

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
April 20, 2022

A regular meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, April 20, 2022, at 6:05 pm.
VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING. Present were: Milo Martinez, Mark Meche, Jamie Graham, Mark Pattison, Larry Spang (Chair). Patti Kelleher, Staff. Not present: Rebecca English, Reed Cutting, Vijay Joyce.

393 Essex Street – continuation

Carling Audette submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint

Ms. Kelleher stated that the final paint colors were conditionally approved on March 2, 2022 and the final approvals will be made in the field.

5 Warren Street

Charles and Kathleen Galvin submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fencing

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/29/22
- Photographs

Charles and Kathleen Galvin were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Galvin stated that they want to replace the front property fence between their house and 9 Warren Street and the fence sections facing Warren Street. They provided three options, a mini-stockade fence to match the existing, a black metal fence, and a balustrade fence. Mr. Galvin added that the stockade fence would be unfinished, the black aluminum would be as shown, and the third would remain natural.

Ms. Graham asked if the existing fence was 42-inches-high. Mr. Galvin replied yes.

Mr. Martinez suggested the stockade fence to be treated as a replacement in kind, although he is unsure how the Commission would feel about the use of prefabricated fence panels and exposed posts, which the Commission is typically not in favor of. Mr. Galvin replied that the new fence would be 42-inches-high, although the connecting fences from other properties are 6-feet-high.

Public Comment:

Darlene Melis, 115 Federal Street. Asked if the brown fence to the right was also 42-inches-high and if the proposed would match the neighboring fence. Mr. Galvin replied that the fence height varies down the street. Ms. Galvin added that they would match the original fence height and noted that the neighbors may have changed the fence height over time. Ms. Kelleher noted an application in the 5 Warren Street property file from 2007 called for a 42-inch-high stockade fence replacement.

Chair Spang suggested using two types of fences, a decorative fence along the front and a more utilitarian fence along the side vs. installing matching fences. Ms. Galvin noted that the fences don't need to be held to the same fence height as their neighbor.

Mr. Pattison joined the meeting at this time.

Mr. Martinez asked if the balustrade fence matches the style of the home and suggested a white picket fence which wasn't proposed. Ms. Graham noted her concern with the use of too many fence types all meeting at one corner. Mr. Meche added that there isn't much fence, and it doesn't have much presence, so he would be okay with the stockade fence, if it's not pressure treated, and with the tops cut off to match the height. He was not in favor of the black aluminum fence. Ms. Galvin stated that they would not be in favor of a white picket fence.

Mr. Pattison was in favor of the balustrade but not a flat board fence with the gothic top pickets. A flat board fence could be used at the driveway for privacy to match with a transition to a higher fence at the driveway.

Mr. Galvin noted dimensions on either side of the driveway and the 14-foot-wide driveway opening. Chair Spang suggested a small stockage at the front of the property only and presented a sketch. Mr. Pattison noted that maintaining the same fence height and turning the corner gives the fence more purpose. Chair Spang suggested an conditional approval with a final approval by a several Commission members. Mr. Galvin noted his concern with Reliable Fence's ability to provide this type of design. Ms. Kelleher noted that the neighboring fence is 5'-6" to the highest picket.

Public Comment:

Darlene Melis, 115 Federal Street. Noted that the neighbors had a fence and questioned who owned the middle fence.

Joyce Kenney. Believes there is a second fence next to the property dividing fence that's proposed. Ms. Galvin replied that there is only one fence so there will not be two fences back-to-back.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Pattison and Mr. Martinez agreed to review the fence design.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve a flat board fence with cap between the two properties – 74-feet in length, turning the corner and transition to 5'-6" and into the balustrade fence, with the balustrade flanking the driveway. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Amendment by Mr. Meche for he and Mr. Pattison to finalize the fence details. Mr. Martinez accepted amendment. Roll Call: Martinez, Meche, Graham, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

115 Federal Street

Darlene Melis submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for copper gutters, skylight, and roofing

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/28/22
- Photographs

Darlene Melis was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Melis stated that she came before the Commission last spring to re-shingle the back wing of the kitchen and ell. The proposed shingles would be on the main part of the house and would match the shingles installed in 2021. They want to extend their gutter to capture more rainwater with a new copper gutter. The skylight was a replacement around 1985 and needs to be replaced again, with the new one matching the existing dimensions.

