

**DRAFT**  
**SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES**  
January 20, 2016

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, January 20, 2016 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Reed Cutting, Kathryn Harper, David Hart, Susan Keenan, and Larry Spang. Staff present: Jane Guy and Patti Kelleher.

31, 33 and 35 Warren Street

The Philips Warren Condominium Trust submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to add stainless steel chimney caps to six chimneys.

The applicant Matthew Murphy of 31 Warren Street was present.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/4/16
- Photographs
- Specifications for Gelco Chimney caps: 1/4/16

Mr. Murphy stated that his wife is a trustee of the Association as is Joseph Kay of 33 Warren and Peter Flomp of 35 Warren.

Ms. Herbert asked if the proposed chimney caps will be painted black.

Mr. Murphy said that the intent was to keep them stainless color since not very visible from street.

Ms. Herbert stated that many owners have painted their caps with a powder charcoal black finish over the stainless steel.

Mr. Murphy stated that he was not opposed to painting caps.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Spiros Flomp of 50 Broad Street stated that he was not opposed to chimney caps but was very concerned about the rear deck that was replaced at 33 Warren Street which is larger than the original deck. He stated that the deck is visible from Flint Street.

Mr. Murphy stated that the owner of 33 Warren was responsible for the work, not the Association, and he was told by this owner that he submitted an application and received approval for the work.

Bruce McDonald of 5-7 Flint Street also spoke about his concern over the deck's size, which is larger than the original deck and was not appropriate under a Certificate of Non-Applicability. He stated that he submitted a complaint to the Commission sometime in early September stating that the deck was visible from a public way and was larger than the deck it replaced.

Ms. Guy asked if visible from public way.

Mr. McDonald stated in the affirmative.

Ms. Herbert noted that the work was reviewed by the previous staff person for the Commission who is no longer with the City.

Ms. Guy stated that she will research the issue further and will send the owner of 33 Warren a violation notice if necessary.

The Commission discussed whether the tree canopy may have shielded the deck from view during the summer.

Mr. Hart requested staff to research whether a building permit was issued.

Ms. Herbert asked if there was any additional public comment. Hearing none, she closed the public portion of the hearing.

Mr. Spang stated that he would prefer the issue with the deck be resolved before deliberating on the chimney caps.

Ms. Herbert asked the applicant if he was amenable to continuing the hearing to the next meeting on February 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Mr. Murphy stated that he was fine with delaying the vote.

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

### 18 Washington Square West

The Hawthorne Hotel submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace 40 existing wood windows with Marvin Ultimate insulated/double pane wood window units.

Present were Travis Strout and Michael Strout from Strout Construction and James Gillis, the Executive Officer of the Hawthorne Hotel.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/31/15
- Photographs
- Sample Marvin Ultimate window unit

Mr. Gillis stated that the Hotel was proposing to replace 40 of the 450 windows on the Hotel. He stated that the only windows to be replaced were in the Hotel's bathrooms.

Mr. Strout stated that the new window units would have an exterior enamel paint and that all windows would be covered with storm windows. He stated that the new windows would match the original configurations of either 4/4 or 6/6.

Ms. Herbert asked about the dimensions of the muntins on the new windows.

Mr. Strout stated that they would be the same as the windows previously approved by the Commission for a building on Winter Street.

Mr. Cutting asked which windows would be replaced.

Mr. Strout stated that all windows to be replaced would be on the upper stories; no windows would be replaced below the Hotel's awnings.

Mr. Gillis stated that one window on the second floor would be replaced and the rest would be on upper floors. He also stated that this was the first phase of a long-term project to replace all the windows at the Hotel.

Mr. Spang asked if the storm windows will be retained.

Mr. Strout replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Harper asked if the Hotel had looked into restoring the existing windows.

Mr. Gillis stated that the Hotel had restored the windows in the past but now believe that thermal windows would be more efficient with double glazing and insulated pockets, particularly since the bathrooms are unheated.

Ms. Harper asked if the new windows would have true divided lights.

Mr. Strout answered that the new windows would have double paned glass with dividers between the glass.

Ms. Herbert noted that the Commission has required dark spacer bars in the past.

