

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION

MINUTES

June 1, 2022

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, June 1, 2022 at 6:00 pm via **Zoom Virtual Meeting**. Present were: Milo Martinez, Larry Spang (Chair), Mark Pattison, Mark Meche, Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce, Jamie Graham. Staff: Patti Kelleher Not present: Reed Cutting.

Opening Remarks

Chair Spang made mention that Commission meetings are slated to resume in-person on July 15, 2022 at City Hall Annex.

427 Essex Street

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/1/22
- Powerpoint presentation

The City of Salem submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate the Choate Memorial statue. David Knowlton, City Engineer and Director of Public Services, was present, as well as Jay Carroll, City Roadway Project Manager, Trish Domigan, a consultant from VHB, Amy Silbovitz, from VHB, and Amanda Roy, also from VHB. The transportation improvement program was characterized similar to recently completed projects on Canal Street, Bridge Street, and North Street. The city funds and creates design and permitting for projects, which are then provided to MassDOT which provides oversight. Estimated budget is \$14 million, engineers from VHB were present to walk through the project. The Choate monument was moved within past 20 years and its current location poses some problems with intersection as far as design is concerned. The statue is also not well-located in terms of enjoying it. The project team intends to add green space at end of Warren Street near CVS. Ms. Roy and Ms. Silbovitz presented a Powerpoint. Ms. Roy spoke about Boston Street transportation improvement project. Project limits were covered as were existing conditions and planned improvements: i.e. roadways and sidewalks, infrastructure upgrades, ADA compliance gaps, and curb ramps needed to be brought up to code. Current roadway cross section allows parking on each side and one way traffic on each side covering Boston St. and Essex St. Existing conditions were shown. The design plan involves improving pedestrian and bike accommodations; maintaining vehicular ops; replacing trees that have been removed; maintaining as much parking as possible; and improving transit/traffic stops. Overview of proposed improvements were shown; from Howley Street to Nichols/Grove Streets (10 foot shared used path which continues to Boston and Essex Streets).

Boston/Essex Streets intersection was discussed, specifically the location of the Choate statue on an island. The proposal involves moving statue to Dalton Parkway. Ms. Silbovitz noted that the origin goal was to meet City and MassDOT's complete streets guidance, connecting sidewalks everywhere; and installing pedestrian/bicycle shared use paths and widening roadways. A road safety audit was conducted, which found that moving the median island statue would improve sightlines and incorporate protected permissive phasing for the left turn to Boston Street. The audit found that Essex between Jackson and Boston Street is a high-crash location. Accidents over 3-year period were shown, some of which involved the statue itself.

Ms. Roy noted that a park environment would be created—a concept was shown with a request for feedback. Benefits of moving statue would allow the public to experience the statue away from its present location in the middle of the roadway. ADA-accessible walkways/potential around the statue.

Statue would be exposed to less pollutants. Area could be added to annual park maintenance for future upkeep. Chair Spang asked if the planners had information on the past move of the statue. Mr. Knowlton was not aware of when exactly the move had occurred but was under the impression that the statue was previously on the other side of the intersection. Also noted that the Tree Commission had recommended speaking to Historic Commission for feedback at this early juncture. All abutters would be solicited at a later date for feedback on the project during a 25% design hearing at some point in July. Construction would not occur until 2026.

Chair Spang asked about replacing trees 1 to 1 inch caliper approach, which Ms. Domigan said would not be used. Ms. Domigan noted that plantings in the Dalton Parkway park area would be looked at for opportunities to expand existing plantings and shrubs. Chair Spang asked Ms. Kelleher for guidance on the Commission's jurisdiction over an historic, publicly owned statue located in a Historic District; the issue of jurisdiction was somewhat unclear. Ms. Domigan noted that MassDOT is overseeing this project which identified statue as not meeting federal standards as far as presenting a safety issue. MassDOT may revoke funding/support of this project if the statue remains a safety issue in its present location. Chair Spang asked if the standards had changed since prior relocation, which Ms. Domigan noted that they had. Ms. Domigan noted that 42 accidents had occurred over a three-year period, one of which was a crash right into the statue. Ms. Kelleher asked if this project goes through MHC approval/review as well. Ms. Domigan noted that environmental permitting requires consultation with historic commissions, tribal committees, and so forth to solicit feedback on design. MHC was contacted as part of this project. Chair Spang asked if Ms. Kelleher knew background as to how Choate statue ended up where it currently is. Ms. Kelleher noted that statue was in middle of rotary and then relocated in 1997. Chair Spang recollected that this was historically where city transition between urban areas and historic district and more rural area of Highland Ave (and was then redeveloped in the 1960s/1970s); marking a boundary, so to speak.

