

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
February 16, 2022

A regular meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, February 16, 2022, at 6:00 pm. **VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING.** Present were: Reed Cutting, Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce (Acting Chair), Milo Martinez, Mark Meche, Mark Pattison. Not present: Larry Spang.

20 Chestnut Street

Shawn Smith submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for roof vents

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/27/22
- Photographs

Shawn Smith was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Smith stated that they are planning a light remodel of a couple second floor bathrooms that don't currently have exhaust vents. They will be vented through the attic with 4-inch ductwork with an 8-inch x 8-inch black roof vent. Their double-house neighbors at 22 Chestnut placed a vent directly in front of their front chimneys so they would do the same. Their second proposed vent is at the rear two-story addition and the vent would be placed in front of the vent stack. Mr. Joyce suggested the roof vents be installed behind the chimney where they will be less visible. Ms. Smith replied yes, which would also reduce the run of ductwork. Mr. Martinez asked if the same vent would go in the opposite side. Ms. Smith replied yes, the vent is a standard size roof vent manufactured by Grainger.

Commissioner Pattison left at this time.

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

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Martinez, Meche, Joyce were in favor and the motion so carried.

5 Broad Street

Charing Cross Realty submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate the building –

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/17/22
- Photographs
- Drawings by Pitman & Wardley dated 1/17/22

Peter Pitman of Pitman & Wardley Associates was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Pitman stated that the building is the old senior center and a former Salem high school from the 1850's. The existing dormers are not original, and the balustrade is no longer present. The building backs up to Broad Street Cemetery where a public easement exits onto Broad Street. The finished building will include a restored cupola and bell tower and a recreated balustrade will be used as screening for new HVAC equipment since there is no ground footprint to use. The existing windows will be restored, a new fence will be added to screen the parking lot, and the side entry doorway will be lowered to create an accessible entrance with a transom above. The brownstone and granite plinths will remain, new brick will be added at grade to create a new walkway, landscaping and simple iron fences will be added to conceal the window wells. The current a non-compliant HC ramp to the basement will be removed and a stair will be added to provide access to 2 basement units. The new landscape plan was completed by Jim Emmanuel and will be reviewed by the Planning Board (PB). The fence will have granite newel posts at the ends and cast-iron finials on top of the posts. The rooftop dormers are in line with the exterior brick wall and the

balustrade will have paneled posts. The building was constructed in the 1850's and the dormers may have been added in the 1870's or 80's. The proposal is to have loft style attic units and proposed dormers will provide light and make the space usable. The new details will be recessed and more modest, so the dormers have a smaller profile from the street. The internal 3-foot-deep balcony will have sliding doors and is needed for ventilation and emergency egress. The bell tower will be restored, and the slate roof will be preserved. The new dormer work will use salvaged slate from the existing dormers.

Mr. Joyce asked about the proposed door material and surrounds. Mr. Pitman replied that there will be custom fabricated doors painted black to fit the openings with trim painted to match the existing trim. There was concern about including a vision panel because of a tight landing so they'd rather not include a solid panel door. Mr. Martinez suggested the use of a 4-panel door with the 2 upper glass panes and lower 2 panes.

Mr. Meche asked how far the front door is set back. Mr. Pitman replied approximately 3-feet and the replacement door will be put back in the same location. Mr. Meche asked if the transom above to be new door is existing or new. Mr. Pitman replied new, and it will have mullions.

Mr. Pitman stated that at the parking lot façade they will remove the brick in-fill, preserve the rusticated surround and granite plinths, remove the granite treads and lower the entrance, similar to the PEM former Phillips Library building on Essex Street with a transom with a mullion. Cast iron fences will be installed around the window wells and basement stairwell and the front window wells will have planting and greenspace for screening.

Mr. Pitman stated that at the rear cemetery side the existing ramp is not near any HC parking spaces and there is a travel easement along the rear façade. The rear dormer windows will not be at an egress height so they will have minimal size lites. The center dormer window will remain and the two on either end will comply with current light and ventilation requirements, and ice and snow cleats will be added to the roof. They will remove the rear HC ramp to reveal and restore the granite steps below and repurpose the granite steps from the driveway entrance if necessary.

Mr. Pitman stated that at the left elevation, new walkways will be set on granite curbs, the gas meters will be screened, and they will work with MEP engineers to elevate the equipment to the roof rather than at grade. If anything is unavoidable a copper or matte black sleeve will be used to conceal it.