Mr. Meche noted his concern with rain running off the roof too fast and missing the gutter. Chair Spang questioned the downspout dimensions. Ms. Melis noted that the downspouts will be reused and there is one at both ends of the house. During the 2015 ice storm they had ice damming down to the front door, and the copper gutter was too flexible and became slightly malformed, which is another reason to replace it with a stronger gutter. The gutter projects out more on the garden side to prevent overflow and the new gutter would be like the gutter installed by Osgood down the street.

Mr. Pattison suggested that a greater projection/width of the gutter would make it more susceptible to bending from ice and snow. Ms. Kelleher noted that the existing gutter is a 16 oz. gauge while the proposed is 24 oz gauge and will be 1-inch wider. She also noted that Historic New England suggested an elliptical gutter to hold even more water. Mr. Meche noted that elliptical gutters are available for purchase by select companies, the gutters do appear hidden and extending them out a bit could be beneficial. He also suggested adding a third downspout.

Ms. Melis noted her desire to install them as soon as possible. Mr. Pattison suggested the applicant also speak to gutter installers about increasing the size of the gutter outlet into the downspouts.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to approve a skylight to match existing, new roof shingles at the rear and new gutters as proposed. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Meche, Graham, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

9 Cambridge Street

Elisa Hofmeester submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a rear shed

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/28/22
- Photographs
- Eastern Shed details
-

Nicolaus Hofmeester was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Hofmeester stated that he wants to place a 6-foot-wide x 10-foot-long x 8-feet-8-inch-high shed on his property. The Quaker model is proposed, and he would want to install dark architectural roof shingles to match the house, to upgrade the siding from vinyl to pine clapboards to be painted or stained to match the house. The side of the shed would be visible from the driveway. He noted that the existing fences are 6-feet-5-inches-high, and the shed is manufactured by Eastern Shed. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission approved Slateline designer shingles several years earlier for the house. Mr. Hofmeester added that the shrubbery between the fence and the shed would conceal all but the ridge of the shed.

Mr. Meche stated that he would prefer a simpler gable roofline. Mr. Hofmeester replied that the gambrel matched the roof of the house but looked oversized for such a small structure, but other styles are available. Mr. Meche suggested the Aspen style with a simpler shed roof. Mr. Martinez stated that a gable roof with a better hood overhang would be a nicer solution, he was in favor of a shed in this location, and suggested doors with fewer lites given the utilitarian use of the shed. Chair Spang noted that the Aspen has a more traditional roof pitch. Mr. Meche added that the hood shape of the Quaker is only at the façade plane, and not at the soffits. Chair Spang echoed Mr. Martinez's comments that the simpler design is better and supported the Aspen style. Mr. Martinez added that the Commission previously approved the Aspen style at Orne Square.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Hofmeester requested a continuance to compare the alternative shed styles and design options.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Meche, Graham, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

186 Federal Street

Denise M. Carria submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for retaining wall and foundation modifications (after the fact)

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/28/22
- Photographs

Jim and Denise Carria were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Carria stated that the house was collapsing when they purchased it one year ago and a chimney had also fallen. One idea was to abut the brick foundation wall with blocks to provide support and stop it from bowing out. This method caused them to cover up the brick foundation and both windows that were already in-filled with wood. He wanted to support the building and stucco over the brick which was in bad shape.

Chair Spang asked if the retaining wall was installed along the property line. Mr. Carria replied that the blocks are where the house meets the driveway, and the leftover space was in-filled. This was the worst section of the house, and the floor needed to be in-filled with cement to keep the concrete floor in the basement from collapsing.

Chair Spang asked if the Building Inspector reviewed and approved the changes. Mr. Carria replied that he didn't make any changes, he only added a lally column in the basement to support the structure; however, the City's Engineering Department approved the plan that their engineer, Bob Griffin, submitted after the fact. Adding the blocks against the brick wall was his idea in addition to the internal work that was completed.

Mr. Pattison requested additional information on the blocks supporting the wall. Mr. Carria replied 4-feet-high x 4-feet-wide blocks. Mr. Meche asked if the buried wall was waterproofed. Mr. Carria replied that he doesn't believe so, but they added a trench drain and a drywell in the rear yard. Ms. Kelleher stated that the Engineering Department reviewed and approved the drainage permit, but she doesn't believe the building inspector has approved it. Mr. Carria added that he provided photos, drywell, PVC drain, and the in-fill was approved before it was covered up. Ms. Kelleher noted that Bob Griffin works with the city on a lot of projects and knows what the city would approve.

