

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
January 19, 2022

A regular meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, January 19, 2022, at 6:00 pm. **VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING.** Present were: Vijay Joyce, Milo Martinez, Mark Meche, Mark Pattison, Larry Spang. Not present: Reed Cutting, Rebecca English, Stacey Norkun.

85 Memorial Drive- continuation

City of Salem requested a Waiver of the Demolition Delay to demolish buildings at Camp Naumkeag

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/18/21
- Photographs
- Updated Form A - Area Form for Camp Naumkeag
- Additional materials

Patricia O'Brien and Elizabeth Peterson from the City's Recreation Department and project consultant Margaret Wood were present to discuss the project.

Chair Spang stated that the closing of public comment did not pass at the previous meeting where this application was discussed, so it is still open. There is also no new information to report.

Ms. Wood noted that at the last meeting, resident Steve Kapantis spoke during the public hearing to request a structural assessment by a certified engineer as specified in the demolition delay ordinance. The City is now in the process of hiring an independent structural engineer to complete this assessment.

Chair Spang noted that the Commission received 5 or 6 sets of written public comments, which were split between support and opposition of the project. Others raised concerns and were in favor of more investigation.

Public Comment:

Christopher Patzke, Lafayette Street. Mr. Patzke reported that he had forwarded his list of 11 concerns to the Commission, City Councillors, and to the Mayor regarding the review of this project. He expressed his opinion that this project violates professional preservation standards that are written into the Commission's Guidelines. These should be addressed. He questioned the \$638,000 design fee and requested a complete plan for the destruction proposed at both Camp Naumkeag and Pioneer Village and their associated cultural landscapes, as well as a complete plan for preserving the sites in situ, so citizens can assess what is right for their community. He reported that he has received personal attacks for his advocacy, despite his professional expertise and graduate level training, and has nothing to gain from this project, but believes that other advocates either will gain something or have political ties to this project or do not understand the professional standards that should be applied. He expressed disappointment that no new information was being presented despite the City's desire to push the project through, showing little respect for those with valid concerns. Chair Spang replied that tonight's discussion is about whether to grant the request to waive the demolition delay for the buildings at Camp Naumkeag.

Mary Ellen Halliwell. Asked how many people are attending the meeting. Ms. Kelleher replied 31 people total, 20 members in the audience and 11 panelists. Ms. Halliwell read her e-mail comments into the record.

Emily Udy, Historic Salem, Inc. Ms. Udy stated that HSI submitted a letter regarding the request to waive the Demolition Delay for Camp Naumkeag which also included several questions. They support the Commission making a determination of historic significance for the property and for defining the site as preferably preserved. Historic Salem encourages the City to begin the consultation process with the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) or have the Salem Historical Commission request the consultation.

Rod Parker. Asked if there are preliminary estimates for the cost other than the \$638,000 fee. Ms. Wood responded that the preliminary estimate is just under \$4 million. She stated that she is not sure where the figure of \$638,000 for designer fees originated, as it is not accurate. The funds for the project will come from the Signature Parks bond passed last year and the remainder will come from Pioneer Village income. She noted that the

advertised fee for the conceptual design work completed to date was \$75,000 and they will negotiate a fee with the design team for the remainder of the work. She noted that many things remain undetermined, and this is a high-level estimate that needs final information to refine the estimated cost. Mr. Patzke responded that the city's fiscal report from 2021 lists the designer fee as \$638,000.

Mr. Meche requested to review HSI's questions included in their letter. Ms. Udy noted that a letter dated January 18, 2022 was submitted and contained the following questions.

Q1: What are the potential funding sources for this project that may trigger MHC review?

Q2: Is the applicant able to show evidence of viability for this project compared with maintaining and promoting Pioneer Village in situ?

Q3: What alternatives to demolition are being considered?

Q4: General concern for long-term successful operating viability of the site, including a better understanding of sufficient parking and access being provided.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Spang suggested a motion to close the public hearing, which will become a milestone on the demolition delay period so the applicant can move forward with the process. A vote to deny it means the 18-months clock starts.