Mr. Pitman noted that the building section shows the modest new dormers pushed away from the front face of the wall and the 42-inch railing height. The floor will be raised two risers and a structural engineer didn't see any need to remove framing, so they will build on top of the existing framing. Mr. Meche questioned if the balconies met the IBC egress requirements. Mr. Pitman replied that they will use a sliding door rather than an egress window at the bedrooms, but it will act as a functional Juliette balcony. There are two means of egress, and he needs to meet the bedroom window requirement.

Mr. Joyce asked for the material proposed for the sidewalls of the dormer. Mr. Pitman replied that they will repurpose the slate and the casing will be weaved around the corner and into the slate on the sidewalls. There is no room for clapboards and the dormer will have minimal dimensions with a relatively small wall area.

Mr. Meche asked about the plumbing vent locations. Mr. Pitman replied that if anything can't be vented behind the balustrade, he will return to the SHC, but they will not vent anything through the front of the building. There will be many penetrations, but the details need to be determined. Mr. Meche asked if all existing flues will be reused. Mr. Pitman replied that they will be capped in place if they aren't reused.

Mr. Joyce asked if the existing windows are true divided lite. Mr. Pitman replied yes, and they will be replicated, and field painted. They will add a storm assembly but haven't spoken to any companies yet due. He requested an approval as is and if they find a large window storm manufacturer he could return to the Commission for their review. Mr. Meche replied that interior and exterior storms aren't within their purview.

Mr. Meche suggested adding structure above the cornice to reinforce the horizontal plane since there is still a bit of roof plane below the window and suggested a handrail at the balconies. Mr. Pitman suggested a sloped railing or sheet metal. Mr. Joyce asked how far up the roof it would extend. Mr. Pitman replied that it would resemble a snow fence detail rather than a pitched roof which will block light, ventilation, and the view which is already a challenge.

Mr. Joyce asked if the snow fence would be at the front and rear. Mr. Pitman replied that they would only be at the rear since the front sliding doors are protected by large gables, and the window wells would be a simple black tube or snow cleats. Mr. Joyce agreed that the profile remain low and continue the roof line across the windows.

Mr. Meche suggested the existing vent penetrations in the front pilasters flanking the entry door be removed. Mr. Pitman replied that all existing front façade penetration will be removed.

Mr. Martinez noted that the window configuration at the dormer windows is changing from 8 over 8 for two sets of windows and they will be changed to door size windows with a transom configuration above the door. Mr. Pitman replied that there is a wall between the dormer transoms, the doors will be tall since the hip roofed dormers are the main light source. The arched window in the front is common space and side elevations will be unit windows. The existing dormer windows have approximately 8-12 inches between the jambs and the wall that divides them, widening them insignificantly to allow for egress. The door head height is 8-feet above the finished floor. Mr. Martinez suggested adjusting the mullion locations, so they resemble the windows on the first and second floors. Mr. Pitman replied that they will be a closer match and will be modest.

Mr. Martinez asked why the roof pitch at the dormer has changed. Mr. Pitman replied that the new dormer will match the pitch of the existing roof and the current dormers have a different pitch.

Mr. Martinez asked if the side entrance door transom be reduced by making the door taller since the proportions are strange with a small looking door and two large transoms above. Mr. Pitman replied that the door is 3-6'W x 8-feet H and the mullions were added between the two transoms to break up the pattern and make the pane pattern vertical not horizontal.

Mr. Martinez asked why a fence is proposed at the parking lot. Mr. Pitman replied that the PB is concerned with headlights, view corridors, traffic flow, etc.

Mr. Meche asked about the large circles shown on rear façade. Mr. Pitman replied that they are existing kitchen vents that will be removed.

Public Comment:

Karen Murray Cady spoke in favor of seeing this building being restored. Concerned about when the neighborhood should weigh in on the traffic, parking, and the impact construction will have on the neighbors. Mr. Pitman replied that those questions are legal issues that get resolved at the PB meetings, but they will have a neighborhood meeting prior to the PB meeting to address the concerns of the neighbors.

Michael Steinitz, President of Friends of Broad Street Cemetery. Happy to see the building be rehabilitated. Regarding the west parking lot door, the PEM example lowered the entire surround and in-filled the area above with brick, so the entrance was the same proportion. This seems to be an awkward solution, with a lot of glass, that's highly visible when traveling down Broad Street, although the original photo doesn't show any further detail. Mr. Joyce replied that moving it down takes it out of level with the main Broad Street door, so moving it down and adding a transom above keeps them level.

Sarah Staats asked if the cupola would be restored. Mr. Pitman replied yes, the details will be restored, and any missing elements will be replicated using paint grade mahogany.

