

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
February 2, 2022

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, February 2, 2022 at 6:00 pm via **Zoom Virtual Meeting**. Present were: Rebecca English, Reed Cutting, Larry Spang (Chair), Mark Meche, Vijay Joyce (Vice Chair). Not present: Milo Martinez, Mark Pattison, Stacey Norkun. Staff: Patti Kelleher

4 North Pine Street Unit 2—continuation

Alex Tracy submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install dormer on rear elevation.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/22/21
- Architectural drawings/details
- Product details

Alex Tracy was present; noted that follow-up details had been added from past session to add window dormer to second bathroom. Architect Jamie Graham was present to discuss details. The Commission had requested to make the dormer a gable to match with layout of the house. A full bath will be added to the second floor; a shower will be located at area of the dormer. Mr. Joyce asked if the window size would match the gable end. Ms. Graham noted that the intent would be to match the existing. Mr. Joyce noted that the third-floor windows on the gable end are smaller than other windows on the home which the planned dormer window should match. Mr. Joyce asked if the rake molding turns and runs along fascia before it hits the roof, which Ms. Graham affirmed and noted that the intent would be to continue the molding along the long end. Mr. Meche asked if storms would be put on the installed windows. Ms. Graham noted that Marvin double-hung ultimate would be done on the exterior as well as a fiber-glass casement window on the interior of the shower so that moisture would not penetrate outer wood window.

No public comment.

Mr. Joyce asked if the slope at 9 inches per foot would match existing, which Ms. Graham noted was an estimate; the intent being to match existing slope. Mr. Meche asked for clarification regarding the dormer trim details: molding, fascia board, a board inch and a half/2 inches a board that follows the vertical cut. Ms. Graham noted that photographs of existing roofline had been looked at to match existing for window as well as trim on the roof.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the clarification that detail #3 on drawing A1-110 included dormer trim that returns from the face of the gable to the roof plane.

Mr. Joyce recommended the following amendments: window should match the existing window size on the gable end and all trim and details to match existing as closely as possible.

Chair Spang recommended an amendment that dormer window should be painted to match existing.

Mr. Meche accepted the amendments and Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, English, Cutting, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

284 Lafayette Street – continuation

Coach House Inn LLC submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a condenser.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/9/21
- Photographs
- Renders
- Site plan/aerial view

Nick Giallousis was present to discuss the application.

Chair Spang reminded the Commission that screening was being planned for condensers, and that the Commission had previously showed preference for the look of a fence for screening. Mr. Giallousis noted that pictures on Lafayette Street had been taken in the interim between this and past meeting. Mr. Giallousis had a renderer show some samples of fence styles based on photographs taken. Site plan and aerial view were also shown. Chair Spang asked if the end of the fence would align of the corner of the house; Mr. Giallousis noted that a concrete retaining wall prevents this. Picket and board fences were shown as options, which Mr. Giallousis noted would both provide enough airflow. 281 Lafayette has the picket fence design shown, which is shorter and painted a bluish gray. Mr. Meche wanted to stop the posts at the top rail rather than having any decorative caps. Mr. Meche also had no issue with the board fence, though expressed preference against having posts sit over the top of the fence; the point being to hide all evidence of mounting of the posts. Mr. Joyce noted that the picket would be more appropriate, and more decorative would be acceptable considering the style and look of the house itself. Mr. Joyce also noted that the fence should be painted the trim color of the house. Mr. Giallousis was open to any material the Commission preferred. Mr. Joyce noted that anything cedar, pressure-treated, anything rot-resistant would be advisable.

No public comment.

Chair Spang noted that because the fence is intended to screen the unit, the pickets should be made tighter. Mr. Giallousis noted that an inch and a half/two inches spacing were planned and he was open to tighter orientation. Mr. Joyce noted that an inch max could be a proposed parameter. Chair Spang asked how tall the pickets would be if they aligned with top of condenser; 61” with new grade elevation. Mr. Meche asked how far below the sill the concrete goes; Giallousis noted that it was still 61” to 62”. Mr. Meche preferred to see the top of the pickets be no higher than the bottom of the sill. Mr. Joyce proposed a tight Victorian square lattice rather than picket, given concerns that a 61” high picket would be too large. Mr. Joyce cited the Ropes Mansion which has a 6’ tall lattice fence that has been extant since the Victorian era, a precedent that would fit this style of home. Precedent options were also shown from Botts Court and Federal Street. Mr. Meche expressed reservations about approving a description rather than a drawing of a fence; and voiced support for a board fence. Ms. English expressed support for lattice over solid board style. Mr. Meche and Mr. Cutting also expressed approval for lattice. Chair Spang clarified that a dimensional drawing with elevations/measurements would be necessary for approval rather