Mr. Hart asked if it was possible to conduct a site visit to see the difference between the muntin bars of the new windows and those of the original windows at the Hotel since the small sample window unit presented to the Commission appeared to have wider muntins.

Mr. Strout stated that it is difficult to get a large sample window unit that would accurately convey the dimensions of the muntins.

Mr. Hart stated that the sample window did not appear to have the same muntin dimensions as those shown in the photographs.

Ms. Guy stated that the Commission could make approval conditional on specific dimensions of muntins.

Ms. Harper asked how long the entire project was expected to take.

Mr. Gillis responded that the project has a long term scope with other restoration efforts planned including repointing of the brick exterior.

Mr. Hart expressed concern that this was a long term project that would ultimately result in total replacement of all windows at the Hotel.

Ms. Herbert asked the applicant to show the specific windows to be replaced.

Mr. Gillis indicated on the photographs the windows to be replaced.

Ms. Herbert noted that the windows to be replaced were stacked in a vertical row.

Mr. Gillis reiterated the Hotel's need to fix the drafty windows.

Ms. Harper asked if the windows are currently operable.

Mr. Gillis replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Spang asked whether the brick molding surrounding the windows would be replaced or reused.

Mr. Strout stated that all existing window casings would remain in place; only the sash would be replaced.

Mr. Spang asked if the trim would be painted as part of the project.

Mr. Strout stated that exterior trim would be painted if exhibiting deterioration and peeling condition but the plan was to keep storm windows intact during sash replacement which would limit ability to make repairs to exterior trim during this phase.

Mr. Gillis noted that the Hotel would undertake tuck pointing and full repainting of the Hotel's exterior in the summer. He also noted that the paint colors would remain as existing.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Mr. Hart asked to schedule a site visit at the Hotel on the following Monday. He also requested that the applicant bring a drawing indicating specific windows to be replaced.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she would attend the site visit as well.

It was recommend that the Hotel submit an exhibit for the next meeting that specifies which windows will be replaced.

Ms. Herbert recommended that the Applicant bring an existing window sash to the next meeting.

#### 183 Federal Street

Jeff Schmidt submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to approve the replacement of a three-tab asphalt roof with GAF architectural shingles. The work has already been completed.

Jeff Schmidt was present. Evan Franklin from Peter Ryan Roofing Company was also present.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/4/16
- Photographs
- Exterior Repairs Specification: 1/4/16

Mr. Franklin noted that the application was incorrect in stating that the roof shingles are a GAF product. It is an IKO brand of shingles.

Ms. Harper noted that the Commission has approved this IKO roof shingle in the past.

Mr. Schmidt stated that the property had ice dams, leaks and interior damage during last winter's storms and the roof required repairs. He stated that the Condo association raised funds to replace the roof and went out to bid, selecting Peter Ryan Roofing. He asked the roofer to get the necessary permits. He also stated that on November 30, 2015, he faxed a letter to the City about the project but was not sure who received the letter.

Ms. Guy stated that DPCD never received the letter.

Mr. Schmidt again stated that he thought the contractor would get the necessary permits before replaced the roof.

Mr. Franklin stated that he was only representing the Company but had very little information on the project. He did note that the new roof is a Harvard Slate color.

Mr. Hart asked if the contractor has applied for a building permit and if so, was the permit ever issued.

Ms. Guy stated that the roofer applied for a permit but the Building Department referred the applicant to the Department of Planning & Community Development to apply for Historical Commission approval and held the permit pending Commission approval. The building permit has still not been released.

Mr. Hart stated his objection to the roof's variegated color.

Mr. Spang asked for confirmation that the picture of the house was an image of the new roof.

Mr. Schmidt replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Schmidt said that the Building Inspector notified him that the roof was replaced without permits and approvals and told him that he need to rectify the situation.

Mr. Franklin stated that three-tab shingles are being phased out so roofers may not be able to get that type of shingle in the future. He also noted that architectural shingles are a 50-year shingle.

