

DRAFT
SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
January 18, 2023

A regular meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, January 18, 2023, at 6:00 pm. **VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING.** Present were: Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce, Mark Meche, Milo Martinez, Kelly Tyler-Lewis. Not present: Reed Cutting, Jamie Graham, Mark Pattison, Larry Spang. Staff: Patti Kelleher

Request for Comment – Salem Willows Fish Pier and Seawall

Ms. Kelleher stated that the Commission voted to submit a letter of support, which hasn't been sent because the plans were revised to include rejoining the seawall on either side of the pier and the Commission may want to provide additional comment. The existing seawall is approximately 14-inches above grade and partially exposed from the park side with a small rubble wall is visible. The seawall is broken in various locations and the new connection will raise the grade, include a new 42-inch-high railing on top of the pier wall to match the existing. The opening to the pier has been closed off.

Ms. Tyler-Lewis joined the meeting at this time.

Acting-Chair Joyce asked whether the new seawall proposed will be high enough to include decorative paneling. Mr. Martinez noted concern with the low proposed height because a higher railing will not keep water out, with the sea level continuing to rise. Mr. Meche noted that the proposed higher railing height is required to prevent pedestrians from falling and has been raised approximately 1-foot and the pier height would also need to be raised. The proposed is 2-feet above the base flood elevation (BFE) and what's proposed meets the current code. He noted that the same engineer is working on the other seawall in the Willows, however, this location is more character defining from the water side. Ms. Kelleher presented before and after seawall details. Acting-Chair Joyce and Ms. English had no issue with the proposed design. Ms. Kelleher noted that the City reached out to HSI for comment and received no response.

Public Comment: No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Kelleher to draft a revised letter based on the last public meeting and add the comment to possibly raise the height to plan for future sea level rise and to include decorative panels. Mr. Martinez suggested replacing the railing with a higher decorative concrete wall only, withdrew that comment, then suggested adding an additional 14-inches+/- in height to the pier wall using pressed panels with 28-inch +/- railing above. Mr. Meche suggested a higher wall 6-inches below the top rail so that only a top rail needs to be installed.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to send a comment letter to the City of Salem in support of the modifications to the Willows seawall with the suggestion to replace up to 14-inches of the railing with a decorative railing to match existing. Mr. Meche amended the motion to include decorative concrete. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Meche, English, Tyler-Lewis and Acting-Chair Joyce were in favor and the motion so carried.

316 Essex Street– continuation

First Church in Salem, Unitarian_submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for new fence

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/15/22
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant requested a continuance to the next regular meeting.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting on February 1, 2023. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Meche, English, and Joyce were in favor and motion so carried.

55 Summer Street

Kelly and David Shutoff submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace rear window.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/12/22
- Photographs

Kelly Shutoff was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Shutoff stated that they wish to replace some rear windows, including a broken double-pane kitchen window at the rear ground level which is not visible. An Andersen Window representative suggested addressing other rear windows at the same time due to their operational difficulties. Ms. Kelleher stated that High Street is named in the McIntire District although no properties on High Street are in the boundaries of the district and visibility is limited.

Ms. Shutoff noted that the 1 over 1 kitchen window is no longer manufactured but will be replaced with an identical window. The upstairs windows are the farthest away from High Street and will have a 6 over 6 configuration. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that the configuration is the only aspect that would be visible. Mr. Meche asked if the replacement windows would fit into the existing openings. Mr. Shutoff replied yes.

Mr. Meche asked if the house had wood clapboards. Ms. Shutoff replied yes and noted that the existing windows have storms. Mr. Meche asked if the storms will be removed. Ms. Shutoff replied that the kitchen window only has a screen. Mr. Meche noted that the specification for the window model proposed had a 2011 or 2012 date. Ms. Shutoff replied that the representative informed them that the window has not changed.