than a rendering. Mr. Joyce also clarified that the top of the fence should be no higher than the windowsill, and that the squares formed by the lattice be no more than 1” wide.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the application for a fence in the style of Botts Court precedent shown in terms of the post, trim, caps, dimensions, and construction, with a drawing to be presented for final review and approval by a Commission member, painted to match trim. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, English, Cutting, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

186 Federal Street—continuation

James Carria submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a rear fence.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/1/21
- Photographs
- Product details

Ms. Kelleher presented a photograph of the property and summarized the previous meeting discussion regarding the request to replace fencing surrounding rear of property. Vinyl fence was originally proposed which the Commission was not in favor of. Applicant has explored other options before returning to present meeting. Image of colonial-style fence was shown which the applicant is proposing. Applicant noted that given pricing of other fencing, colonial-style is preferred. White cedar was asked about so that fascia boards are all white; whereas the image showed red cedar. The applicant is still in process of looking into pricing. Chair Spang asked if a fence company was yet selected; Northeast Fence was looked at but quotes were being garnered from multiple vendors. Chair Spang clarified that white cedar will not look like a painted white. Chair Spang confirmed that the fence would wrap three sides of the yard; an aerial view was shown. Fence will start at back edge of garage, and will not come to Federal St. The fence may overlap the garage by a foot or two. Mr. Carria indicated that the new fence would not be visible from Federal. Mr. Joyce noted that different vendors will have different takes on the colonial-style fencing which may be dissimilar to the image shown. Mr. Carria noted that he would go with Northeast Fence if there were any dissimilarities with other vendors. Mr. Joyce noted that this exact type of fence had been approved for the First Church on Essex Street. Mr. Joyce were amenable to white cedar, preferably painted to match trim. Mr. Joyce and Mr. Meche were supportive of wood being natural but not necessarily in need of sealant. Ms. Kelleher noted that portions of the fencing to the right of the house would be visible from Federal where the fence jogs over to meet existing rotted fencing.

Public comment:

Joyce Kenney spoke in support of the proposed colonial-style fence.

Ms. Kelleher noted that work carried out on this property without approval may be brought back before the Commission at a later date.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to approve the application as presented with white cedar. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, English, Cutting, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

2 Oliver Street

A review of detailed plans per Certificate of Appropriateness/Concept Approval issued on September 1, 2021.

Peter Pitman was present to deliver presentation review of detailed plans; began by thanking the Commission for allowing the clients conditional approval to move forward with the ZBA to receive required clearances. The general concept had received approval but areas in question included the Federal style balustrade and the new entrance which was too ornate for what would have been a back area of a home. The owner was amenable to removing balustrade to a flat copper roof. The materiality of the project was also questioned. The client wants to move forward with brick, including that on the carriage house; all of which are historically accurate. The brick will likely not match historic brick exactly. Mr. Pitman was open to changing the bond pattern. Another point of contention was the handrail; client is in touch with Cassidy Brothers foundry which has worked on the Common Fence and at the Boston Common to get cast replacements for the handrail. A patio handrail has two options: handrail up above like existing fence (cast in place; which is a bit busy; layering would be complex and complicated, not consistent with patio design); Mr. Pitman was more so in favor of a wrought iron railing, as a simpler cast iron railing design is preferred.

