

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
August 17, 2022

A regular meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, August 17, 2022, at 6:00 pm. **VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING.** Present were: Jamie Graham, Milo Martinez, Mark Meche, Mark Pattison, Larry Spang (Chair). Staff: Patti Kelleher. Not present: Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce.

Chair Chair Spang noted there was a bare quorum until other Commission members join.

Request for Letter of Support for Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application – Superior Court and County Commissioner’s Building

Raime Schneider and Adam Giordano of WinnDevelopment, and Steve Prestejohn of Cube 3 were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Schneider stated that while they’ve been working on the crescent lot, they completed a laser scan of the courthouses and a limited window and survey study, are working with potential partners to understand their programming needs, and are currently seeking historic tax credits. Mr. Prestejohn noted that in the RFP submission from 2020, they previously proposed a mixed-use residential and commercial, the commercial tenant options were open-ended, and there was a list of items to be preserved. Their design team has visited the building, commissioned a 3D scan for their working drawings, did drone survey of the building and roof, and now have a more refined scheme. The newly proposed uses include mixed-use commercial, and 25 residential studios, 11 proposed in the Superior Court building and 14 in the County Commissioners building.

Mr. Prestejohn stated that at the Basement level, 5 garden level units are proposed in the County Commissioners building and 3 in the Superior Court, as well as possible mechanical or Administrative, and a kitchen. At the Ground level, the entries and connector will be retained, new event space for commercial use, with 5 units in the County Commissioners building and 5 in the Superior Court. At Level 2, 5 residential units are proposed in the County Commissioners building as well as mixed-use commercial space at the Superior Court. In the attic at the Level 3, the attic, 3 more units are proposed. The goal was to retain original exterior characteristics and to infill boarded up openings. Ms. Schneider noted that the August 31st submission for tax credits, requires a letter of support from the Historical Commission.

Chair Spang requested a review of the parameters of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) which required that certain elements be retained to pursue historic tax credits, and state or federal tax credits. Ms. Schneider replied that DCAMM gave them a preservation list and the proposed plans are compliant with that list. Certain elements will be maintained, and they are listed on the drawings, and there has been no change to that list.

Chair Spang asked if design changes are proposed for the connecting corridor. Ms. Schneider replied that they are working through incorporating some security component to help mitigate against cross population from the event spaces to the residences. Some basement level windows are filled in and they will propose reopening those openings to possibly add more units.

Chair Spang asked if site changes were proposed, particularly to the historic retaining walls and steps on the site would. Ms. Schneider replied not currently, although they are still contemplating adding a rear patio space near the street. Mr. Giordano added that they will need to understand site accessibility but there is no intent to modify the retaining walls. Ms. Schneider noted that they will need to size equipment and provide access to it. Some does exist on site, but it does not need to be included on the submission. This is the first submission for Massachusetts Historic Tax Credits.

Mr. Meche asked if the plans had been updated to show the proposed units plans. Ms. Schneider replied that MHC has 3 submissions each year, where applicant can accrue credits and receive a list of questions as a response, and

this first application will start that process. MHC will want to know where doors and bathrooms are located, and their review focuses more on the interior elements.

Mr. Martinez arrived at this time

Ms. Graham left at this time.

Mr. Meche asked if the MOA was consistent with the RFP. Ms. Schneider replied yes, and the preservation list was included in the RFP. Ms. Kelleher agreed.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Kelleher noted that Mr. Martinez joined the meeting and Ms. Graham left the meeting, so the Commission is still at a bare quorum.

Chair Spang stated that in general, he is in support of the renovations, although they still a lot of work to be done. He suggested that staff craft a general letter of support on behalf of the Commission. Ms. Kelleher agreed to note that the stage of review was preliminary, the Commission will continue to work with the applicant, and she will also highlight elements to review later.

Chair Spang asked if the ramp between the buildings was existing. Mr. Meche replied that there is an existing ramp although he's unsure whether the ramp shown is existing or new. He added that he would be in favor of submitting a support letter.

VOTE: Meche made a motion to approve a letter of support for the renovation of the County Commissioners and Superior Court buildings. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

90 Federal Street– continuation

Francis Flaherty submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace roof

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/23/22
- Photographs

Francis Flaherty (Owner), Carrie Cabot (Owner), and Chris Sennott (Roofer) were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher noted that Mr. Meche attended a site visit at the property yesterday.

Chair Spang noted that a replacement of the slate roof that continues to leak is proposed, and it would match the back side of the house which was previously approved with asphalt. Mr. Meche noted that this is an example of the Commission switching from slate to another material, due to slate having a limited lifespan. The leak locations are hard to determined and could originate from the perimeter where deterioration was present. Ms. Flaherty noted that leak was an old problem that had been repaired.