Mr. Pattison asked for clarification as to the Commission's purview in moving the statue, which Chair Spang agreed as to the need for understanding jurisdiction. Ms. Kelleher vowed to investigate further. Mr. Joyce and Chair Spang conversed as to the issue of historical appropriateness in discussing the statue's current placement/location. Chair Spang asked if the City was doing any research report on the statue's background. Ms. Domigan also wanted guidance on means of moving the statue, if and when the time comes. Ms. Kelleher noted that CPA funds were used to restore statue in 2017 as well as its base; documentation exists from that project.

Mr. Meche questioned how important statue is in its current location from a historical standpoint. Mr. Meche asked if there was thought of putting rotary here and placing statue in the middle. Ms. Domigan noted that as part of design development alternatives of cross section Boston/Essex were looked at including roundabout/mini-rotaries. Unfortunately, the right-of-way real estate is not present here to accommodate a roundabout (i.e. intersection would need to be wider; too many constraints to contend with). Ms. Domigan noted the problems with a roadway that goes directly into roundabout, i.e. there is not enough deflection at this location and roadways are not wide enough to meet roundabout standards. Chair Spang asked if there was a way to find out how many curb cuts and how many are legal. Ms. Domigan noted that operations of businesses were looked at with priority to ensure that businesses were able to have access and offer access to patrons. Ms. Graham asked if there would be any wayfinding or signage to indicate relocation of Choate statue. Ms. Domigan was supportive of implementing such indications. Chair Spang asked if any issues are known pertaining to the Choate family, in terms of

controversies. Ms. Kelleher was not aware of any concerns regarding Joseph Hodges Choate from a historic controversial vantage point.

Mr. Martinez asked if the statue is outside of the historic district. Ms. Kelleher looked on MACRIS which suggests that the statue is part of the local historic district.

Public comment:

David Williams, 342 Essex St, has resided there for 36 years. Provided history on movement of statue. Noted that Choate was born in Salem, lived in NY, father was a physician in Salem. The family lived on Essex Street, perhaps one reason why it is located on Essex/Boston. Noted that statue was formerly in middle of rotary and experienced more accidents. In 1997, City came to Essex Street Neighborhood association to talk about entrance corridor streets, placing the statue at one of those entrance corridors. Mr. Williams was in favor of keeping statue in its place in a historic district. Reason why statue was moved was as a plug to divert traffic away from Essex. If the statue must be moved, Mr. Williams proposed moving it somewhere else on Essex rather than off of Essex.

Andy Lippman, 28 Chestnut Street, president of Chestnut Street Neighborhood Association. Urged presenters and Commission against relocating statue to Dalton Parkway. Echoed Mr. Williams' comment about the statue being in a rotary, significant largely for where and what it is; marks delineation of Highland and Essex; encourages people to follow Route 107. Mr. Lippman noted that it was extremely unlikely that Dalton Parkway would increase foot traffic. Proposed potentially moving the statue further into Essex.

Christopher Patzke, 224 Lafayette, did not necessarily agree with moving from a prominent to a secondary/marginalized location. Mr. Patzke noted the importance of telling story of Salem through monuments in terms of placemaking. Was not convinced by the safety aspect of the argument; the monument is not causing accidents. Mr. Patzke made two requests and a suggestion: that the design team make a sincere effort at redesign; that Salem not be burdened with any more rotaries; and perhaps move statue to more dignified space like Harmony Grove Cemetery.

Annie Harris, 28 Chestnut Street, noted that the statue was extremely handsome, and is a joy to see as entrance to Salem. Ms. Harris did not want it moved and noted that the Dalton Parkway location would be unlikely to increase foot traffic to see the statue.

Ian Popken, 329 Essex Street, noted four points: the statue marks entrance to this area of historic district; safety audits can only be taken so seriously; only one alternative was presented, wanted to see multiple alternatives; and if the statue is removed, a safety impediment is going to be removed.

Tim Jenkins made mention of section 106 review of Historic Preservation Act in recommending/requiring a full review of all alternatives to this project, i.e. more alternatives should be presented by the project team.

James Sullivan, 374 Essex Street, registered objection to movement of statue. Mr. Sullivan was a proponent of what had been said by other public commentators. Spoke of progressivism that Choate is known for from his lifetime, as well as the statue's value in adding a measure of safety to the rest of the

historic district on Essex St. Mr. Sullivan also noted that moving the statue may create precedents for moving other statues.

Karen Popken, 329 Essex Street, was strongly opposed to moving statue of Salem native to Essex Street. Spoke of Choate's social, political, and historical accomplishments.

Helen Sides, 35 Broad Street, believed that the statue should remain where it is. Location on Essex/Boston Streets is ideal because Choate can be seen from all directions; it's a very directional statue and should be kept where it is.

Chair Spang summarized the questions raised from the public and asked for more information about the statue's origins.

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

Mr. Knowlton noted that he would coordinate with Ms. Kelleher when the City was ready to come back for further discussion.

Columbus Avenue seawall reconstruction

The City of Salem requested comments on the seawall reconstruction.

Documents & Exhibits:

- Letter
- Photos
- Engineering + site plans

Mr. Knowlton noted that wall would be reconstructed at higher elevation in more resilient fashion. Large granite rock wall to replace existing rubble stone wall. Lucas Taylor, consultant engineer with GZA, was present on the call. A letter to MHC had been drafted, looking at adverse effects on historic portion of the wall. Mr. Taylor walked the Commission through the letter that was drafted. Aerial image of cove was shown. Wall is 470 feet in length, 20 foot wide opening in center, with granite block landing that leads into beach area. Project is to provide more resilient structure to contend with waves. Cracking and mortar falling away was shown, loss of stones, etc. Looking at landing from the beach showed crumbling, stones unraveling. Engineering plans from permit set were also shown. Cross section was presented to show granite block stones on concrete footing. Granite stone steps on multiple sides would be used rather than just one side. Twenty-foot-wide opening would be closed and replaced with a flood gate, according to Mr. Knowlton. Chair Spang asked Mr. Taylor for clarification on new wall height above sidewalk, which Mr. Taylor noted that existing wall is 1 ½ to 3 feet above the sidewalk. Proposed wall would be 4 to 4 ½ feet above the sidewalk. Mr. Meche asked for clarity that sidewalk is already at 7-8 feet above beach. Mr. Knowlton noted that new height is about 11 ½ feet. Chair Spang asked if flooding would be minimized as a result. Mr. Knowlton said that the 100-year storm was being used as reference; and specified that this is not a flood control project so much as a seawall protection project. There will be some over-topping with the goal of ensuring that water stays inside the coves. Mr. Knowlton noted budgetary/funding limitations on this project, but that neighbors on either side of Cove could be advised on enlarging walls. Chair Spang inquired about requirements to comply with ADA, e.g.

stair access from platform; raised the notion of a ramp transiting from platform down to the beach. Mr. Knowlton noted that the site is not currently ADA-accessible; and the plans do not involve changing this. A waiver request was submitted to architectural board in Boston. Chair Spang asked if existing planters would be recreated. Mr. Taylor noted that options exist for smaller planters, more resilient options needed to be considered. Chair Spang clarified that there would be no changes to water outfall, which Mr. Knowlton noted that a pipe would stay. Ms. Graham asked for clarification on the 20-foot opening converting to an 8-foot-wide gate, which Mr. Knowlton said could either be a slide up gate or hinged gate to latch and close. The 8-foot option was the most feasible option, according to Mr. Knowlton.

Mr. Meche was not keen on the landing and gate reconstruction; would rather see bigger opening. Ms. Kelleher noted that the wall is a contributing resource in the Salem Willows National Register Historic District. Commission's purview is comment-only with the objective to provide requested feedback. Ms. Kelleher noted importance of retaining pillars. Mr. Martinez noted that pedestrian use of wall will be greatly impacted: increasing the wall's height would separate passerby completely from the view. Resiliency for singular events is being prioritized over viewshed and accessibility. Large stone granite wall is what would be seen around colonial wall, which Chair Spang appreciated (particularly in moving away from concrete). Mr. Joyce noted that wall should blend in with surrounding neighborhood/environment; perhaps through applying treatment/finish to inner side of granite blocks to make them look rougher. Chair Spang agreed with Mr. Joyce that the proposed wall would look like Derby Wharf more than a seaside community. Chair Spang asked if 20 feet existed to work with; and proposed perhaps putting some piers in between to reduce the span to provide a sense that this is an open and welcoming place rather than a hidden inaccessible site.

Public comment:

Christopher Patzke noted that reconstructing wall at higher elevation is correct thing to do. Storm surges and inundation from ocean is part of what city is using as part of misinformation to destroy cultural landscape. If rigor is used in this application, must be used in the Pioneer Village conversation as well.

Claire Sonnenberg-Cawley, 61 Columbus Ave, directly across from wall, worked on Flood Control Advisory Committee/Seawall Committee for three years. Spoke of the importance of the planned openness of the entrance at 20 feet.

Ms. Kelleher asked if Mr. Taylor and Mr. Knowlton would like the Commission's initial comments in writing. Mr. Knowlton noted that rougher wall surfaces may help with over-topping; would need to look into the availability of rougher stones. Expressed concern about wider opening because this would add significant cost; floodgates, purchase, install, and maintain. Eight-foot-wide was more reasonable which is why they settled on this. Chair Spang noted that mitigating wave action might necessitate improvements to beach itself not just the seawall. Mr. Meche asked if the materials that were presented were available via salem.com, which Mr. Knowlton affirmed. A detail, callout, and/or elevation of gate at 1:1 scale should be made available, Mr. Meche recommended.

VOTE: Mr. Meche motioned to continue the discussion. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Graham, Pattison, Martinez, English, Joyce, Spang, were in favor and the motion so carried.

Historic Salem, Inc. Proposal for Commission review of at-grade changes

Requested discussion for Commission review of at-grade changes.

Colleen Brewster and Lou Sirianni, Botts Ct, were present (co-chairs of HIS's Salem Brick Coalition) as well as Tim Obert (HSI board member and Coalition member). Proposed "Sidewalk and Paving Guidelines" were presented with the intention of receiving review from Commission. Fencing guidelines of Commission were used as reference/templates, Mr. Sirianni mentioned. Would like the document reviewed and edited by Commission with a mind towards including paving as part of the Commission's purview. Design standards for public sidewalks were shown. Ms. Brewster wanted to know if the Commission had been able to review, provide comments on, etc. the guidelines presented. Mr. Obert was prepared to speak of what other cities and towns have done with paving guidelines. MHC gave options for exemptions that cities could select, which Salem did choose, but other cities in MA did not exempt paving in at-grade work. Ms. Kelleher reminded all present that the city does not currently have jurisdiction over at-grade changes. HSI is recommending that the Commission provide guidance on at-grade paving changes, both private and public walkways. The first step would be to incorporate guidelines, and the second step would make it more jurisdictional. Chair Spang asked if the HSI affiliates had spoken to City Councilors for support. Mr. Sirianni noted that two or three councilors were potentially in support; but that the speakers would not consider moving ahead without Commission's support. Chair Spang noted that the guidelines were nicely written. Chair Spang noted that visibility from public way would likely be the tipping point. Chair Spang asked if this would also pertain to smaller garden paths, as an example. Mr. Sirianni noted that elements clearly visible from a public way were meant to be overseen rather than incidentals. Ms. Brewster noted the benefit of having a set of accepted materials that could be used and approved in an administrative way rather than exhaustive applications. Mr. Meche expressed concerns about differentiating between preservation and beautification; are we using a historical reference or simply making a united path through a city/neighborhood.

No public comment.

Ms. English was in favor of putting at-grade changes in the purview of guidance provided by the Commission. Mr. Joyce and Mr. Meche agreed.

137 Fort Avenue

Jessica and Michael Blomerth submitted a waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to remove more than 50% of roof.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/29/22
- Photographs

Mr. Blomerth was advised at zoning meeting to come to Historic Commission. Need to put addition on and need to remove more than 50% of the roof to do so. The intent is to put a second and third floor onto the home. Mockup of finished product was shown. Mr. Meche asked why special permit was needed. Mr. Blomerth noted that two-and-half-story area is where work is being done; and that applicants are trying to maximize third floor. Mr. Blomerth noted that they are trying to stay consistent with the neighborhood; live near Dead Horse Beach and Columbus Avenue. Abutting neighbors have no issue

with the Blomerths' plan. Ms. Kelleher noted that Willows is a National Register District but this building is non-contributing to the District. The question was raised as to whether this building is historically significant; built in 1957. Mr. Pattison requested a street view to see surrounding properties and asked if the building would be much taller than surrounding, which Mr. Blomerth noted that the house would reach 34 feet tall whereas neighbor is at 35 feet. Mr. Meche asked if Zoning Board accepted this as two-and-a-half story; Mr. Blomerth noted that they were going for a special permit. Ms. Kelleher again reminded the Commission of their primary task in determining whether the property in question is historically significant. Mr. Meche and Mr. Joyce conversed about the dates of construction for this and surrounding houses, i.e. early 1900s and during the post-WWII period.

No public comment.

Mr. Martinez echoed comments that were made concerning offering architectural design guidance. Ms. English agreed. That said, Commission members did not find the present house to be historically significant to the point of preserving its existing appearance. Chair Spang noted that a sizeable front porch might be preferable to a roof deck. Ms. Graham pointed out that the applicants need not be symmetrical in their planned design; citing the fact that neighbors' houses are not symmetrical. Mr. Meche also contributed design advice and cautioned that a variance may be needed rather than a special permit. Mr. Joyce also recommended a Mansard roof.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to find the building not historically significant and waive the demolition delay. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Joyce, Graham, Martinez, Pattison, Meche, 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 retaining wall and foundation modifications (after the fact).

Documents & Exhibits:

- Application: 3/28/22
- Photographs

Chair Spang noted that since the last meeting, the building inspector determined that the retaining wall is structurally sound. Mr. Carria was present on the call and uploaded images of the property prior to retaining wall being put in, as well as letter from next door neighbor pertaining to what has been done. The neighbors were Melody Lee and Pamela Waldron. Ms. Waldron's letter from early May 2022 was shown. The letter was in support and sympathetic to the work performed. Ms. Lee's letter also appreciated the beautification efforts of the Carrias, spoke to the house enhancing the appearance of the area/neighborhood. Mr. Carria noted that he had spoken to contractor about changing face to a brick veneer that faces neighbor and what is seen from the street. Chair Spang clarified that either a thin or full-face brick would be used. Mr. Carria noted that a cap of blue-stone slate would be used. Mr. Joyce noted that the foundation was failing thus the retaining wall was built. Mr. Carria was asked if anything was put up against brick when fill was poured; Mr. Carria noted that two huge blocks were placed right up against the house (Chair Spang noted that these were big modular retaining blocks for highway-grade changes). Mr. Carria noted that packed stones are against the portion shown, and then reinforced with cemented rebar (reinforced block system, noted Mr. Meche). Mr. Joyce asked if anything is preventing moisture

getting down into the bricks under the house. Mr. Carria noted that this has yet to occur; the ground is covered with asphalt to prevent moisture leaking down the driveway. Mr. Meche noted that this approach will not function as a water barrier. Mr. Joyce had an issue topping this off with something that would not address the issue as to why any of this work was done in the first place. Chair Spang noted that the building inspector had already approved/given blessing to this installation. Chair Spang noted that building moisture was not addressed with the building inspector. Mr. Joyce was appreciative of Mr. Carria's willingness to put up a brick facing. Mr. Joyce asked if there was any consideration about making this area a patio area. Mr. Carria preferred to not make this a patio area; also noted that a fence would be put up, likely a wrought iron option; one from Reliable and another from Northeastern had been looked at. Mr. Joyce wanted to see specifications on brick veneer; the fence that will go up; water-struck brick, not sand-struck (more historically created); blue-stone cap. Chair Spang asked for opinion of thin versus dimensional brick; Mr. Joyce did not have issue with thin brick. Mr. Meche would be surprised if thin brick would be recommended for this application. Mr. Pattison noted that thin brick had no structural function. Mr. Pattison noted that space for cavity wall did not exist on this site. Chair Spang asked if applicant would be adding full brick to outside of the wall, which Mr. Carria noted that his decision depended on what his neighbor was willing to allow. Welded fire fabric would need to run horizontally and be anchored to the wall with mortar to bind it, Mr. Meche and Chair Spang noted. These details have yet to be worked out. Nominally, brick along that face; details on the brick are subject to approval as would always be the case. A Commission member would need to work with Mr. Carria to finalize details. Mr. Meche would support a brick solution but did not see benefit of tearing out the work that was done; adding a layer of brick is fine but do not go with increasing perviousness. Mr. Pattison proposed erecting a fence over the retaining wall, which Mr. Carria noted would likely be disagreeable to his abutting neighbor in terms of visibility in their driveway. Mr. Pattison also recommended a transition with wooden baluster on wall for upper half. Ms. Kelleher asked if Commission members would be willing to work with applicant if support for fence that actually exists. Mr. Pattison and Chair Spang volunteered to work with Mr. Carria on board fence. Ms. English was not in favor of fence. Mr. Pattison noted that a fence is going to be constructed at some point and that the applicant/Commission should get ahead of this eventuality. Mr. Martinez and Ms. Graham expressed disapproval of the planned fence. Chair Spang was unsure as to how fence was anchored to wall or ground. Mr. Martinez and Ms. English expressed the need to see architectural rendering. Mr. Joyce requested specifications on brick (full dimensional water struck brick; match the foundation of Mr. Carria's house; how brick will be installed), fence type (material, what it will look like), a plan for installing fence, specifications on existing cap; and if cap is reused, how this will relate to brick and brick wall. Ms. Kelleher asked if members would work with Mr. Carria or if a design professional should be hired.

No public comment.

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

186 Federal Street—continuation

Denise M. Carria submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness regarding storm window and storm door color, parge foundation, and modification of windows on garage.

Documents & Exhibits:

- Application: 4/28/22
- Photographs

Mr. Carria noted that a Brosco window and door would be used which had been proposed by his contractor/installer. Ms. Kelleher pointed out that an all-wood window, single-glaze, and 6 over 6 would count as a Certificate of Non-Applicability. Chair Spang asked if the storm window and storm door color had been approved, which Ms. Kelleher affirmed. Chair Spang proposed using grout to fill cracks in the garage to match existing color to look like existing.

VOTE: Mr. Meche motioned to approve repair of concrete masonry units on garage using cement grout that matches existing. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Joyce, Graham, Martinez, Pattison, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Pattison advised using an epoxy grout to get more longevity.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez motioned to approve the removal of plywood to investigate door behind it to see if it is still serviceable. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Joyce, Graham, Martinez, Pattison, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

9 Cambridge St

Nicolaus and Elisa Hofmeester submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace rear addition and new paint colors.

