

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
October 6, 2021

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, October 6, 2021, at 6:00 pm via **Zoom Virtual Meeting**. Present were: Patti Kelleher (staff), Milo Martinez, Larry Spang (Chair), Mark Pattison, Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce. Not present: Stacey Norkun, Reed Cutting, Mark Meche.

346 Essex Street Unit 1

Pedro Perez submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace basement door.

Ms. Kelleher reported that this application was reviewed as a minor change and notices were sent to abutters. Since no objections were received, the Certificate was issued without a public hearing.

337 Essex Street – Salem Athenaeum

Lynn Spencer and Doug Manley were in attendance to discuss the Salem Athenaeum's previous review for accessibility improvements. This is an informational follow-up from the September 1, 2021 hearing after which point the Commission issued a Certificate of Appropriateness on September 9th. The stipulation had been that the brick wall be lowered by 1 tread, which the applicants presented via rendering. Ms. Spencer noted that MHC had approved the initial submission as well as the new plans with the lowered brick wall. The top stair landing will be raised to grant access through the front door of the building. Applicants showed an example of Milford Granite via photographs on site. Despite discoloration of existing steps, a pinkish color can be seen that is approximate to Milford Granite. An additional image showed Milford Granite in relation to marble bases of columns. Ms. Spencer noted that a Deer Isle granite may also be considered instead of the Milford Granite. An image of the Medway stairs in Medway, MA were also shown from a project 10 years prior to demonstrate Milford Granite after having aged 10 years. Chair Spang asked what was approved in terms of stone at prior meeting. It was established that the Milford Pink had been granted approval previously. The Athenaeum will be submitting an application for a Massachusetts Cultural Facilities Fund grant, which needs approvals on all permits as part of the grant process.

171 Federal Street - continuation

Chris and Annie Thompson submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicants are now seeking to restore the historic wood windows which can be approved under a Certificate of Non-Applicability. They are therefore requesting to withdraw their application to replace windows.

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to accept the applicants' request to withdraw the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Martinez, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

361 Essex Street - continuation

Darcy Birse submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install gutters and downspouts.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant has requested a continuation.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue the application to the November 3 meeting. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Martinez, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

122 Derby Street - continuation

Robert Burkinshaw submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to rebuild addition

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/20/21
- Plans/drawings by JFA Design Group
- Photos

Mr. Burkinshaw reported that an architect has been hired and drawings have been submitted. He reiterated that his original intent had been to rebuild the addition in the same manner but is now seeking some design modifications based on feedback from the Commission. He presented the new drawings, which included a second floor over the store part of the building as well as a two story addition instead of the original one-story massing. He stated that he would prefer carriage doors on the addition in order to show that a carriage house/garage adjoins the main building. The desire was in part to be reflective of the period that this building is from. Chair Spang asked if the carriage house addition will be a storage space. Mr. Burkinshaw attested that this area is and will be used for storage and packing. Putting on a second floor would provide much needed extra space in the building. Mr. Burkinshaw noted that a Commission member advocated making the new space efficient and useful moving forward. He provided several options for different roof variations. Chair Spang noted that drawing #3 shows the type of building/structure that currently exists on the site. Chair Spang noted that drawings #1 and 2 increase the amount of second-floor space which would be used by the company rather than residences. Drawing #1 has a flat roof and Drawing #2 has a pitch roof. Chair Spang asked if the applicants have talked to building department about any potential zoning issues. Mr. Burkinshaw responded that he did not anticipate any issues but would speak with zoning. Mr. Burkinshaw asked if the Commission had any preference among the options presented. The middle section of the building currently has a taller façade; and the middle section roof would need more reinforcing, Chair Spang anticipated. Mr. Burkinshaw noted that two steel beams had been put in when his father originally bought the building. An architect or engineer noted that one or more new supports would be necessary moving forward with these additions.

Ms. English asked if proposed new addition would be set back on the lot or flush with the plane of the existing façade. Mr. Burkinshaw replied that it is set back, which corresponds with the original footprint. Mr. Martinez proposed seeing a gable all the way across rather than a flat roof; otherwise, the look and feel of the building will be changed. Chair Spang noted that the peak of the roof seems to go up considerably in the proposed alteration drawings. The applicant noted that the peak of the leftmost part of the building will not be raised. Top of ridge of existing is 22' 10". Mr. Martinez expressed preference for gable-type roof but could be swayed to flat roof.

The project architect, John Andrews of JFA Design Group, joined the meeting. Mr. Andrews noted that option #1 has gable end remaining, with second floor added to right side and raised to match same ceiling height of the left structure. Chair Spang noted a discrepancy between roof height labels on A1 and A3 (i.e. Drawings #1 and #3). The basic desired goal for the applicant was to keep the existing piece on the left. Mr. Burkinshaw's stated preference was A1 in keeping with the look of the original building. Chair

Spang asked if Mr. Andrews anticipated going before the ZBA and ultimately advocated going through ZBA to ensure the project will not be rejected before the Commission discusses.