Mr. Martinez asked if the muntins would be exterior applied. Ms. Shutoff asked if the storms should remain. The Board agreed that the storms should be removed. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that the Andersen proposal listed other windows. Ms. Shutoff replied that the other windows are in the living room and master bedroom but are minimally visible. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that no grille pattern is proposed on the specification. Ms. Shutoff replied that the specification sheet is an early version, and the bedroom window configuration will be 6 over 6 to match others.

Mr. Martinez asked if the other windows would be the same size. Ms. Shutoff replied that no two window sizes are alike, but the new configuration will be close. Mr. Martinez suggested the kitchen window also be 6 over 6. Acting-Chair Joyce agreed that it would provide a cohesiveness.

Mr. Meche noted that the proposed window is Fibrex and raised concerns with locating the new window in the same shallow relief within the window opening so the profile remains. He requested the proposed color. Ms. Shutoff replied white, but they will paint the new ones to match the other window color. Ms. Kelleher noted that she doesn't remember the Andersen 100 Series being approved by the Commission and they would request that the material be painted.

The Board discussed requesting a window sample despite the minimal visibility. Mr. Martinez believed a sample would be beneficial to see and requested the Suggested the applied grill have the putty edge. Ms. Tyler- Lewis noted that the exterior applied grille will provide more dimension.

Public Comment: No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to approve Andersen 100 Series, single or double hung with an applied exterior grille using the ovolo or putty applied edge at panes and the window to be set in same plane as other historical windows. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Martinez, Tyler-Lewis and Joyce were in favor and the motion so carried.

142 Canal Street

Canal Realty Development, LLC submitted a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish rear garage building.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/4/23
- Photographs

Steven Feinstein was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Feinstein stated that he received approval from the PB and Conservation Commission to demolish the rear of the building, which was used as garages to service vehicles. They proposed to build residential units above with garages below within the same footprint. He noted that the area is only visible from the rail trail, and he was not convinced that this project is under Commission jurisdiction even though original building dates to 1942 because the garage was an addition. The existing siding is concrete panels, and the proposed façade will be like the façade at Artful Life with the blue siding. The garages below are proposed due to flood plain. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission needed to determine whether the garage was historically significant and preferably preserved.

Mr. Meche didn't find the garage historically significant. Acting-Chair Joyce and Ms. English agreed.

Public Comment:

Kelleher stated a letter was received from Ward 5 Councillor Jeff Cohen in support of the project.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: English made a motion to find the building not historically significant. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Martinez, Tyler-Lewis and Joyce were in favor and the demolition delay was waived.

3 Beckford Street

Holly Barrett submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace slate roof with asphalt shingles

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/4/23
- Photographs

Holly Barrett was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Barrett stated that the roof has slate on one side and asphalt shingles on the driveway side, and both need replacing. She proposed to remove the slate and have the single entirely as asphalt. Acting-Chair Joyce asked if the slate was failing. Ms. Barrett replied that there is leaking on the slate side and cracks on the interior. Ms. Kelleher noted that the 3-tab shingles on left side date back to 1985 and the contractor proposed GAF Timberline HDZ shingle in Charcoal Gray, which does have an angled cut, so he proposed CertainTeed Landmark shingle in Moire Black as an alternative. She noted that the contractor didn't believe IKO was a good quality shingle, which has been an option for the Commission in the past. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that the Commission has approved Slateline which is an architectural shingle which has straight cuts like slate, giving the visibility of the roof. Ms. Barrett raised concerns with the potential difference in cost.

Mr. Martinez preferred CertainTeed Landmark due to its uniform colors and suggested Pewterwood rather than Timberline which has more color variation. Ms. English agreed with Mr. Martinez regarding the product. Ms. Barrett preferred the more solid color of CertainTeed Landmark in Pewterwood if the price was comparable.

Public Comment: No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Kelleher encouraged salvaging of the slate shingles. Mr. Martinez suggested alternative color options. Ms. Barrette felt that Moire Black was too dark and noted that she would wait until Pewterwood would be available.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she discussed with the Contractor (Osgood) about whether there are concerns about using dark shingles due to heat absorption from the sun and he replied that with a proper underlayment and ventilation that use of a darker color will not make a difference.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve CertainTeed Landmark in Pewterwood. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Martinez, Tyler-Lewis and Joyce were in favor and the motion so carried.