Documents & Exhibits:

- Application: 5/4/22
- Powerpoint

Nicolaus and Elisa Hofmeester were present with Helen Sides, architect. Ms. Sides noted that an addition was added at some point; a shed-like unheated space. Proposed to add new second story, relocate bulkhead. Close to property line of Hamilton Hall. Slightly visible from Broad Street as well as between Hamilton Hall and the applicants' home. Existing details were shown; as well as where a new roofline would be and where existing roofline would be visible from street. Existing dormer on gambrel was shown, as well as new skylight and new addition. Chair Spang showed an aerial Google view as a visual aid. Ms. Sides noted that the new addition's roofline would be in line with the shallower end of the gambrel and will thus look like the existing dormer, as clarified by Mr. Joyce. Mr. Martinez clarified that the skylight would likely not be visible. The addition is getting longer and improving existing conditions; will be fully insulated, fully heated, more usable space; with rear entry and complete interior work. Mr. Martinez clarified that the footprint is getting a little bigger, to which Ms. Sides noted that this would be a full demo. Mr. Meche asked if the existing color would match, to which Ms. Hofmeester noted it is similar but slightly different. Mr. Joyce clarified home was built in 1890. Queen Anne Pink was shown as the intended paint color, Benjamin Moore; trim is Cotton Balls; Essex Green for shutters; and Black for door. Ms. Kelleher asked if this pink had been compared to existing, which the Hofmeesters noted was more peach and more pale; the existing is more beige. Ms. English asked if the shutters are currently Essex Green, which Ms. Hofmeester said they are not. Mr. Martinez cautioned the tones of the green which are being planned in order to differentiate the shutters from the door; not to choose a green that too closely resembles black.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez motioned to approve the application to rebuild rear addition and new paint colors as applied for with the caveat that applicants may alter green in the field to be overseen by Mr. Martinez and Ms. Graham. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Joyce, Graham, Martinez, Pattison, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

123 Federal Street

Cali Fidopiastis submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to paint carriage house. Paige Dunsmore was also present on the call.

Documents & Exhibits:

- Application: 5/5/22
- Photos

Ms. Dunsmore explained that the rear carriage house was covered in ivy which has been removed to reveal damage to stucco. Would like to seal the house. Ivy was killed and removed by previous owner. Ivy had worked its way through the stucco, even entailing new chimney work. Ms. Dunsmore was not under the impression that the carriage house had ever been painted. Mr. Meche asked how fresh the stucco was; Ms. Dunsmore noted that the house has not been re-stucco'd. Mr. Meche noted that patched stucco work was carried out one month prior to date of meeting. Mr. Meche noted that some kinds of stucco should not be painted for a while and to consult with a painter. Mr. Martinez asked if new stucco is drastically different color from previous stucco. Mr. Meche asked how old the carriage house is. The applicants were unsure; could have been in the 1920s because murals were done in 1930s. Mr. Meche suggested that carriage house not match main house and should not be house body color but perhaps the trim color. The applicants were open to this. Mr. Joyce asked whether the stucco had ever been painted or was simply stucco. The goal is to preserve stucco through painting. Chair Spang asked if painting could be detrimental to the stucco. Mr. Martinez asked if the applicants would be open to doing a color in the same family as the color of the main house; Sag Harbor Grey or Richmond Grey. Mr. Martinez proposed approving these colors and allowing the applicants to pick; and leave the trim the existing color (of creamy white).

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez motioned to approve two color options Sag Harbor and Richmond Grey with existing trim color to match. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Joyce, Graham, Martinez, Pattison, Meche, Spang (no) were in favor and the motion so carried.

Salem Common—continuation

The City of Salem/SCNA submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replicate carvings on Washington Arch in the Salem Common. The Salem Common requested a continuation to the next meeting.

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

155 Derby Street—continuation

Wharfside Condominium Association submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate roof drains to new daylight drains at foundation. The Association requested to continue.

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

The following applications were originally advertised on the agenda but were continued due to time constraints.

169 Federal Street

Brian Peters submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for storm window and storm door color.

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

9 Hathorne St

Greg Davis submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove vinyl siding and restore building.

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

7 Orne Sq

Katherine Green and Michael Walpole submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new shed.

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

21 Flint St

David Kaytes submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to modify previously approved plans for rear alterations.

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

5-7 Flint St

Ilse Peirce submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace window.

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

39 Warren St

William Healy and James Raye submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate rear downspout. This request is being reviewed under minor change category with waiver of public hearing pending abutter notification.

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

Adjournment

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:36PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Dan Graham, Historical Commission Clerk