Mr. Pattison was uncomfortable with the proposed designs, citing the fact that this was historically a home that was turned into a business before undergoing various additions. Mr. Pattison noted that some of the proposed designs start to look like a home that was added onto all at once or a business that was converted to a home. Mr. Pattison felt that the ad hoc nature of what exists is now part of the building's historic character, and that some of the proposed alterations come across as unnatural to the existing design.

Mr. Andrews asked for clarity that the second-floor addition would be acceptable to be added to the rightmost addition. Ms. English expressed support for the intended addition given that the rightmost part of the home subordinates the carriage house from the rest of the house. Despite favoring gables, Mr. Martinez agreed with Mr. Pattison's point that the flat roof adds to the eclectic feel of the house. Ms. Kelleher noted that the building was constructed in 1864 and served as a grocery store almost from the time of its original construction. Chair Spang showed a mockup image of gable roofs on the middle and right addition and raised consideration of dormers in these sections per Mr. Martinez's suggestion. Mr. Pattison expressed preference for seeing the roofline lowered for the carriage house addition. Mr. Andrews pointed out that the roofline is going to be higher to account for ceiling heights in the second floor, but expressed openness to the possibility of adding dormers to the roof pitch

Chair Spang sought to establish what the applicants and board members wanted to see before moving forward. Applicants want the roofline to stay as-is on the left side. Mr. Pattison would accept a flat roof to remain in the center, but that the right addition should not be the same height as the middle. Ms. English preferred flat to pitched roof and was fine with the second-floor addition. Changing from flat to otherwise would too greatly change the look of the façade. Mr. Martinez agreed with Mr. Pattison that the third piece could be more subordinate in terms of height. Design A1 seemed to be a favorite, simply so long as the rightmost addition is subordinated. Mr. Martinez and others expressed preference to see the windows be consistent. Chair Spang noted that some of the detailing on the leftmost part of the building seemed authentic, i.e. the gable end specifically; and the cornice has historic shapes. The additions should incorporate such details. Mr. Burkinshaw asked for guidance on the garage/barn doors. Chair Spang expressed openness to what was presented, as did other members. Mr. Andrews asked for clarification that rendering with shadowing is preferred, which Chair Spang affirmed. Mr. Martinez showed an image of 1 Forrester to demonstrate shadowing, in which a subordinate structure to the main house had smaller windows.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to continue the application to the meeting on October 20, 2021. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Martinez, Pattison, Spang, were in favor and the motion so carried.

360 Essex Street

Emily and Robert Stuart submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter rear dormer and skylight.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/9/21

- Photographs

Emily and Robert Stuart were present. The applicants noted that the dormer and skylights are leaking. Dormer has metal louvers that can be flipped up, and when windows are open, water pours in. The dormer is not believed to be original, and the applicants' intent was to replace skylight with new skylights that are solar-powered. Dormer is visible from Federal Street but skylights are not. Mr. Martinez asked for the location of the skylight to be replaced, and clarified that the dormer will be replaced with skylight. Ms. Stuart noted that the new skylight will be a little bit bigger than the existing skylights; and thus the size of all skylights will increase because all are being replaced. Ms. Stuart noted that the Monroe Street skylight will be as close as possible to what is existing, though will be a little bit longer. Mr. Martinez asked Ms. Kelleher if this skylight model has been approved in the past. Ms. Kelleher stated that similar skylights were approved on Orne Square and Winthrop Street. Mr. Pattison asked for details on the existing dormer which the applicants noted was initially a "whole house" fan, which sounds like a jet engine. The fan was inoperable when owners bought the house two years ago. Chair Spang noted that the proposed skylights will be 44 ³/₄ by 46 ¹/₄, which is nearly square. Mr. Martinez noted that the dormer is quite large compared to a normal skylight. Ms. Stuart noted that the existing skylight is 30" x 38".

Public comment:

Josiah Fisk, 358 Essex Street, spoke in support of the application as the applicants' neighbor. Mr. Fisk stated that he did not like the existing dormer and expressed the desire to see it removed and had no issue with the proposed skylights or their size. He noted that the existing dormer is not historic. As long as skylights are low-profile, Mr. Fisk felt that they would be a significant improvement to existing.

Dan Ricciarelli, Essex Street, also submitted an email in support of the dormer removal.