Emily Udy, 8 Buffum Street. Noted that all other windows and dormers have a heavy stone lintel and asked if there an opportunity to create an upper lintel with stone trim to tie it to the other windows. Mr. Pitman replied that they could add a wood trim that touches the wood cornice, but it wouldn't be appropriate to include a brownstone lintel since they are framed in wood. Mr. Meche suggested enlarging the trim at the head of the transom. Mr. Pitman replied that the doors will be 3-feet wide and 6-feet wide overall. Mr. Martinez suggested the doors mimic the window and making a large mullion between the transom in the dormer. Mr. Meche suggested using French doors. Mr. Pitman agreed and don't that they don't want a single course of slate above so that's why they selected wood and a wood corner board could also be used.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she received an e-mail from Lisa Lyons, with questions and concerns that related more to the PB review.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Kelleher stated that regarding the discussion on recreating the balustrade, another project used mahogany and composite for repairs in hard-to-reach areas and suggested it be considered for this project. Mr. Joyce added that once painted the difference in material wouldn't be very visible.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the complexity of the new iron railing at the window wells hasn't been called out. It's unknown if they would be similar to the cemetery and she suggested a conditional approval for their design.

Mr. Meche suggested other conditional approval items such as the west entrance, balcony on third floor, and infill items like doors and windows. Mr. Joyce added the dormer trim detailing, fencing, changing all doors to 4 panels, and balustrade.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to grant conditional approval with additional review of all entry doors, balustrade, balcony, fencing with the submission of floor plans, and mechanical plans. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Martinez, Meche, Joyce were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. English joined the meeting at this time.

38 Norman Street

38 Norman Street LLC submitted a request to Waive Demolition Delay to demolish 1956 garage building

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/5/22
- Photographs

Ryan Wittig and Matthew Moore of Camerra Capital and Philip Sima, Balance Architects, were present.

Mr. Witting stated that a 20-unit residential building is proposed with a ground floor commercial space, which is an upgrade over the current existing use as a former gas station and a Christmas tree lot. Ms. Kelleher noted that traditionally the Commission has asked for development plans, but this project is also going through PB, SRA, DRB review as well.

Mr. Sima noted that the building is a 2,000 square-foot former Texaco service station built in 1956 located in the downtown district. It has stucco siding, one window and 2 service doors on Norman Street, and CMU on the rear wall. No original Texaco signage remains. The new development proposes to eliminate the Norman Street curb cut. A 20-unit development with a first-floor commercial space with outdoor seating on Norman Street and vegetative screening. There will be an enclosed trash and recycling room, and pavers at the residential entry and seating. There will be 3 floors of residential units that step back alongside the abutters and at the roof decks. The rental units are primarily 1 and 2 bedrooms, there will be an architectural CMU masonry base, with ACM panels, and brick and clapboard siding above. The parking entry is partially exposed and partially over the building with an opaque garage door. Iterations resulted in a 4-story development, rather than the 5-stories originally proposed. They want to create a vertical prominence to differentiate between the base with a different pattern of brick at the 4th floor and the use of banding.

Mr. Joyce stated that the application is to discuss the Demolition Delay request so they can't talk about the design. According to the Demolition Delay the existing building should be well documented with plans and photographs if it cannot be saved, because this is representative of the style used at the time.

Public Comment:

Mark Ricklefs, 24 Norman Street. Concerned with the 3-story building's impact on adjoining house and residential neighborhood. He stated that the request to waive the demolition delay was the first time he had received notice of the project, which was concerning since the project is far into the process. He asked what will happen to people

using that parking area or the Christmas tree lot that people in the neighborhood get their tree from. The dumpster would be less than 20-feet from the closest Salem neighbor. While the developers state that neighbors are aware of the demolition, he is the only one that showed up at this meeting and he's concerned this will be like other new developments. Ms. Kelleher noted that language was added to the recently revised Demolition Delay ordinance requiring for a 2-week notice to abutters and abutters to abutters. Other review boards would have done the same and included newspaper ads too. The Commission only sends notices to abutters and abutters to abutters.

Emily Udy, Historic Salem Inc. HSI has no comments on the historical significance of the existing building and is in agreement with the Historical Commission. The previous demolition in this area of the downtown in the 1940s and 50's divided Crombie and Summer Streets from the McIntire District and anything proposed should connect the neighborhoods in a pedestrian friendly way that's beneficial to the neighborhood. She thanked the developer for working with HSI and hopes they continue that outreach with others.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she received no additional written public comments and there are other opportunities to participate in the PB, SRA, and DRB review on other concerns.

Mr. Joyce noted that parking, etc. will be reviewed by the Planning Board.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the request to waive the Demolition Delay with the condition that photographs and dimensional plans of the existing building be provided prior to demolition. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Martinez, Meche, English, Joyce were in favor and the motion so carried.

