

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
May 4, 2022

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, May 4, 2022 at 6:00 pm via **Zoom Virtual Meeting**. Present were: Milo Martinez, Larry Spang (Chair), Mark Pattison, Mark Meche, Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce (Vice Chair), Jamie Graham. Staff: Patti Kelleher. Not present: Reed Cutting.

9 Cambridge Street —*continuation*

Nicolaus and Elisa Hofmeester submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a rear garden/bicycle shed.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/28/22
- Photographs
- Powerpoint presentation

Nicolaus and Elisa Hofmeester were present for a continuation of their application. They presented Powerpoint slides modified from previous meeting. The home is located next to Hamilton Hall and applicants are requesting to place a shed in back corner of yard. A 6x10 garden shed – specifically a Quaker-style shed – was proposed, made by Eastern Shed Company in Andover, MA. The shed comes in different outside materials, applicants selected pine double-clapboard siding with black roof shingles to match the house. The shed is only visible down the homeowners' driveway. Mocked-up views from the street were shown. The shed is 10 feet wide; glass doors would be used. More animated views were shown to demonstrate local vantage points from which shed would or would not be visible. Questions on style of shed had been asked of the Commission in previous meeting, as well as other shed options and featuring of a glass door. There is no electricity in the shed and glass door allows for natural light, which makes shed feel larger than its 6x10 frame; glass door also adds to attractiveness of small yard. The glass door of the shed cannot be seen from any public viewpoint. Historic Commission had proposed Aspen model which had been approved for another property. The Hofmeesters nonetheless preferred the Quaker over the Aspen style, noting that the Aspen has a higher roof pitch and creates more shade in the garden; also indicated that the Aspen roof pitch may clash with existing house architecture. In summation, the Hofmeesters noted that the Quaker had better proportions; roof lines of Quaker shed matches pitch of house better; matches the house design and the yard; includes roof overhang that other styles do not have. The applicants reiterated that the siding and trim for the shed is pine clapboard and will be painted to match the color of the house. Mr. Joyce noted that the shape of the roof of the Quaker is odd, but this is simply a utility shed.

Mr. Martinez noted that triangular part of the side façade was likely done for ease by the manufacturer; expressed reservation about supporting this design in order to avoid the triangular element of siding. Chair Spang noted that something may be put over the triangular portion to conceal this feature. Mr. Joyce asked if corbels or brackets feature on the applicants' house, which Mrs. Hofmeester affirmed. Mr. Joyce asked if the shed could be customized, and proposed options for placement and orientation of a corbel or other ornamental feature to match/respond to the house. Mr. Hofmeester was amenable to this idea. Chair Spang showed an image of the planned ornamental piece that currently features on the home via Google Maps. Mr. Joyce noted that the ornament does not have to be very ornate, just a simple feature added to the shed. Mrs. Hofmeester asked what material the ornament should be made of, to which Mr. Joyce noted that consistency should be the goal (thus likely wood rather than wrought iron).

Mr. Martinez proposed deputizing some Commission members – and personally volunteered – to oversee the final details of the planned action.

Public comment:

Mike Podmaniczky, 386 Essex Street, volunteered to help the applicants create the proposed ornaments out of wood.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the application of the Quaker shed in all pine to be painted same color scheme as house with the alteration being that the corner board at the overhang to extend all the way up to the eave and the overhang to then be supported by decorative wood bracket to match that on existing bay of the house in similar shape and style; final details to be confirmed by deputized Commission members, Mr. Joyce and Mr. Martinez. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Graham, Pattison, Martinez, English, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

186 Federal Street—continuation

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

Chair Spang noted that Mr. Martinez, Mr. Pattison, and himself had visited the site with Ms. Kelleher. Structural work including foundation had been done; Ms. Kelleher had spoken to building inspector who is in touch with applicant to review structural repairs. Until discussion with inspector has resolved or concluded, this application should be continued.

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

Jim Carria later appeared on the call and desired to know whether or not Commission would approve work performed after the fact. Mr. Martinez expressed reservations about re-opening the discussion given that the application had been continued earlier and thus may have precluded involvement and discussion from members of the public who may have wanted to weigh in. Ms. Kelleher proposed a meeting with Mr. Carria and the building inspector prior to next Commission meeting.