Chair Spang expressed support for the removal of the dormer but was cautious about the size of replacement skylights, namely their width which is nearly four feet of glass, which is a little atypical for skylights around the district. He preferred something more vertically proportioned. Mr. Martinez, Mr. Pattison, and Ms. English agreed. Mr. Martinez suggested a 30 x 46 skylight. Ms. Stuart clarified that all of the skylights would match in size.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve the application to remove the whole house fan dormer and replace it with a 30 9/16" x 46 1/4" sized Velux skylight and to replace two existing skylights with new skylights to match. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Martinez, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

360 Essex Street

Emily and Robert Stuart submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint color for side fence.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/9/21
- Photographs

Mr. and Mrs. Stuart noted that significant rehab had been done to the wood fence on the side of house and would they would like to paint to match the black wrought iron fence at the front of the property. Ms. English asked the material of the fence to which the applicants noted cedar. Benjamin Moore Matte Black is the intended paint color. Mr. Pattison asked if there is only one section of fence between the houses. Mr. Stuart responded that fence runs from the front of house towards back of building. Ms. English asked if any portion of the fencing on the property would remain white/natural or if all would be painted black. The applicants were undecided but noted that the fence would generally be painted black. Mr. Martinez clarified that there is no fence on the other side of the property. Mr. Martinez asked how tall the fence is, to which Ms. Stuart answered 31” tall.

Public comment:

Josiah Fisk noted that the property line goes back, jogs, and goes further back behind the garage located behind 358½ Essex Street. A lot of vegetation exists, and the back part of the fence is not very visible from public ways.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve the application to paint the 31” tall wooden fence along east side of property in Benjamin Moore Black. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Martinez, Pattison, Spang, were in favor and the motion so carried.

360 Essex Street

Emily and Robert Stuart submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for roof balustrade and hatch.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/15/21
- Photographs
- Drawings

Mr. and Ms. Stuart presented their application stating that an old photo in applicants’ possession shows a balustrade that used to be located on the roof and they would like to recreate this element. Building inspector Steve Cummings visited and gave guidance on height and structure of balustrade. Chair Spang asked if the roof is habitable space. The applicants noted that there is a ladder that goes up to a roof hatch to the space. The roof hatch is leaking, and the applicants would like to replace it with new hatch, which is not visible from the street. The space is about 13’ x 13’. Chair Spang noted that if the balustrade is meant to be occupied by people, it would need a handrail which would raise the height and close off any gaps to protect occupants/users of the space. Drawings were shown with new railing designs and details. Existing railing is three feet, Ms. Stuart noted; 36” is residential code. Building inspector said he would make the railing 42” if it was his house. Ms. English asked if the material would be wood, which the applicants affirmed. Post would match post built in the back, Ms. Stuart said, which match old photos obtained of the house. Mr. Pattison noted that the proposed drawing of posts did not match the posts shown in the old photograph. Chair Spang noted that modern code suggests that space between posts cannot be more than 4 inches wide for safety purposes. Mr. Pattison asked if the owners could not build this as an antique balustrade; Chair Spang noted that if this was not an occupied space but rather decoration, they would not have to comply with code. Mr. Pattison noted that the proposed design has a vertical “bowtie” appearance whereas the old one was more rounded. He expressed his preference to

recreate the old designs. The Stuarts stated that they planned to insert a piece of steel under the bottom rail with an angle iron fabricated to the exact length of the four sides, which was proposed by building inspector to give wood more stability. Chair Spang noted that more detail and molding are shown in the historic photo versus the proposed drawings. Chair Spang noted that the idea of replicating rail was a nice idea, but doing so would necessitate making posts, rail, and balusters more consistent with and closely matching to the old photos.

Mr. and Mrs. Stuart expressed desire to withdraw their application.

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve the applicants' request to withdraw the application without prejudice. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Martinez, Pattison, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

1A Cambridge Street

Elsbeth Slayter and Murat Recevick submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for architectural roof shingles.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/16/21
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher presented the application on behalf of the applicants who were not in attendance. She reported that the owners recently purchased the home and the roof is in very bad shape. They are proposing to use Certainteed Landmark shingles in "Pewterwood" to match the color of the existing 3-tab shingles. She noted that the Commission has approved this architectural shingle in the past, typically in Moire Black color. The Commission discussed the proposed color of the shingles and whether it had a uniform color or was variegated. Mr. Joyce noted that IKO Cambridge architectural shingles would be a viable alternative.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the application with options for either Certainteed Landmark Moire Black or IKO Cambridge Charcoal Grey, with the option for the applicant to return to discuss if neither product is available. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

39 Washington Square

Sarah and Adrian Herr submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an exterior vent.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/18/21
- Photographs
- Elevation drawing by Helen Sides Architect

Helen Sides was present on behalf of Adrian and Sarah Herr, owners.