6 Lathrop Street

Michael Buonfiglio submitted a Request to Waive Demolition Delay to demolish more than 50% of the building

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/31/22
- Photographs
- Plans by MAC Design

Attorney Kristin Kolick of Correnti & Darling, Michael Buonfiglio, and Matt Carlson, Project Designer at MAC Design were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Kolick stated that the building is in the Bridge Street Neck National Registered District, the original building was constructed around 1800, but the structure has been substantially altered with oddly configured bump-outs on multiple sides. The applicant purchased the home 1-year ago and intended to complete a renovation and repairs. He intends to square off and modernize the building with the intent to keep it within the character and style of the neighborhood, although the renovation triggers the Demolition Delay Ordinance, and they are requesting a waiver.

Mr. Carlson stated that the front of the house fits in with the Georgian style within the district with its 3-bay facade and 2-bay side elevation, although there have been substantial modifications to the front and rear façades. The houses at 12 Conant Street and 5 Barton Street area similar and have been modified. The modification made to 6 Lathrop include a side porch that created a new entrance, the continuation of the upper level of the gambrel roof to provide additional square footage, at the rear a single story and partial two-story addition and a second means of egress, at the left side a small bump-out to add a half bath to each unit that has structural posts and no foundation. The intent of the proposed design is to preserve some of the street facing elements while improving the living spaces on each floor through exterior balconies and porches. A full height bump-out was also added to preserve the overall new massing of the building. They are pulling from both new and old designs to include covered side porches, gable roofs with gabled dormers that maintain the flat street façade. All the existing windows and siding has been replaced and the brick foundation walls painted. The proposal is intended to restore the aligned rhythm of the façade to a more traditional design and to do away with the windows of various sizes that don't align.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the building is from the mid 1800's Georgian style with the gambrel roof. It is located within a National Registered district and was found to be a contributing resource in the district, which is one of the

criteria for determining whether a building is historically significant. She is not sure when the additions were added, and the structure has most likely been modified since the inventory form was completed. Mr. Cutting noted that the brick foundation extends across the extended left-side. Ms. Kelleher replied that the foundation is high and consistent and could have been moved. Mr. Joyce agreed that the new foundation aligns well with the existing.

Mr. Joyce noted that they are taking off the existing gambrel and proposing a gable roof and asked if the roof will be raised to provide additional height. Mr. Carlson replied yes, the roof would be lifted to provide more third floor living space. The space on that level is only within the gambrel and doesn't extend into the extended roof. Mr. Meche asked how much will be demolished. Mr. Carlson replied that pending a structural review, the structure will be removed down to the ceiling of the second floor, since much of the framing appears to be deteriorating, but what is salvageable will remain, although the window openings would change. Mr. Meche asked if the waiver is being requested to potentially demolish the structure down to the found walls. Ms. Kelleher replied that the removal of 50% or more of the roofline triggered the new Demolition Delay Ordinance. Much of the building will be removed even if the exterior walls remain in place. If there are any hesitations or concerns the Commission can schedule site visits, review condition reports, and work with property owner to search for opportunities to salvage what is left of the historic character.

Mr. Joyce expressed concern that the proposed style doesn't fit within the neighborhood and there is no formal language left that speaks to the historic layout of the proposed structure. The basic shape remains, but the symmetry of a Georgian style, the additions have been lost, and the proposed roof pitch is steeper than the surrounding buildings. Although no additional floor is being added, but the gambrel hides a third floor well and dormer can be added. The house also won't be wider; the left side addition is being removed to restore the 1-room depth. He asked if they considered keeping the left side addition. Mr. Carlson replied that they considered reconfiguring the roof to maximize the living space for the third-floor unit to make each unit equal.

Mr. Meche noted that the shed dormer, where the face of the dormer is in line with the façade of the building, but there is no window over the entry door. The partial demolition has erased the historic aspects, but if those aspects are not so far gone then perhaps there is a better way to reuse them. Mr. Martinez believed that the details are not too far gone, the house is clearly a Georgian style. Its details make it easy to see what it used to be, how it was configured, and its relationship to the lot and the neighborhood. The Commission sees many Georgian style houses turned sideways throughout Salem. The new design is a new house, but the current house is preferably preserved, the discussion regarding the design is to find common ground to complete the work sooner than 18-months. The roof line is entirely characteristic and should be preserved and the gable end is inappropriate for this house. He asked if the footprint is changing or only being modified at the upper level. Mr. Carlson replied that the width would remain, and the depth would increase to match 8 Lathrop Street, but the footprint will remain.