9 Hathorne Street—continuation

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/30/22
- Photographs

Greg Davis was present. Commission members had visited the site in the interim between this and prior meeting. Mr. Davis desired approval on window relocation and slight resizing of window openings, both of which items are necessary because of interior kitchen remodel. Mr. Davis noted that different window models had been explored. Ms. Kelleher provided Mr. Davis with a list of previously approved windows

in the District. Mr. Davis was looking at manufacturers in terms of affordability; including Marvin, Harvey, and Andersen (both Andersen Renewal as well as regular Andersen that the applicant could install on his own). Mr. Davis sought approval for more than one option before reaching a determination as to what could be the best fit for the project moving forward. Chair Spang inquired about pricing as a factor. Mr. Davis noted that Marvin was highest price; Harvey were slightly more budget-friendly; Andersen provided quote on windows themselves (obtainable through Moynihan Lumber), similar pricing to Harvey. Marvin and Harvey are wood windows with aluminum cladding, black exterior, 2 over 2. Andersen has Fibrex (i.e. wood blended with composite material), 2 over 2. All are similar in appearance, according to the applicant. Mr. Davis had not received quote from Andersen Renewal at time of meeting, but anticipated higher cost. Chair Spang noted that details of the window have also been required of past applications. Mr. Meche expressed preference for the Fibrex Andersen window. Mr. Meche showed profiles for Andersen E-series windows which had been approved in past application.

Chair Spang noted the location of the planned rear window, slightly obscured/made less prominent by a bay window that juts out. The windows currently align with foundation/basement window, but would be offset by about a foot with the relocation of windows. Addition of duct work forced this change. Mr. Martinez shared view from end of driveway (not a public view) which showed two windows on home vertical over a foundation window. Ms. Graham asked for clarification that these windows/window openings would also change in size, which Chair Spang confirmed. Chair Spang asked if Mr. Davis had an elevation, which was not available. Chair Spang asked for the sill height change, to which Mr. Davis noted that the old window was 34 wide by 64 high, new window 34 wide by 45 high. Mr. Meche asked if the sill and the head will move, to which Mr. Davis noted the head would not change. Mr. Meche asked if there was going to be less window and more wall, what would be used to fill the outside; Mr. Davis said that vinyl siding would be replaced with clapboard. Chair Spang noted that trim strategy was not yet known. Mr. Meche noted that the shape and size alterations were not of concern, though agreed with Ms. Graham and Chair Spang that an elevation would be necessary to confirm details.

Mr. Meche showed details of Fibrex Andersen window model, and noted that this would be a believable substitute. Ms. Kelleher noted that Renewal by Andersen had been approved for 253 Lafayette as a 1 over 1; they were towards the back of the building. 12 Carpenter was a property where Marvin Elevate had been approved. Ms. Graham clarified that all windows would be replaced with Fibrex windows, which Mr. Davis affirmed. Mr. Joyce noted that simulated divided lites should be used; specifying that muntins/grills should protrude on exterior of glass. Mr. Pattison clarified with Mr. Joyce that grill on outside while spacer bars are used between glass. Ms. Kelleher noted the guidelines' guidance for using simulated true divided lites. Noting the need for more details, Chair Spang asked Commission if they felt comfortable to vote on moving kitchen windows to the back of the house.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve moving the two kitchen windows, shortening them, and creating rough openings. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Graham, Pattison, Martinez, English, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Meche expressed approval for the Fibrex window and wanted to know how other Commission members felt about it. Ms. Graham asked if the Fibrex product was on front or back of property, to which Mr. Martinez noted that it was rather set away from the street (about 50ft). Ms. Graham expressed reservations approving use of Fibrex windows on all of property's windows. Chair Spang agreed given the prominence of window near sidewalk and street level. Mr. Davis noted long lead times in ordering windows and was desirous of approval in order to place order. Mr. Pattison proposed specifying windows that the Commission had allowed in prominent locations on past occasions, which Mr. Joyce was in favor

of. Chair Spang clarified that the viable options were Harvey and Andersen Fibrex, which Mr. Davis affirmed. Mr. Meche noted that many details of the project and installation were still unknown. Mr. Pattison asked where the Harvey Majesty had been approved and installed, which Ms. Kelleher noted were likely Derby St.