The Herrs moved in at beginning of summer 2021; the property is a condo which the Herrs are extensively renovating; the kitchen will be moved from basement to main level. Ms. Sides' clients have nowhere to vent other than the brick façade on Winter St side. The proposal is to use a louver vent. House was shown from Washington Square; one image showed a little black square between windows as the location where a copper vent hood will be. A side door to the left is another condo owner's entrance. The clients considered bringing vent out through basement/side window, but too circuitous to vent properly. Picture of copper square vent was shown; three small vents open when turned on. The plan is to conceal within the brick as much as possible. Ms. Sides reaffirmed that the vent is for the stove/hood. Mr. Pattison asked if any photos are available to show the side wall where the shared entrance door is located. Attempting to run counter to the joist run would prohibit venting through the side wall, Ms. Sides noted. Cannot vent properly to the side wall; doing so may also present a fire hazard. Chair Spang noted that the issue is that the ceiling is tight to the joists, would need to cut into the joists to go out the side wall. Ms. Sides noted that a beautiful interior exists with plaster moldings which the applicants do not want to cut in to. Mr. Pattison asked about the size of the copper vent, which Ms. Sides noted is only about 8"-10" square with a rectangular duct run between the joists. Ms. Sides noted that the hood has not been purchased either until clients determine if proper ducting can be used. Mr. Herr noted that the kitchen vent is a Faber vent, and a reducer will be added; reducing down to 400 cubic feet per minute would reduce the size of the vent to 5 inches. The clients would be surprised if the vent would be more than 6". Chair Spang noted that the vent could be 10 1/2 by 10 1/2. Ms. Sides noted that the Herrs are very meticulous with their house project such as recent window restoration.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve the application for a new vent up to the 10 1/2" size. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

374 Essex Street

Emma and James Sullivan submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace gutters.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/20/21
- Photographs
- Product specs

James Sullivan was present. He noted that copper half-round gutters exist on the front of the main house and on portions of the ell. The rear gutters are pinholed and have been tarred, practically convex at this point. Flat-seamed copper roof is in back of the house. In front of house, gutters are newer, likely within 10-15 years, functional but undersized. Overflow occurs during heavy rains. The applicants explored options to replace half-rounds in the back and came across a product called Duragutter. The copper half round gutters cast the cornice of house into shadow, and Mr. Sullivan is seeking to replicate look of no gutters. The planned product would be a thick extruded aluminum gutter to appear as an integrated wood gutter, which would be appropriate for the house. Elevations were shown to demonstrate how Duragutter product would look; Mr. Sullivan noted that this would restore the cornice detail.

Chair Spang asked if roof is still slate. Mr. Sullivan replied that both main house and ell are in slate, and he has no intention to change. Chair Spang noted that the back ell is visible from the street from both sides. He asked for clarification on how the gutters would be applied/fitted onto the house. The Duragutter product will sit on top of the fascia board; slate has to go halfway through the width of the gutter. Mr. Martinez asked if the return would be replaced with more gutter. Mr. Sullivan answered in the affirmative, but not with more gutter; rather, wood would be used that gets mitered into the gutter at the corner so as to appear as a seamless run from gutter to return. The rake would die into the return.

Ms. Kelleher noted that fiberglass gutters have been approved in past but not the particular Duragutter product in question. The Cambridge Historical Commission has started approving composite materials which have greater capacity than wood gutters would have. Mr. Sullivan spoke to the history, architect/designer, and conception of Duragutter as well as its merits. Chair Spang expressed a desire to see a physical sample and expressed caution against altering the front of the house by removing the original cornice molding and adding a replicated version without clearer understanding how the process will come together. A large section detail showing how the proposal would look is needed. Several layers of moldings exist that would be ideal to replicate; Chair Spang was less concerned about the ells which are less visible. Mr. Martinez was confused as to where the planned gutter is supposed to land. Mr. Pattison similarly wanted a build-up model of what the gutter would look like. The Commission and applicant determined that a site visit would be necessary.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to continue the application to the meeting on October 19, 2021, and to conduct site visit on October 13 at 7:30am. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Vote on Commission Chair and Vice Chair

The Commission agreed to continue to the next meeting when more members are in attendance.

Other Business – Historic Guidelines Consultants

Ms. Kelleher reported that the consultant is still working on revised design guidelines, no update as of yet. Meeting was supposed to take place on October 20, but Ms. Kelleher requested that the Commission conduct a special meeting on October 26 at 7pm for the review. She would reach out to the consultants as well as other board members to confirm this date. Chair Spang also requested that the design consultants present the Commission with a draft to look over prior to the meeting.

Minutes

Ms. English made a motion to approve minutes for July 7, July 21, and August 4. Mr. Joyce seconded. Roll Call: English, Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Dan Graham, Historical Commission Clerk