Public Comment:

Tim Obert, 170 Federal Street. He submitted a letter, as did HSI and the FSNA (Federal Street Neighborhood Association). The applicant is requesting an after the fact approval, but it's clear this was done for parking and not structural concerns. He is concerned with the materials used to build the retaining wall that aren't appropriate for the historic district. The property is also within 200-feet of a FEMA flood zone which requires Conservation Commission approval. A plot plan was submitted that shows an intention to demolish and replace a garage with a new one that includes a dwelling unit. He wants the SHC to enforce the established guidelines, so the applicants don't return with another after the fact approval request. The neighborhood has made significant strides to improve and add charm to this end of the street. Ms. Kelleher noted that all letters were sent to the Commission and applicant today. She did reach out about the removal of the garage which was an early idea but Mr. Carria stated that this part of the project is longer moving forward. Mr. Obert added that approving this request sets a dangerous precedent. Mr. Carria noted that the property already had 2 parking spaces and didn't need more, but he wanted to improve his property.

Ms. Kelleher noted that she received a letter from HSI and Justin Whittier, President of the Federal Street Neighborhood Association.

Chair Spang requested a site visit to see the changes in person and the issues that are concerning to many. Mr. Meche agreed and asked if the Conservation Commission has reviewed to determine if project is within the proximity of the North River. Ms. Kelleher believes so but will confirm and reach out to the Engineering Department and Building Inspector to determine if the structural issued fixed and in compliance with the current code standards.

Mary Hartfelder, Federal Street. Asked what happened to the street trees and other trees on the property which no longer appear in the photos. Mr. Carria replied that the street trees were gone when they purchased the property, the side tree had fallen down on the neighboring house, so it and a neighboring tree were removed. The large tree at the rear belongs to the neighbor.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting and to conduct a site visit. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Meche, Graham, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher agreed to coordinate site visit times.

Mr. Martinez questioned the need for an engineering report. Chair Spang suggested the building inspector be invited to the site visit and that a request for a structural analysis and compliance with the current building code be requested since lally columns may be considered a temporary fix. Mr. Meche suggested the Commission complete their review prior.

9 Hathorne Street

Davis Properties LLC submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace and modify windows and paint color

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/30/22
- Photographs

Gregory Davis and Kate Davis, and Matt Thompson, general contractor, were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Davis stated that the windows need to be replaced with windows that meet code and they proposed white vinyl windows. They also want to remove two 34-inches-wide x 64-inches-high windows on the left side behind the bump-out since their sills are too close to the floor for the new kitchens planned. They want to replace them with two 34-inches-wide x 44-inches-high windows moved to the right approximately 1-foot to accommodate their new kitchen design. Also proposed are new exterior paint colors from the Benjamin Moore Historic Colors: Black (HC-190) for the trim and a White Opulence (OC-69) for the façade.

Chair Spang requested the existing siding material. Mr. Davis replied that building is clad in vinyl siding that is in good shape but they would like to paint it because it is budget friendly.

Chair Spang requested the window type. Ms. Kelleher replied that applicant is proposing Harvey Classic windows. Chair Spang noted that the muntins would be sandwiched between the glass. Mr. Davis noted that the third-floor windows are white vinyl with the same muntin configuration, and they were replaced prior to their purchase of the home. The existing windows are single pane, some are broken and not in good condition. Ms. Kelleher noted that the windows are 2 over 2 and likely originally. Chair Spang suggested repairing the existing windows. Mr. Davis replied that they are not energy compliant. Chair Spang noted that the code does not require the replacement of existing windows so they can be kept. Mr. Meche agreed and asked if the proposed were all vinyl or vinyl clad. Mr. Davis replied all vinyl. Chair Spang stated that the Commission in general does not approve vinyl windows, except for on a case-by-case basis, and suggested the existing windows be repaired because if the Commission were to request historic looking windows it might be beyond their price point. Mr. Davis noted that 11 Hathorne Street, which has the exact same layout, installed white vinyl windows during a first-floor renovation a couple years prior where they moved the same window. Mr. Kelleher stated that there are no certificates in the property files for either the vinyl windows in the attic of 9 Hathorne or the vinyl windows used at 11 Hawthorne. She noted that the neighboring house also changed their window configuration from a 2 over 2 to a 6 over 1, and the Design Guideline state that vinyl windows are not allow in the Historic District. Mr. Davis suggested use of a 2 over 2 vinyl window which is within their price point. Chair Spang noted that a tight-fitting historic window can often perform as well as a double-pane window.

Mr. Martinez suggested 11 Hathorne be added to the list of violations if documentation cannot be found and reiterated that if vinyl windows are approved, they are on secondary facades and hard to see areas, and he doesn't believe these windows should be approved. Mr. Meche agreed and noted that the style of windows hypersensitive to installation and must be a tight fit because the performance in the cut sheet mostly relates to the glass and when air enters from around the windows it is not energy efficient or a great product.