143 Derby Street - Review of final design plans and materials

Stefano Basso of SV Design was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the Commission approved the concept with a condition for the final design to be submitted for their review. Mr. Basso stated that they've progressed the design, new building is labeled 'Building A' and older building with the addition is 'Building B.' They've used the design that moves the bays, which are no longer chamfered, away from the corner; added small hoods over the door; used large fascia at the roof line and smaller profile at the 3rd floor floor-line; and an extended overhang at the driveway side roof to conceal the gutter. There are historic sill details at the window, connected trim at panels at the bays, and the proposed windows are Marvin Elevation which is fiberglass clad. They would like to consider a PVC window option, such as Matthews Brothers, which offers both vinyl and PVC windows with simulated divided lite (SDL) with various muntin profiles. Ms. Kelleher was unsure if a PVC window had ever been approved by the Commission and noted that any new windows do require painting, and the proposed window option may not be paintable. Acting-Chair Joyce suggested a window sample to review. Mr. Basso thought PVC was better quality than the vinyl but offered to provide window samples for all options under consideration and noted that the Marvin was vinyl clad wood and Matthews Brothers was not wood. Mr. Meche asked about the difference between vinyl and polyvinylchloride (PVC). Mr. Basso was unsure of the composition differences, but noted that the Marvin Essential, which is all fiberglass,

however, they were not able to provide a SDL. Mr. Meche noted that the newly proposed windows would have a better sight line than inexpensive PVC windows which the Commission have rejected in the past. Acting-Chair Joyce suggested separating the review of the windows until samples could be provided.

Mr. Basso stated that they selected trim profiles they felt were most appropriate, although Building B has more variation. The existing front building will have a white clapboard cladding that is below the existing aluminum and any historic details would be replicated. The rear barn type structure will be simpler, clad with a natural cedar shingle. The second floor is setback from the main street, as the new addition, it will also be clad in cedar shingles and have a different window pattern to suggest that as the later addition it is not trying to match the original house.

Mr. Meche asked if the any openings have been adjusted or dormer sizes changed on building A. Mr. Basso replied that the dormer that acts as the entryway to the rear unit roof deck above the barn was reconfigured but it largely obscured from the street. Wall height was added to the third floor and that change ties into the right-side dormer. On the driveway side of the building, the façade at the connect was broken up between the barn and the main house, using vertical siding, a third type of siding for this project and the door is the front entry to the rear unit. Mr. Meche asked if the roof ridge was also raised. Mr. Basso replied no.

Acting-Chair Joyce suggested the barn dormers be smaller, narrower, and not meet the main roof ridge height. He would have no concerns if the dormers were switched from a gable to a shed. Mr. Basso noted that at one point they were flush with the main wall but have since been pushed back. Mr. Meche asked if the two roof decks were added. Mr. Basso replied yes. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that the two windows were added.

Mr. Meche asked which visit this was to the Commission. Mr. Basso replied their third. Mr. Meche asked if the rear dormer connects in previous iterations. Mr. Basso replied no. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that new windows are included in the revised dormer design, requested the amount of foundation visible on the barn from Derby Street should be no higher than 8-inches above grade, water table and siding included. He suggested a barn door be introduced next to the rear entrance door in lieu of a window using the track above to create a door hood to make it feel like a barn. Mr. Meche was not completely in favor of the evolution of the design over the door roof deck, the enlarging of the envelope to with dormers that blend to enlarge the unit square footage. The dormers on the right side are spaced 3'6" apart and it has the most projected plane to the wall below it. The primary bedroom and closet are now 25% larger and the gables should remain gables. Mr. Martinez noted that he is not in favor of gable dormers. Mr. Meche noted his preference for larger east facing dormers vs. using shed dormers, which may not meet their design goal. Acting-Chair Joyce agreed and requested the dormers and windows all be pushed back. Mr. Meche suggested making the dormers into one gable that can start lower and be closer to the eave. Mr. Basso suggested eliminating the third side gable and continuing one shed dormer straight across. Mr. Meche replied that it could be an option. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that reducing the dormers would highlight the historic building. Mr. Martinez noted his preference for using 3 peaked gables rather than a shed dormer.

Mr. Meche stated that for the side addition the Commission requested that they differentiate between the old and new. Ms. English agreed. Mr. Martinez noted that the new rear shingled portion was mislabeled as existing.

Mr. Basso stated that the new trim will be painted PVC. Acting-Chair Joyce asked if the rake board trim on the existing building will be rebuilt because the details were shown as new. Mr. Basso replied that the existing will remain. Acting-Chair Joyce asked if when the detail turns the corner, if the gutter would be integrated or the original detail will be matched. Mr. Basso replied that a new gutter would be added at the eave line. Mr. Meche

stated that the gutter along the west façade shows no moulding or gutter. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that there is a bed moulding below the rake board at the soffit too.

Mr. Basso requested the Commission's preferred asphalt shingle style. Acting-Chair Joyce replied, a type with a square cut like IKO Cambridge. Mr. Meche suggested an aluminum slate style shingle which may not be appropriate for the barn. Ms. Kelleher noted that there are approved and installed examples in Salem and Peabody.

Acting-Chair Joyce asked if the Hardi siding would have the smooth side out. Mr. Basso replied yes. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that the bay window facing Derby Street has a staircase inside it and questioned if it would be seen. Mr. Basso replied that the stair will be pulled away from the wall and noted their difficulty in generating the floor plan for the unit with its garage on the driveway side and clipped corners at the bays, and a centralizes stair would break up the living room and kitchen. This configuration allowed them to keep the bay in place. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that high visibility of this window from the street and asked if a handrail would be against the windows. Mr. Basso replied yes. Ms. Kelleher stated that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over the interior and the Commission's suggested design changes have made this condition visible. Mr. Basso suggested using a frosted glass for the sash or installing a removable panel within the track of the jamb, so it reads as a lower shade in place and leaving the upper sash open, as many with street level living spaces do. Acting-Chair Joyce asked if the panels below the bay windows is MDO with applied trim. Mr. Basso replied that a 1/2-inch flat panel would be wrapped in 5/4 flat stock trim with a 3/4-inch difference in plane. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that a historically appropriate detail would include a 1/4 round to provide additional definition. Mr. Meche suggested chamfering which would require additional prep work to paint. Acting-Chair Joyce agreed with adding some level of detail. Mr. Basso stated that they saw Building A as having the massing and detail of a historical building and Building B would have a more modern square cut details that blends in with the neighborhood. Acting-Chair Joyce appreciated their line of thinking but the flat details provide no depth and he would like to see shadow lines, the push and pull of the façade, to provide some character, particularly given its corner location and proximity to the sidewalk. He suggested the use of thicker flat stock if a modern approach was preferred. He noted that the panels below the windows are three different sizes, but there should be an order to them or they are all the same, since the bays will draw the eye up. Some structures in Salem have a particular shape repeated on a specific floor, and he would like to see some consistency between the sizes. He suggested including the door head alignment into the bays to create an alignment between the panels. Mr. Meche suggested the panel drop into the skirtboard and allow it to punctuate between bays and enlarging it. Mr. Basso agreed. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that the door hoods are small and bracket shapes on each building were different, however, applying the bracket shape proposed on Building B to Building A would made a difference, particularly if the hood size were slightly enlarged.

Mr. Basso requested additional insight on the potential addition of a barn door. Acting-Chair Joyce replied a standard size barn down fixed in an open position. Mr. Meche asked whether a traditional barn door with barn door hardware would work for the garage, rather than a faux barn door. Acting-Chair Joyce replied that he considered it as a barn door no longer in use and has been left open, so it feels more like a barn. Mr. Basso suggested a single panel next to a door would make the most since because the larger door would have been on the opposite side with the other garage doors. Acting-Chair Joyce noted his concern with the appropriate narrative behind the addition. Mr. Martinez suggested double barn doors where one is fixed and the other is the passage door. Mr. Meche agreed and suggested that both have glass lites. Acting-Chair Joyce noted that they could act as carriage doors which is more historic to Salem. Mr. Martinez noted that the two doors would be wider like a carriage house door and the lites would be primarily at the top 1/3 of each door. The Board agreed.