Mr. Meche asked if Zoning relief was required. Atty. Kolick replied that they applied to ZBA because the house is in a B4 zoning district. The received ZBA approval for changing use from a 2-family to a 3 unit building. Mr. Buonfiglio added that the structure would not be taken down to the foundation, only to the second-floor deck and dormered as depicted in the renderings.

Public Comment:

Emily Udy, HSI. A letter was submitted that spoke to the significance of the house because of its age, form, and location. HSI believes it should be found preferably preserved. 7 Curtis Street went through a similar process and received feedback from the Commission and HSI on ways to utilize more of the building without changing the roofline. HSI is extending that invitation to the applicant as they would with any project and are happy to participate in any conversation that will help the developer reach their goal while maintaining as much of the historic house as possible. They appreciate the Demolition Delay process which allows that addition time to meet the goals of the community and the developer.

Barbara Cleary, HSI. The new Demolition Delay Ordinance was designed to allow time for design input to determine what details and important features can be reused. Once the finding of significance is determined and the structure is found preferably preserved, design discussed that results in a satisfactory conclusion the delay period can be reduced. One of the contributing elements of the definition of historic significance is a contributing building in a National Register District, which this property does. No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Kelleher stated that if the Commission were to invoke the delay, it would start with the closure of the public hearing, and during the delay the Commission can work with the property owner to find a solution and when the Commission is satisfied the delay can be released.

Mr. Meche stated that the structure is contributing according to the language of the ordinance. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Commission must also determine if the structure is preferably preserved.

The Commission agreed to conduct a site visit. Atty. Kolick suggested a continuation to allow for revisions to the gambrel roof and overall proposed design.

Mr. Joyce noted that there are stipulations for historically significant buildings to maintain their features and bypass the building code if there is no health code or safety violation.

Mr. Meche added that the International Building Code (IBC) provides some flexibility but not for historically significant structures unless it's a museum. His opinion would be for a continuance to modify the design, but if details are replicated to match, they will not look original so saving what you can is better, but it's a good start. He's looking forward to the revised design. Mr. Joyce stated that a walkthrough of the structure during a redesign could occur simultaneously. Window scale and dimensions are also important to keep in mind, so the new windows aren't too small or too big.

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

Other Business:

Old Town Hall – Request for letter of support for grant application

Ms. Kelleher presented a request for a letter of support for the City of Salem's application for a grant under the Economic Development Administration (EDA) to renovate and make sustainable and add HVAC, and accessibility improvements to Old Town Hall. This work would render all three floors of the building useable as a year-round center for arts and culture. Many factors will be considered as part of this review including making it a net zero building, adding fire suppression, restoring interior features, and window operating on the second-floor windows which makes holding summer events challenging. The Commission will have a role in overseeing this future of this historic city resource.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she could draft and circulate a support letter that includes the statement that the Historical Commission looks forward to working with City Planners and Designers to ensure that the character is preserved while making the building more useful for the future.

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve providing a letter of support. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Cutting, Martinez, Meche, English, Joyce were in favor and the motion so carried.

Conflicts of Interest Certification: Ms. Kelleher noted that an e-mail was sent to all Commission members regarding the annual conflict of interest statement. Both the letter and certification form must be signed and returned to her.

35 Chestnut Street: Ms. Kelleher stated that the landing details were sent to her and Mr. Joyce and she will let the applicant know that they are authorized to proceed.

Commission Appointments: Ms. Kelleher stated that there are a regular and alternate position available for the Salem Historical Commission. They are looking for a resident of one of the local historic districts, however Ms.

English is the only woman and full representation on the Commission would be great. Please send any suggestions to her.

In-Person Meetings: Ms. Kelleher reported that she had just received an e-mail regarding resuming in-person meeting. The open meeting law has been extended to allow remote meetings through July. She will request a vote at the next meeting regarding whether to end remote meetings in March or to extend them to July. Mr. Martinez asked whether the majority of the Commission members must be in person to vote if meetings converted to in-person. Ms. Kelleher will request clarification since there have been some question as to what that means for the Board/Commissions vs. the public. Her personal preference would be for in-person meetings although virtual has been very helpful to allow everyone to see all the documentation under review.

Violations: Ms. Kelleher stated that there are outstanding violations that need to be addressed. Including 186 Federal Street which significant violation from the installation of a new driveway. Currently, the owner is working with the Engineering Department and once that review is completed, will return to the Commission to review the as-constructed driveway. The contractor did not pull permits before beginning the work.

Mr. Martinez requested that some of the violations be brought back into the agenda.

Adjournment

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:00PM

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Preservation Planner