Ms. Kelleher noted a list of windows which had been approved: Pelle Architect (all-wood window), Harvey Majesty, Renewal by Andersen Fibrex. Mr. Pattison expressed reservations about approving the Andersen Fibrex before seeing it right on the sidewalk. Ms. Graham expressed similar reservations given that this window had previously only been approved in a limited application in a less prominent area of a house.

Given the Commission members' reservations, Chair Spang advised Mr. Davis to come back as soon as possible with details and intentions, and noted that members with reservations should visit the site in order to reach a determination. Mr. Meche clarified to Mr. Davis that the same window does not need to feature everywhere on the house. Chair Spang wanted to ensure that the back façade is not visible from the abutting street. Mr. Davis said that muntins would not be used on small windows on bay but would feature on all other windows. Ms. Graham noted the need for specific details on which windows would be installed on which locations of the house, which Mr. Davis insisted having provided.

Ms. Kelleher noted that she would provide a spreadsheet of which windows have been approved at which locations.

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

36 Derby St—continuation

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/4/22
- Drawings by Andrew Crocker Architect
- Photographs

Mr. Wrobel provided a new drawing based on discussion at previous meeting regarding railing type and stair location. Existing condition was shown of applicants' current railing which will be changed. Survey was shown; reversing direction of stairway, but because house is at angle to lot line would put widest part of structure closest to the neighbors' side. Noted that it is not possible to reverse the direction of stairs. Updated elevation drawing was shown. Intex railing system was approved at 13 Chestnut St. which the applicants agreed was appropriate to them. Ms. Kelleher noted that from a distance Intex is visually indistinguishable from wood and is paintable. Chair Spang noted that square lattice rather than diagonal are typically approved; "slatted" refers to vertical boards. Mr. Joyce noted that vertical horizontals were appropriate for this application. Mr. Meche did not understand the challenge of reversing the staircase; would get around having to look at the underside.

Applicants are attempting to stay within a 10-foot setback from the neighbor's line to the left side of the property. The deck was widened in the new scheme compared to the old scheme.

Updated proposal is to screen deck with rectangular lattice.

Mr. Pattison noted that the deck is 5 feet wide and 7 or 8 feet high, the lattice panel will be made out of multiple panels linked together, and thus will look like an afterthought. Mr. Joyce asked what the size of the planned panel would be. Chair Spang noted that there are not enough details in the drawing shown. Ms. Kelleher was unaware of any vinyl lattice ever having been approved; wondered if a support piece could be used in back of lattice and then frame out lattice to support it. Mr. Joyce confirmed that wood lattice should be used here. Mr. Wrobel was amenable to Commission recommendations. Mr. Joyce noted that a frame of 1X would be needed; lattice is going to go behind the frame; further noting that to get a giant sheet of lattice like this, more framing would be needed so that there is no seam. Mr. Meche noted that the deck edge looked proud of the frame. Mr. Joyce wanted to see a detailed/section drawing showing how the lattice covers stairs, posts, and so forth. Mr. Joyce supported approving all elements of the application with exception of missing details on lattice. Mr. Pattison asked if the Commission would be okay with usual lattice material on a panel of this size, or some other type of material. Applicants did not want to skimp on the material costs; they were desirous of something that would last. Mr. Meche asked whether a stair can be in a side yard or if there should be concerns about a setback, having looked at the zoning rules. Size and direction of stair were fine with Mr. Meche and Mr. Joyce.

No public comment.

Chair Spang explained that approving the project in concept with details to be finalized pertained to: construction of lattice itself; concern that standard panel size of lattice would require a seam (taking drawing at face value); how the frame gets attached to the joists and seeing posts come down and setting frame within those.