Mr. Basso stated that they are seeking approval to move forward and seek a building permit and suggested final details and windows be reviewed on site. They've received a foundation permit and are gearing up for site work, but the full building permit requires Commission review and approval first. Mr. Meche raised concern with the future design of the dormers and last-minute adjustments can be made in the field prior to the commencement of framing, but they shouldn't impact the foundation work. The site crew is hoping to begin work in February. Mr. Meche asked if the building would be released to issue a building permit one at a time so the larger design concerns can be addressed. Ms. Kelleher replied that it would complicate the issuance of a building permit. She agreed that there were two areas of concern that could be redesigned and continued to the February 1, 2023 meeting or 1 or 2 Commission members could be deputized to review and sign-off on the design and details, prior to the February 1, 2023 meeting. Mr. Basso asked if an agreement among the Commission members could not be reached could a permit for Building A be released since with such a constrained site the construction of one building would need to occur prior to the other. Ms. Kelleher stated that she was willing to discuss the matter with the Building Inspector but raised concerns due to another structure being constructed not as it was approved. Having an approved set of plans tied to the release of a building permit is preferable. Mr. Meche agreed.

Mr. Basso stated that they plan to incorporate some recent changes to the foundation design and lowering the top of foundation wall to 8-inches above grade as suggested would be one of them. They could return with the final design and new information. The Engineering Department may need to know final fixture counts, etc. Ms. Kelleher stated that this is a prominent project on Derby Street and if the Commission isn't comfortable signing off on all the aspects of the project they should continue.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to continue to the February 1, 2023 meeting. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Martinez, Tyler-Lewis and Joyce were in favor and the motion so carried.

Acting-Chair Joyce praised the efforts of the design team to continue to develop the plan details.

Other Business:

Meeting Minutes

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to approve the December 7, 2022 regular meeting minutes. Ms. English seconded. Roll Call: Meche, English, Martinez, Tyler-Lewis, and Joyce were in favor and the motion so carried.

Public Comment

Christopher Patzke, Lafayette Street. He forwarded two pieces of correspondence to Chair Larry Spang and Ms. Patti Kelleher. The first was a response to Mayor Driscoll's project notification form for the Camp Naumkeag/Pioneer Village project, that evaluates her justification for the project. The second is a letter from Joy Beasley, Keeper of the National Register, to Brona Simon, State Historic Preservation Officer at MHC. He requested several times for the Commission to revisit the nomination of Pioneer Village to the National Register to which he did not receive a response. After pressing Chair Spang and Ms. Kelleher he was told that it was not going to happen, so he nominated it himself. He received a roadblock once again and appealed to the Keeper of the National Register and received a response.

With such a strongly worded letter by the person in charge of the National Register, he is deeply disappointed at the actions of the city and that this Commission has chosen not to do its duty and nominate Pioneer Village to the

National Register. He added that the Keeper is looking at this property as district, not just a site, which has significant impacts on the project. He asked each city councillor, the acting mayor, Patti Kelleher and Larry Spang, and he suggested that there is no consideration for the Camp Naumkeag project until the determination is made about its inclusion on the National Register. He asked that Pioneer Village be included on the National Register, he had a conversation with the Deputy Keeper of the National Register, and several nationally known preservationists in support of his efforts, and the press. He added that the movement to save Pioneer Village and stop this project is growing and he's received a tidal wave of support. He hopes politicians, commissioners, and those making these decisions hear the will of Salem residents, because this is not right for Salem.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she will forward all correspondence to the Commission related to this matter.

Adjournment

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Martinez, Tyler-Lewis, and Joyce were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting ended at 8:50PM

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen Brewster
Clerk