Chair Spang stated that Ms. Kelleher can provide a list of windows the Commission has previously approved and if an alternative window is found with a more authentic look, the Commission can consider it. He is not opposed to relocating the windows.

Mr. Thompson disagreed with the statements made by Mr. Meche regarding the Harvey window, which he is certified to install. The existing window frames are in good shape and have no structural defects so the replacement window would fit very well within the window opening. Believes the Commission should not have difficulty denying this request given that the neighbors used the same window and the owners of 9 Hawthorne are willing to match the historic configuration.

Ms. Graham requested an elevation be submitted to determine the change in scale of the proposed windows compared to the existing.

Mr. Pattison requested a site visit to determine the view of the windows. Mr. Meche requested a sample of the proposed window. Mr. Pattison requested the window sample be full size that closely matches the new size proposed. Chair Spang noted that head, jamb, and sill details would be required when the applicant returns.

Mr. Thompson stated that they did a gut renovation to restore the home and achieve maximum energy compliances for multiple building codes and restoring these windows with the hopes that they will achieve the same energy compliances levels will be next to impossible.

Mr. Thompson noted that the storm windows will be removed. Mr. Meche replied that the storms appear to be a tight fit into the vinyl surround, a detail that may be difficult to change.

Ms. Kelleher suggested the applicant consider removing the vinyl siding and restoring the façade like the house across the street. Mr. Davis noted that some aspects of the home will be restored, the front doors, interior stained glass, and woodwork at the front stairwell. Chair Spang noted that the finish paint color on the entry door may require an application as well.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting with a site visit to be determined. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Meche, Graham, Pattison, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

36 Derby Street

Stanley Wrobel and Barbara Wioncek submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to modify rear egress stair

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/4/22
- Photographs
- Elevation plans by Andrew Crocker Architect

Stanley Wrobel and Barbara Wioncek were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Wrobel stated that Andrew Crocker is their architect and the insurance told them to replace the stair for safety reasons. They want to install a stair that is 6-inches wider, from 3-foot-6-inches to 4-feet, and to align it with the front face of the house. This a multi-family house and this will be an emergency egress for the second unit.

Chair Spang asked how the deck to this unit is accessed. Mr. Wrobel replied that there are two entry doors, one of the downstairs and upstairs unit. Ms. Wioncek added that the interior stairway is narrow, and this entry is wider and could be used to move larger items. She noted that the property line may go 1-foot into the neighboring property.

Mr. Wrobel added that they may also want to increase the deck size to match the new stair.

Mr. Meche noted that the proposed lattice may not be approved. Ms. Wioncek replied that the existing plastic lattice is falling apart, and they would prefer to install painted wood lattice. Mr. Meche noted that this would be a better replacement than what is there.

Mr. Meche asked how far the bottom of stair is to the rear property line. Mr. Wrobel replied approximately 6-feet. Mr. Meche suggested moving the stair closer to the property line, to create a landing before the door and reversing the swing. Chair Spang suggested for usability reasons the storm door swing be reversed. Ms. Wioneck replied that they would like to maintain the rear area for usable space rather than moving the stairs.

Chair Spang noted his concern with the view of the underside of the stair from the street. Ms. Wioneck replied that they hope to conceal it with lattice. Mr. Meche suggested putting more value into the posts and an Intex PVC railing system rather than vinyl. Ms. Kelleher stated that the Commission has approved a similar egress stair on Flint Street and similar railing material at two other properties. Mr. Pattison noted that the Commission will be concerned with the details that face Derby Street and the architect should investigate them. Mr. Worbel noted their desire to mimic their neighbor's porch design behind them which is not in a historic district. Ms. Kelleher noted that the system installed at Cambridge Street didn't have hangers, it was joined to resemble a traditional all wood system.

Ms. Wioneck noted that the reverse swing on the storm door is awkward. Mr. Pattison replied that reversing it would make it easier to move items in and out. Mr. Meche suggested the bottom of the stair doesn't need to be aligned with the bottom of the ell, but it could move closer to Derby Street. Ms. Wioneck suggested that it might make it awkward compared to the existing front landings and they may decide not to flip the swing of the storm door. Chair Spang reiterated that the Commission will need details of what is seen from Derby Street as well as details of the stair and railing.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Meche, Graham, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

386 Essex Street, Unit 4

Michael and Christine Podmaniczky submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for rear roof deck

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/4/22
- Photographs

Michael and Christine Podmaniczky were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Podmaniczky stated that they purchased the unit in January 2022, the existing 8-foot x 8-foot deck area is for exclusive use for Unit 4 and overlooks 5-feet of flat roof beyond it. From across Flint Street the railing only the top 3 to 4-inches of two sides of the railing would be visible. The roof is flat, and they would duplicate the railing on the building's porch on Essex Street, using Spanish cedar painted white to match the trim color of the house.