Mr. Hart expressed his concern that the Commission's guidelines stated that three-tab are the preferred roofing material and the owner or contractor did not get approval before replacing the roof.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE:** *Ms. Harper made a motion to approve the application as submitted, due to the Commission having previously approved this roof shingle. Mr. Spang seconded the motion. Ms. Herbert, Mr. Cutting, Ms. Harper, Ms. Keenan, and Mr. Spang voted in favor. Mr. Hart voted in opposition. The motion so carried.*

161 Essex Street, 173 Essex Street and 179 Essex Street

The Peabody Essex Museum submitted a request for a waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance for the demolition of a 1904 entry façade and corridor on the East India Marine Hall (EIMH), the demolition of the 1953 Loring Building additional on the southwest corner of the EIMH and the demolition of single story ells on both 173 and 179 Essex Street. The request was also for comment on the museum expansion project under M.G.L. Chapter 9.

Mr. Hart recused himself from the proceedings and sat in the audience.

Robert Monk and Phillip Johns of PEM were present.

Mr. Monk presented drawings of the proposed expansion project, which included the proposal to relocate the granite entrance to the east side of EIMH. He presented drawings showing the evolution of EIMH:

Mr. Monk stated that the PEM's goal is to present EIMH as its own separate building with a glass wing. He stated that this requires the removal of the Mifflin gallery and Loring building to add the new wing and restore windows on the west side of EIMH (which will be visible from the glass corridor).

Mr. Spang asked if the roof will be bearing on the masonry wall.

Mr. Monk replied in the negative, and presented the drawing of the cantilevered skylight, which will require removal of a course of brick to make a weathertight connection. He noted that the rafters will be metal. Mr. Monk stated that the relocated entrance on the east side will have a purpose as an emergency exit. It is not functional now.

Mr. Cutting asked for the dimensions of the corridor that is proposed for removal.

Mr. Monk stated that it is 10 feet wide and 40 feet long.

Mr. Monk noted that the dome over the Loring Building contains an important mural that came from a house on Chestnut Street. The mural will be removed and conserved.

Mr. Monk stated that the building is both a National Historic Landmark and is listed in the National Register. The PEM has filed a notification form for the work with the Massachusetts Historical Commission. The PEM has also conferred with HSI, which has requested further information. HSI specifically raised concerns about the Loring Building's Cornae mural with seascape image and its bay window. He stated that ice damage has caused some flaking to the mural and ceiling plaster. Mr. Monk presented a copy of the organization's letter.

Mr. Monk stated that no changes are proposed for the façade of 173 Essex Street but windows on the east elevation will be infilled.

Ms. Herbert asked what impacts the closed window openings will have to the interior of the building.

Mr. Monk stated that the PEM has not finalized plans for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors of the building but expects upper floors to become office space with first floors remaining retail. He stated that some windows open onto an interior stairwell, which is an open, suspended staircase. Mr. Monk stated that rear ells will be demolished and space will become a new garden accessed through the museum. Rear facades will include new and/or restored windows. Ells are currently used as storage for retail tenants.

Ms. Herbert asked if retail space needed the storage.

Mr. Monk stated that retail market is for 800 to 1000 sf range – new space will be much larger even when ells removed.

Mr. Monk presented an alternate plan that would leave the granite entrance in place. He stated that this plan would break cadence of the new space and length of EIMH.

Mr. Spang noted that the entrance would be set back in its new location and asked whether it would clip corner of pediment gable.

Mr. Monk replied in the negative. Mr. Monk said the Museum will remove the existing iron fence in front of the EIMH and would reinstall entrance doors to façade to restore original appearance of building. He noted that the relocated entrance would be used regularly for groups and as secondary entrance at night to allow two difference spaces to be used.

Ms. Herbert asked why the fence and anchor required removal.

Mr. Monk stated that the Museum wanted to restore building to as close to original as possible. Mr. Monk stated that the fence and anchor were installed in 1890 and the Museum had not yet finalized the design of the new doors and expected to have more details in February. He presented drawings of the original 1825 façade of the EIMH doors and stated that he expected design to be similar. He noted that the Museum was trying to open up the overall appearance of the building and lighten the look of the façade and that the PEM is now more of a fine arts museum than a maritime arts museum.

Ms. Guy asked what will happen to the anchor and Mr. Monk responded that no plans were in place yet.

Ms. Harper noted that the designs presented were a significant change from the last proposal.

Mr. Monk noted that the Museum was seeking a waiver of the demolition delay and comments from the Commission on the proposed plans to address the MHC's request that the Commission and Historic Salem be included in the planning process. He stated that they will continue to work on the design and build consensus.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Ms. Keenan made a motion to approve the waiver of the demolition delay. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried. Mr. Hart abstained.**

Ms. Guy noted that the MHC is seeking comment under M.G.L. Chapter 9 to determine whether the project will or will not have an adverse effect on historic resources and asked whether the Commission had any immediate comments for MHC.

Mr. Spang asked about the historic status of 173 Essex Street.

Mr. Monk stated that the building was constructed in 1858 as the city's first boys club. He noted that all three buildings were historic and several had some bank related history.

Mr. Spang noted his concern regarding the proposed infill of the window into the interior stairwell and what impacts it would have on the elaborate interior staircase.

Mr. Monk stated that he would bring in drawings as the design process progresses and the Museum would hold meetings for all interested parties. He noted that Historic Salem requested the Museum develop a Memorandum of Agreement and that the Commission could continue to work with PEM as a party to the MOA.

The Commission agreed that the primary concerns were: the configuration of the doors and panels on the EIMH, the impacts of the infilled stair window on the interior staircase and the future of the iron fencing and anchor. They also stated their desire to participate in a Memorandum of Agreement and to continue seeing drawings as design progresses.

**VOTE:** *Mr. Cutting made a motion to have Staff prepare a letter to MHC expressing the Commission's support for the relocation of the 1904 West Entry façade to the east side of EIMH, and comments related to the design for the installation of new façade doors and panels, the potential impacts from the infilled stair window at 173 Essex Street, the future treatment of proposed new building and the future of the iron fencing and anchor. Ms. Keenan seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried. Mr. Hart abstained from voting.*

Mr. Hart left the audience and rejoined the Commission.

### 320 Lafayette Street

Empire Telecom requested comments on potential effects on historic properties for a proposed telecommunications facility at 320 Lafayette Street in accordance to the Section 106 review process.

The applicant was not present.

### Documents & Exhibits

- Letter from Empire Telecom received 12/4/15
- Maps
- Specification drawings: 11/18/15
- Photographs: 1/19/16
- Photographic Rooftop Equipment Inventory: 1/19/16

Ms. Guy stated that the applicant was unable to provide an inventory of all the equipment on the roof, but was able to provide photographs.



Ms. Herbert suggested asking that the owner to provide an inventory of all equipment on the roof to determine whether any are obsolete and can be removed. She noted that the view of rooftop has now reached a level of major impact from all of equipment on roof.

Ms. Harper asked what statement “mechanicals are partially visible” on the drawings meant.

Mr. Spang request that owner paint the existing enclosure where paint is peeling.

The Commission discussed whether proposal will have any adverse impacts to historic properties adjacent on Lafayette Street.

Mr. Spang noted that building is not adjacent to any designated buildings and equipment will be behind existing equipment; therefore it would not be an adverse impact.

Ms. Guy noted that the Commission’s previous reviews did not find adverse effect but the proliferation of these units is troubling even if designated historic buildings are further away.

Ms. Kelleher noted that older buildings are within visible distance but they are not formally designated as historic.

Steve Dibble, Ward 7 Councilor stated that other telecommunication companies are proposing installations throughout the City and are presenting projects to the City Council, who will be holding a series of meetings to get better information on impacts from equipment.

**VOTE: Ms. Harper made a motion to send a comment letter with the recommendation that the owner complete an inventory of the existing equipment to determine whether any antenna are obsolete and can be removed and that the equipment enclosure be painted. Ms. Keenan seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.**

### 39 Norman Street

EBI Consulting requested comments on potential effects on historic properties for a proposed telecommunications facility at 39 Norman Street.

The applicant was not present.

### Documents & Exhibits

- Letter from EBI Consulting received 12/23/15
- Maps
- Specification drawings: 12/23/15
- Photographs: 12/23/15

Mr. Hart stated that historic buildings exist on Gedney Street and questioned whether information provided was definitive enough to show whether the equipment would be visible from street.

Mr. Spang noted that drawings specify that new equipment would be located behind an existing stealth wall.

The Commission agreed that if new equipment is located behind stealth wall then it would not be an adverse effect.

**VOTE:** *Mr. Spang made a motion to send a comment letter finding no adverse effect, conditional that the equipment is located behind the stealth wall. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

203-209 Essex Street - Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application – Request for Letter of Support

Ms. Guy read letter from Epsilon Associates, representing Hotel Salem Real Estate Holdigns, LLC regarding an application for MA Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits to restore the Naumkeag Clothing Company building for use as a hotel in downtown Salem.

The Applicant’s representative Mark Meche was present and presented a Powerpoint presentation. He noted that the applicant is applying for National and State historic tax credits and has received approval from the SRA through the small project design review process.

Ms. Herbert asked if the rooftop mechanicals will be visible.

Mr. Meche responded that the building has parapet wall, a screen wall will be built, and mechanicals are low profile. He also noted that the mechanicals will be set back from the façade and are expected to be smaller and quieter than older models. He stated that they will be difficult to see from ground level. Mr. Meche commented that he will consider options for making mechanicals as invisible as possible.

Mr. Meche presented floor plans of the project. Some units are multi-level for families and others are micro rooms. He presented elevation drawings depicting changes to the exterior walls and windows.

Mr. Hart noted that many changes will not be visible from street.

Mr. Meche stated that the exterior façade will be restored and repaired with a new sign band and storefronts and the SRA has requested more detail.

**VOTE:** *Mr. Hart made a motion to submit a letter of support for the tax credit application. Ms. Keenan seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

FY2016 Survey and Planning Grant Application Letter of Support - Downtown Salem Survey Update

Ms. Guy provided a letter requesting a SHC support letter for the City’s application for Survey and Planning Grant funds to update the Downtown Salem Cultural Resource Inventory.

**VOTE:** *Mr. Hart made a motion to submit a letter of support for the Survey and Planning Grant application. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

FY2016 Massachusetts Preservation Projects Fund Application – Dickson Memorial Chapel

Ms. Guy provided a letter from the Department of Planning and Community Development requesting a support letter for the City's request for MPPF Grant funds to restore the Dickson Chapel at Greenlawn Cemetery.

**VOTE:** *Mr. Cutting made a motion to submit a letter of support for the MPPF application. Ms. Keenan seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried. Mr. Spang abstained from voting.*

CPA Determination of Historic Significance for Mack Park

Ms. Guy read a letter from Jason Silva requesting a determination of historic significance for Mack Park. She presented the inventory form completed for the Mack Park/Ledge Hill Park which included the house and other structures on the site.

Mr. Hart noted that the house and surrounding site are historic as documented on the inventory form.

Councillor Dibble noted that the wall surrounding the park is in need of restoration and that a determination that the site is historic would allow the wall to be considered for CPA funds.

**VOTE:** *Mr. Cutting made a motion to find Mack Park a historically significant property, and by extension all existing features on the site are historic and that the wall, in its disrepair, has an adverse effect on the site. Mr. Hart seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

Pioneer Village

Ms. Guy presented a letter from Elizabeth Peterson, Director of the Witch House and Pioneer Village, requesting determination of historic significance for Pioneer Village, which is seeking CPA funding. The Commission asked whether an inventory form has been completed for the property. Ms. Guy presented the inventory form.

Councillor Dibble noted that a major reconstruction is planned for the drainage system at Canal Street, which will direct water through Forest River Park and adjacent to Pioneer Village to Salem Harbor. He asked whether the determination would have an impact on the project, which is out to bid.

Mr. Hart questioned if it had been permitted through Section 106.

Ms. Guy stated that she would check with the City Engineer.

**VOTE:** *Mr. Hart made a motion to find Pioneer Village a historically significant property. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

Proctor's Ledge

Ms. Guy presented letter from the City requesting determination of historic significance for Proctor's Ledge, for which the City will be seeking CPA funding.

Mr. Hart noted that Tad Baker, an expert on the Witch Trials, has documented the site.

**VOTE:** *Mr. Hart made a motion to find Proctor's Ledge a historically significant property. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

**Other Business:**

Ms. Kelleher read a letter from Historic Salem, Inc. to MHC requesting participation in all Section 106 and MGL 27-C Reviews.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Community Development Planner