Ms. Wioncek noted that once the porch is built, the applicants could work with members to finalize details. Mr. Joyce and Ms. Graham volunteered to help with finalizing details. Ms. Graham advised the applicants to make contractor or carpenter aware that standard lattice cannot be used for this project; i.e. that something custom will be needed.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve application to include Intex railing systems; wood lattice of sufficient thickness to span the details; final configuration of lattice to be confirmed with carpenter prior to construction; lattice to be painted grey, framing white (and railing already comes white). Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Graham, Pattison, Martinez, English, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

386 Essex Street Unit 4 and 1

Michael and Christine Podmaniczky submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate granite post.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/10/22
- Photographs

Michael Podmaniczky noted that Jay Levy is also part of this application as Unit 1 of the property. Mr. Levy initiated the idea and Mr. Podmaniczky submitted the application/proposal. Mr. Podmaniczky showed plot plan; image of posts were shown; post on the right used to be much closer to post on the left. This used to be a gate. At some point, post on the right was moved to allow space for two cars to park. The left and right posts belong to units 1 and 4 respectively. The plan is to move lefthand post about 3 feet to the left, ideally, to edge of the garden in order to alleviate parking issues. Mr. Levy was responsible for putting in bids. Gilbert Garcia, who has performed landscaping work in Salem, would be responsible for moving post; though the applicants had not yet received a bid. The goal would be to move post to left, repair cobbles, so that when finished, the post should look like it had always been there. Chair Spang expressed concern about the post being moved is that a car would be moved into egress path; do not want to be in violation of building code for egress. Mr. Podmaniczky noted that parking would stay the same, there would just be more swing room for pulling in and out of the space. Mr. Martinez noted that pavers could be used to designate the walkway as distinguished from the driveway if the building inspector requires and/or has questions.

No public comment.

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Graham, Pattison, Martinez, English, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

21 Chestnut Street

A request was made to extend the Certificate of Appropriateness for 21 Chestnut St. The approval is to add addition to back of property issued in April 2021. The applicants are seeking an extension for a year since they were not able to get the work completed due to COVID-19 pandemic. Existing addition will be removed and new one added.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to extend the Certificate for an additional year. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Graham, Pattison, Martinez, English, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

39 Washington Square

A request was made to extend the Certificate of Appropriateness for 39 Washington Sq. In 2019, applicants received approval for new paint colors; door “Wilmington Spruce”; door trim and entrance walls “Mainsail”; entry stairs “Pavement”; want to extend this a year moving forward. One of the owners was on the call if Commission had any questions. Mr. Martinez visited site recently, and painting has commenced. Sarah Herr was on the call and confirmed that priming has begun. Ms. Herr noted that painting of windows had been undertaken which was part of a Certificate of Non-Applicability.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to extend the Certificate for an additional year. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Graham, Pattison, Martinez (abstain), English, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

4 Hamilton St

Ms. Kelleher noted that applicants were requesting a continuation for their certificate to enclose a window on the side of the building, however, the Commission had approved closing shutters only with window sash to remain but applicant now needs to remove sash. An image was shown on Google Maps. The applicants closed it as approved but were unable to keep the sash because framing needs to get done as part of kitchen renovation; from the outside, everything will look as approved. Ms. Kelleher asked if Certificate could be extended for another year, or if a new application was needed since sash is not being kept intact. Mr. Pattison was of the mind that a new application would be needed. Mr. Martinez asked if shutters would be operable. Mr. Pattison recalled that they would be fixed, as did Ms. English. Chair Spang echoed Mr. Pattison's view that because a condition of the Certificate has been defied/not adhered to, a new application would be necessary. Commission determined that new application was needed and did not take a vote on extending existing certificate.

Other Business

Ms. Kelleher noted that Certificates of Non-Applicability have begun to be added to agendas for transparency and record-keeping.

Chair Spang recommended that the Commission notify applicants that meetings would likely not extend past 9:30PM and give applicants option to continue their applications to future meeting.

Mr. Martinez asked about the state of in-person meetings in the future, to which Ms. Kelleher noted that her understanding was that in-person meetings would resume after July 15th. A quorum of members present would be required. Meetings are slated to be hybrid. All meetings will be streamed live with option for some members and the public to participate remotely. This may require staff to coordinate remote participation from the public. The full board needs to be visible to members of the public participating virtually. Chair Spang proposed potentially holding a practice session with just the Commission members.

Adjournment

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Dan Graham, Historical Commission Clerk