Chair Spang stated that decks have framing members that create platforms and the railing can end up higher than planned. Mr. Podmaniczky replied that he intends to use 2x10's scribed to the rubber membrane roof pitch to thin down the height, and he will include a sleeper as shown on the plan.

Chair Spang asked how the posts will be anchored. Mr. Podmaniczky replied that he will use aluminum casting lag bolts bolted to the frame below and tied to the wall of the house to the corner posts, and the corner will be bridled over it. Chair Spang asked for the slope of the roof. Mr. Podmaniczky replied that it pitches away from the building on all sides.

Mr. Meche suggested the use of a pedestal system over the membrane roof rather than using sleepers that would penetrate the roof and could be a problem in the future. Mr. Podmaniczky replied that he has been discussing the design with Tom St. Pierre and the details will be determined.

Mr. Meche noted that the sample rail has no center rail, only posts near the side, and he suggest that layout be replicated so there is a large panel across the middle of the span. Chair Spang noted that the details will be mostly hidden but there could still be unintentional build-up making things larger and higher than intended.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Mr. Martinez made an amendment for the application to submit a dimensional drawing and detail. Mr. Pattison and Mr. Meche accepted the amendment. Roll Call: Martinez, Meche, Graham, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

419 Lafayette Street

Richard and Wendy Brennan submitted an application for a Waiver of Demolition Delay to remove more than 50% of roof

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/30/22
- Photographs
- Drawings by Seger Architects

Dan Ricciarelli of Seger Architects was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Ricciarelli stated that the property is near the border of Marblehead, they completed the renovation at the front home and the proposal is for the rear structure. Due to climate issues the owner is proposing to raise up the house and add a second floor with a simple gable roof and an open eave. The owner plans to retire into the home so they want to make it more accessible too. The bottom floor is unfinished, and they want more living space above with a deck off the family room. They would raise the first floor 2-feet, add a cripple wall to fill in the space below, and add a second floor with a new roof.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the proposal to demolition more than 50% of the roof/building triggers the demolition delay ordinance. The building is over 60 years old, making it subject to a 12-month delay. The Commission needs to determine if building is historically significant and preferable preserved. Mr. Meche noted his concern with cripple walls at the ocean front and whether the structure would be taken down to the first floor. Mr. Ricciarelli replied that they determined this is the best way to go and with the wave action they need to raise it to the base flood elevation.

Mr. Pattison suggested proposed rendering be submitted rather than simple diagrams.

Mr. Martinez asked if the property was in a National Register Historic District. Ms. Kelleher replied that it was not in a district and the building does not have an inventory form. The inventory form for the front building doesn't mention the rear building. The building's construction date is 1958. Chair Spang stated that he would not support imposing a demolition delay because there is not a lot that is historically significant about this building. Mr. Pattison and Ms. Graham agreed. Ms. Kelleher noted that there are other mid-20th century examples in South Salem with more detail and design but she noted that these buildings have also not been inventoried. The applicant is seeking a waiver of the 12-month demolition delay. Mr. Ricciarelli agreed that this structure doesn't rise to the level of historically significant.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to find the structure not historically significant. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Meche, Graham, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher requested drawings and photographs to document the existing conditions of the structure.

Ms. Kelleher noted that in the future the City should focus on this area of South Salem for an historic resource survey. She reported that the City will be undertaking a survey of the Mack Park neighborhood next. Chair Spang noted that additional inventory projects would be good to get ahead of the demolition process for applicants who don't believe their homes and accessory structures are significant.

20 Beckford Street

Paul Bunker submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for vent pipes.

Ms. Kelleher reported that this request was reviewed under minor change category with notification sent to abutters. Since no abutter objections were received, the public hearing was waived and the Certificate of Appropriateness was issued.

78 Washington Square

Estevan Martinez submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for vent

Ms. Kelleher reported that this request was reviewed under minor change category with notification sent to abutters. Since no abutter objections were received, the public hearing was waived and the Certificate of Appropriateness was issued.

Adjournment

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Meche, Graham, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45PM

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner