to the City of Salem regarding the proposed Winter Island multi-use trail project, which includes vegetation management activities, slope stabilization, benches, rain garden, and interpretive signage using state funding from the Department of Conservation Services PARC program. The project is listed in the state and national registers of historic places. MHC has requested that an intensive archaeological survey be conducted for the project . The purpose of the survey is to locate and identify any significant archaeological resources that may be affected.

The Commission discussed architectural shingles.

Ms. Harper stated that she has been looking at how other Commission's handle architectural shingles. There are some commissions (Conway, Cambridge, and Falmouth) that have approved architectural shingles since 2008. It would be good to see where they stand now.

Ms. Bellin asked what the Massachusetts Historical Commission thinks about architectural shingles.

Ms. Harper stated that she and Mr. Hart separately spoke with Paul Holtz at MHC. He requested an email request, and the MHC staff will talk about the issue internally. He had stated that he has difficulty denying the architectural singles.

Mr. Hart added that he has only approved them on a single building basis, however. Not for full districts.

**VOTE: Ms. McCrea moved to request that project completion photos be requested for all certificates. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.**

Ms. Harper stated that maybe the shingles can be tracked.

Mr. Spang stated that the salt and pepper hue is more contemporary. He feels the uniform hue does not stand out as much.

Ms. Bellin stated that the exposure of the architectural shingles is much smaller which adds to the busy look.

Ms. Harper stated that the guidelines state that they will review the shingles on a case by case basis.

Mr. Hart stated that neighbors sent him pictures of work being undertaken at 31-33 Essex that showed the door and sidelights being removed. The owner had submitted an application for a Certificate of Non-Applicability to replace in-kind, but then his contractor removed the sidelights. Jane Guy spoke with the owner, he is going to replace the sidelights and submit a new application for a Certificate of Non-Applicability.

Ms. Herbert stated that this is the same developer that installed block glass on the basement windows on another building within the district, rather than replacing them.

**VOTE:** *There being no further business, Ms. McCrea made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

Respectfully submitted,

Natalie BL Lovett  
Community Development Planner