Mr. Meche clarified that complete approval is being sought on details as drawn. Mr. Pitman noted that that was correct; requested to be made aware of particular details or revisions sought by the Commission. Mr. Meche wanted to see detail on trim profiles and asked whether the presentation showed a shop-built door or a built product. Mr. Pitman noted that the door will be shop-built as the door is 8' tall. (The client may work with Blue Anchor on the door, which Mr. Pitman has previously worked with.) Mr. Meche asked if glass is single pane or insulated. Mr. Pitman clarified single pane. Mr. Meche was concerned if this would be to code. Chair Spang agreed with Mr. Meche that more details were needed. Mr. Meche also wanted to see eave profile from wall to roof. Mr. Meche noted that there needs to be some kind of differentiation between the additions and original elements of the house. Mr. Pitman cited work done on a staircase at Peabody Essex Museum (PEM) to differentiate new additions versus original construction and materiality. Ms. English was in agreement with Mr. Meche that the new addition needed to subtly stand out from original. Mr. Joyce noted that treatment of surround of the doors needs to feature Doric style on the utilitarian part of the home; those moldings are most easy to procure and readily available. Mr. Joyce cited a home on the corner towards the Common. Mr. Meche asked if the Doric canon has proportion rules as far as the entries; proportions shift radically on this house, thus there is a need to account for those differences. Mr. Pitman noted that a Doric-inspired/style trim package was planned around door. A literal recreation of a Doric package was not intended, Mr. Pitman said, and again cited the PEM building. Mr. Pitman noted that the intended mason would procure a sample for the Commission to examine. Mr. Pitman noted that the Doric shown is not a true Doric but is nonetheless consistent with Federal interpretations of Doric. Mr. Joyce asked for refined clarity on the moldings, details of the door, etc.

Chair Spang raised the prospect of deputizing one or more Commission members to guide Mr. Pitman through the process in order to streamline working through the details in an expeditious manner. Mr. Joyce and Chair Spang volunteered for the deputization. Details to be specifically looked through include: trim; eave edge conditions as brick hits; typical window details; kitchen door surround; guest suite door surround; hand railings/edge condition of patio raised plinth; brick and mortar.

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to continue the application and discussion to March 2, 2022 meeting. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, English, Cutting, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

5 Broad Street

Ms. Kelleher reported that there was a mistake in advertising the application for 5 Broad Street so it was readvertised for the February 16th meeting.

Salem Deed – Request for Determination of Historic Significance

Ms. Kelleher presented the City's request for determination of historic significance for the Salem Deed. The Salem Deed dates from 1686 and is considered evidence of conveyance of land of Massachusetts tribe to English settlers. The Deed is made of parchment, has description of land, signatures, marks from indigenous people who were part of the tribe at the time. If this is deemed historically significant, it will be eligible for CPA funds. The City will seek CPA funding to have the document treated by conservation professional and framed in double-sided archival frame to preserve it. The double-sided document would not be publicly displayed as it is too fragile; it would remain in City Clerk's vault. At this time, a copy would not be part of the project as the Massachusetts tribe was concerned with doing so, i.e. expressing reservations as to how such a copy would be circulated, distributed, interpreted, etc.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to find the Salem Deed historically significant. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, English, Cutting, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Brick Sidewalk Coalition

Brick Sidewalk Coalition has submitted a letter to the Commission. Colleen Brewster and Louis Sirianni were present to discuss the initiative. When the City drafted the Salem Historical Commission district guidelines, they elected not to include paving in the regulation. MA Chapter 40C allows historic districts to select certain items for purview, including at-grade change to terraces, walks, driveways, sidewalks, etc. When Salem drafted its ordinance, they opted not to include at-grade changes such as walkways. In order for Salem to adopt review of at-grade changes, the local ordinance would need to be revised with approval from the City Council. Mr. Sirianni and Ms. Brewster noted that other communities have adopted this provision, including Newburyport; Nantucket; Provincetown; Brookline; Rockport; New Bedford; Plymouth; Hingham; and Marblehead. Provincetown and Brookline exclude paving.

Ms. Kelleher proposed that Ms. Brewster reach out to the communities with at-grade paving changes in their ordinances to get feedback as to what types of procedures and experiences those communities have used. All of this would be done to determine what guidelines may be adopted in Salem.

Commission Member Resignation

Ms. Kelleher reported that Commissioner Stacey Norkun has resigned effective immediately. All agreed that she will be missed on the Commission.

Adjournment

Mr. Joyce made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. All members were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting adjourned at 8:33PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Dan Graham, Historical Commission Clerk