Mr. Meche noted that at the last public hearing the applicant expressed support for the Commission not approving a waiver of the delay, which would result in an 18 month delay for demolition. Ms. Wood replied that the City is still in support of the Commission not approving the waiver. Chair Spang noted that the City is willing to accept the delay.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, Pattison, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Chair Spang asked the Commission to consider whether the 4 buildings of Camp Naumkeag are historically significant and if so, are they preferably preserved. Mr. Meche replied that there are issues to consider such as landscape features and building conditions. He asked if the determination was specific to the 4 buildings only or to Camp Naumkeag in general. Ms. Wood replied that the bathroom building was constructed significantly later than the camp buildings and the City will submit a separate demolition application for this structure which is between 50 and 99 years of age. Mr. Meche asked for clarification on whether the Commission's decision would protect the entire camp for 18-months and if this is the first time the ordinance has been used. Ms. Kelleher replied that the demolition delay is narrowly defined to buildings and structures in their present location and the Commission doesn't have jurisdiction over landscape features, although they can advocate for the landscapes. Ms. Joyce stated that he would be in favor of both being defined as significant and preserved. Mr. Pattison agreed.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to find that the four Camp Naumkeag buildings (cottage, lodge, men's and women's cabin) are historically significant and preferably preserved. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, Pattison, Spang were in favor, Martinez not in favor, and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher reviewed a list of action items prepared by staff that could address questions and concerns raised by the Commission.

1. Structural Assessment
2. Reuse study/assessment
3. Interpretive Plan for Tuberculosis Health Camp/Camp Naumkeag building(s)
4. Consultation with MHC
5. New cultural landscape reports
6. Environmental Assessment
7. Evaluate Pioneer Village project under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation & Guidelines on Floor Adaptation for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings
8. Full photographic documentation
9. Retention of the buildings until all necessary funding and permitting is secured
10. Submit separate WDDO application for the 1963-bathroom building

11. Confirm if relocation of Pioneer Village buildings qualifies as “demolition” under City’s Demolition Delay Ordinance

Chair Spang stated that the list of items would occur during the 18-month delay once the waiver is denied. Mr. Meche noted that while he agreed with the list of items, the list conflates the two sites. Ms. Kelleher agreed to reorganize the list and make it site specific. Mr. Martinez replied that when considering demolition, the Commission tries to work with the applicant over the 18-month period because once that delay period is over the applicant can do as they wish. Part of this negotiation period is the future use of the site and not allowing demolition without knowing the intended use of the site. Ms. Wood questioned the need for a Cultural Landscape Report and asked if there is a model to follow. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Commission and public have concerns with the siting of the buildings and their orientation of the buildings to each other, as well as how the landscape plays a role in each project. The Inventory forms don’t touch upon landscapes and the report could provide that information. Mr. Meche noted that a guide to the report is available on-line. Ms. Wood stated that she will respond to the list with questions, noted that a report of this type has never been requested before, asked that this project be consistent with the ordinance. She noted that the Commission doesn’t govern cultural landscapes, questioned whether this report would give the Commission the information they need to make their decision, and noted her concern with being mindful of the spending of taxpayer money. Ms. Kelleher replied that the report was a staff prepared list based on public and Commission comments. Chair Spang suggested formalizing that question in a motion or allowing it to remain a suggestion

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to deny the Waiver of Demolition Delay. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, Pattison, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the intent of the delay is to find alternatives to demolition if and where possible. However, if the Commission is satisfied that all efforts for preservation have been considered and acted upon before the end of the 18-month period, the Commission could vote to reduce the delay period during a public meeting. The Commission could request some of the items listed but encouraged that it all be submitted at one time to review at one meeting. Ms. Wood noted that the list of items will take a couple of months to complete although some will require further definition to understand what the Commission is seeking, and she believes some of them have already been met.

284 Lafayette Street - continuation

Coach House Inn, LLC submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install condenser units - *continuation*

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/4/21
- Photographs

Nick Giallousis was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Meche stated that he and Ms. Kelleher made a site visit the previous week. The location of concern is on the right side where the grade has risen creating a swale, but the grade would be lowered so the 59-inch projection of the condenser will begin lower than current grade. The basement windows are older and simple but have been modified and rather than taking out a sash and installing a wood panel with refrigerant lines, he suggested the refrigerant lines enter between the windows through the mullion. The proposed screening fence should be approximately 18-inches away from the house and the equipment may sit on a concrete pad.

Mr. Giallousis stated that he appreciated the site visit and feedback. The area next to the existing poured concrete retaining wall would be excavated to lower the grade so that ultimately, the tops of the condensers would be just below the bottom of the windowsill. The units would be no less than 18-inches away from house, 61-inches high, and concealed with a fence at a height to match the top of the condenser. The finished product will bundle the 3 refrigerant lines. The overall unit and fence will protrude 5-feet away from the house to allow for proper airflow around the 3-condensers. They are using a slightly larger commercial unit condenses the amount of space needed for them at the exterior.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the units will be a good distance from Lafayette Street and two different options for screening are proposed. The applicant prefers the louvered design but the corner post treatment is still undecided. Chair Spang suggested they confirm sound ordinance requirements at the property line. Mr. Meche noted that Salem does have a nuisance noise ordinance although the sound can't be measured until someone makes a noise complaint. Mr. Giallousis replied that his Lynde Street project has condensers 12-feet from the property line and next to a church and they are extremely quiet.

Mr. Giallousis stated that he originally proposed a 2-sided fence; however, a third side could be placed at the driveway side to conceal the units from that angle. The fence post caps can be at the discretion of the Commission. Mr. Meche noted that fence posts with a finished look are preferred. Mr. Giallousis suggested Boral or painted PVC trim. Boral has a slight grain but looks smooth from a distance. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission prefers flat side out exposed. Mr. Meche stated that the Commission will need more detail, trim shapes, sizes, spacing, etc. in order to make a motion, and noted his preference for the Federal Street solution.

The Commission discussed various types of screening. Mr. Giallousis noted his preference for a traditional fence with vertical slats and requested the Commission's preferred materials. Mr. Pattison suggested Azek as a bottom board of the fence for longevity since it will be so far from the street. Mr. Joyce noted the variety of screening used in the neighborhood rather than the use of simple boards and a cap.

Mr. Martinez requested a site plan showing the location of this screening.

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

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

12 Carpenter Street - continuation

William Grover submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows - *continuation*

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/22/21
- Photographs
- Marvin Elevate replacement window specifications

William Grover was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Meche noted that he and Mr. Martinez made a site visit. Ms. Kelleher summarized the applicant's request to replace existing replacement windows from the 1980s. She noted that the inventory form shows that the window configuration at the property have changed a couple of times over the years. The Marvin Ultimate and Marvin Elevate are proposed, although the Ultimate has a deeper bottom rail. Their preference is for the Elevate window which is a composite product. Mr. Meche noted that the original window sashes have been removed but the balance and jamb assembly will need to be removed to allow the new window to tuck-in behind the jamb creating a cleaner and more traditional profile. He expressed his opinion that the proposed Elevate windows are a better match.

Mr. Martinez noted that the sashes have mitered corners, the composite windows have a matte finish rather than glossy, and the finish can be painted but black would be ordered. Mr. Grover noted that the black windows will be replaced with new black windows.

Mr. Pattison asked if the storm windows would be reinstalled. Mr. Grover replied no and noted that the replacement windows will be installed from the inside.

Mr. Joyce asked if these windows been previously approved by the Commission. Ms. Kelleher replied no.

Mr. Martinez asked if there is a concern among the Commission with only using these on the first floor. Mr. Grover noted that the first-floor windows weren't maintained. Ms. Kelleher noted that the applicant is open to replacing all of the windows.

Mr. Pattison raised concerns with not installing wood windows. Mr. Meche replied that there would be considerable expense for all new wood windows. Chair Spang noted that the synthetic exterior has a higher performance. Mr. Meche stated that replacing replacement windows is a different standard to meet in his opinion. Mr. Martinez noted that the proposed product is more sophisticated product than others previously proposed.

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

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve Martin Elevate in pre-finished black and to replace all windows in the house. Mr. Meche seconded the motion.

Mr. Meche made an amendment to include that the new sash inserts will be Elevate model, to remove the old jamb liners, and for new windows to be closely fit to original frame. Mr. Martinez accepted the amendment.

Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, Martinez, Spang were in favor; Mr. Pattison opposed. The motion (4-1) so carried.

313 Essex Street

Acasa Realty LLC submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace roofing

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/5/22
- Photographs

The applicant was not present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the front of the building's hip roof is slate while the sides are asphalt 3-tab shingles. The proposal is to repair the slate and to replace the 3-tab shingles with CertainTeed Landmark architectural shingles in Charcoal Black.

Mr. Pattison noted that the high roof has a shallow angle making it less visible. Mr. Meche agreed and noted that asphalt composite shingle wasn't ideal. Ms. Kelleher noted that Slateline and CertainTeed are designer shingles. A couple years ago the Commission toured the historic district to view roof shingles. The consensus at that time was that a uniform color was more important than the cut of the shingle. Chair Spang noted that the Slateline did resemble slate. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission has approved two Slateline colors in the past. Chair Spang added that in addition to the colors, the width of this shingle is also more consistent.

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

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to approve as submitted due to the roof being low slope and the roof being well above the streetscape, and to commend them for saving the slate. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, Pattison, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

316 Essex Street

First Unitarian Church submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fencing

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/5/22
- Photographs

Peter Eschauzier, member of First Church and on property committee was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Eschauzier stated that the church originally wanted to replace a section of the picket fence; however, the nursery school at the church wanted to build an outdoor playground and their proposed fence didn't conform to the type of privacy fence required for a child's play area. The new fence is in keeping with the fence at the rear of the property. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission approved fencing in 2018 along the rear of the church adjacent to the Bowditch House owned by HSI and next to the Witch House, but now the applicant would like to replace all fencing. They have a proposal from a fence company to change the fence on the side of the church and remove the rear gate and replace with fencing.

Chair Spang asked if the proposal would replicate the new fence at 314 Essex Street. Mr. Eschauzier replied yes, with the same 8-foot x 6-foot Colonial Premium fence. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission could approve the request with the condition that it replicate the fence design at 314 Essex Street. Any changes to this design would require the applicant to return for review. Mr. Eschauzier replied that the only difference would be that a portion of the new fence near the front would be painted white and the remaining left natural. Mr. Martinez asked if the fence along Eaton Place currently has spindles. Mr. Eschauzier replied yes. Ms. Kelleher noted that the fence is partially visible between the Witch House and HSI building. Mr. Martinez stated that if a portion remained unpainted, he would have no issue with the differences in fence styles.

Chair Spang noted that modern fences have visible or interrupting fence posts. Ms. Kelleher noted that the property at 314 has visible posts. Mr. Meche stated that the fence will be far enough from the street for him to be supportive of it, although he has concerns with the use of pressure treated posts. Chair Spang suggested approving cedar posts with a cap since pressure treated wood has a greenish hue and have a rougher texture with knots. The Commission would prefer they be dressed like the fence panels.

The Commission discussed the use of various fence post caps. Mr. Eschauzier noted that the proposed caps appear to match the existing caps and they received prices for a premium grade and a lesser grade but will use the premium grade. Mr. Pattison noted that pressure treated posts were priced, however; that's not what is shown in the proposed photo.

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

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve a new Northeastern Colonial unfinished 6-foot-tall fence with 5x5 cedar posts, with a flat post cap. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, Pattison, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

284 Lafayette Street – Application reviewed under consideration as a minor change

Coach House Inn LLC submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter sign

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/9/21
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher reported that the request to alter sign was reviewed under the minor change category. Notices were sent to abutters and abutters to abutters. No objection was received and the Certificate of Appropriateness was issued without the need for a public hearing.

Request for Letter of Support – Survey and Planning Grant Application for Mack Park Neighborhood Survey

Ms. Kelleher requested a letter of support for the City's grant application to survey the historic neighborhood of Mack Park. This project will be similar to recent survey projects in South Salem and Downtown and will document historic resources in the area between North Street to the Peabody line and the North River Canal. A preservation consultant would survey 100-125 properties in the neighborhood. The funds are from the MHC for a survey and planning grant and includes a pre-application and then MHC determines if they want to move it to the next step. The full application is due in February, it is a competitive grant.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve a letter of support. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, Pattison, Martinez, Spang in favor and the motion so carried.

Request for Letter of Support – American Battlefields Preservation Planning Grant Application for Fort Lee

Ms. Kelleher requested a letter of support for the City's grant application for a Preservation and Management Plan for Fort Lee. This project would include a conditions assessment and a site survey that would create a 3-D rendering of the fort. The planning study would explore how to preserve the fort while still allowing public access so people can still appreciate and recognize the significance of the cultural landscape. This study would balance the desire to restore the site to its previous cleared hillside, eliminating 50-years of vegetation and plant growth with the need to address sustainability and environmental concerns. She reported that the City previously submitted an application in 2021 but unfortunately, the application was not processed correctly and was never considered by the Park Service review panel. The City will be reapplying for the grant in the new funding round. During the last application process, the City did not have time to request letters of support. Now, with additional time, the City is seeking support from historic groups and stakeholders for the project. Mr. Meche stated that he will reach out to the boy scouts and allow them an opportunity to submit a support letter as well.

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

Other Business:

39 Washington Square

Ms. Kelleher stated that Mr. Martinez and Chair Spang were working with the owner on final details for the new K-style gutter to be applied to the built-out cornice. Chair Spang asked if hardwood would be required. Mr. Pattison requested the use of cedar or mahogany for the two finish boards for longevity. Mr. Meche added that he would be in favor of rot resistant hardwood and pressure treated interior components.

Executive Session for Review of Salem State University South Campus Disposition RFP

The Commission to review and comment on a draft Marketing Plan and Request for Proposals prepared by and for the Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance for the disposition of Salem State University South Campus at 8, 11, 20-32 Harrison Road and 262 Loring Avenue through executive session because an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the public body.

Executive Session

Chair Spang stated that the Commission will vote on whether to reconvene Open Session at the conclusion of the Executive Session.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to move to Executive Session and that the regular meeting will not reconvene at the close of the executive session. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Joyce, Meche, Pattison, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

The regular meeting adjourned at 9:10PM

The executive session meeting adjourned at 9:40PM

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher, Preservation Planner