Mr. Sennott stated that he replaced the rear roof and recemented the valleys, the interior leak damage follows the valley and settles at the gutter line. He proposed three options, 1) keep cementing the valley, which is a temporary fix, 2) remove the slate and reinstall new slate, which is too expensive for the homeowner, and 3) Replace the roof. The cement used is a roof flashing that is semi-viscous and will harden over time. It's like tar but meant for roof

repair applications and fills in the valley as an inexpensive short-term fix. The original valley flashing is below the cement which will pit, rust, and corrode, and 5-years ago they recoated an existing repair. The original repair included pulling slates from the gutter line, removing loose or broken slate within the field of the roof. To properly fix the roof all materials must be removed in the area and reinstalled, which could be as much as 80% of this roof, to install a proper overlap of the slate. The cost to completely remove and reinstall the slate entirety is very expensive and would include sidewalk permits and temporary obstructions creating a long-term overhead hazard.

Chair Spang remembered the review of this project 5-years prior with the discussion with the same contractor and the Commission being less reluctant to change the rear roof shingles due to the lack of visibility. The property owner at the time was also happy to continue to repair and retain the front slate roof shingles.

Mr. Meche noted that with a bare quorum, he sees the slate roof as worth saving but is not eager to say no.

Ms. Cabot stated that she is not in a financial position to keep fixing the roof and having water leaks into the home and asked for consideration for their efforts to save what the can that has since become a financial burden.

Mr. Martinez asked if the roof was original. Ms. Flaherty replied yes. Mr. Martinez noted that the life expectancy of slate is approximately 100 years and it's not prudent to keep asking a homeowner to repair what should be replaced. Mr. Sennott added that slate's life expectancy can be between 100-125 years, rot is the biggest concern, but also the wood boards below it and nails also deteriorate and allowing 10-pound shingles to fall off the roof. All of that needs to be removed if they aren't structurally secured to the home. The replacement would be a CertainTeed Belmont shingle which is a close match to the rear but it's a full solid shingle with the Highland Slate as an alternative. Mr. Martinez suggested the snow guards be reinstalled to help sell the look. Mr. Sennott replied that the existing snow guards are damaged, and they would need new ones.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Pattison agreed with Mr. Meche, noted that a slate roof repair can be staggered, and the valley replaced, without removing so much of the existing roof. Mr. Sennott stated his desire to make sure the roof is repaired correctly even if that could mean extending the repair. Chair Spang reluctantly agreed to replace the slate with asphalt rather than continue to force repair. Mr. Meche agreed with the limited lifespan of slate and noted that he would support replacement, but they shouldn't rule out looking lower for the source of the leak.

Mr. Martinez questioned making the snow guard reinstallation a requirement or suggested. Mr. Flaherty and Ms. Cabot raised concerns with the pricing. Mr. Meche suggested reinstalling the existing. Mr. Sennott noted that the snow guards are not original to the house. Chair Spang noted that the far-right side does not have an existing snow guard, it's on the left and in the middle only.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to approve to approve the application as submitted, with the addition of keeping the existing snow guard or finding a suitable replacement. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

90 Federal Street— continuation

Francis Flaherty submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace gutters

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/23/22
- Photographs

Francis Flaherty (Owner), Carey Cabot (Owner), and Chris Sennott (roofer) were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Sennott stated that the proposed K Style gutter would be seamless and rolled directly from a truck, so there is no manufacturer, but the shape would be identical to the existing gutters. The 3-inch round downspouts are in good condition and would remain. They are most likely white aluminum. Ms. Kelleher suggested that they may be PVC, and that they should be painted to match the body of the house.

Chair Spang noted that if new downspout were proposed, the Commission would need to review colors, materials, and locations. Mr. Sennott noted that the existing downspouts would remain at the corners, but they would clean up the transition from the gutter to the downspout, meaning the downspout would continue straight up and the outlet would move closer to the street, but the material would be aluminum not PVC. The downspout would still need to angle out away from the house to connect to the underside of the gutter and under the eave.

Mr. Martinez asked how they would terminate the new gutters if the existing wood gutters were to be replaced. Mr. Sennott replied with mitered corners and a return toward the house.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Martinez noted that the Commission usually has reservations about removing wood gutters, but he would support unifying the gutter system because the K style gutter was already installed on the rear roof.

VOTE: Pattison made a motion to approve replacing the gutters with K style with mitered ends, replacing the existing downspouts with aluminum sized to match existing be in a straight line and meet the cast iron drains at the sidewalk, all painted to match the trim. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

358 Essex Street U1- continuation

Josiah Fisk submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fence and change fence color

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/19/22
- Photographs

Josiah Fisk (owner) and Ryan Juckett (Owner of second unit) were present to discuss the project.

Chair Spang noted that the Commission has previously requested a site visit to determine the intersection of the proposed fence along the left side property line and access yard.

Mr. Meche stated that he and Mr. Pattison conducted a site visit. The proposed fence would extend across the court walkway in front of the door. The location is not critical, the posts will be behind the fence, it will conceal the gate, and as an in-swinging gate the hardware will be hidden. The applicant is proposing to do the same on the other side of the home where there is a board fence and a deteriorating existing corner post. Mr. Pattison mentioned speaking with Mr. Fisk regarding cutting off the right-side post, removing the pickets, placing the pickets behind the lowered fence, and starting over with the top rail installed on the edge. White cedar pickets would be used, the bottom rail is stable as is, the gate would hinge off the new corner post, and reversing the swing of the gate will define the area. They also spoke of extending the brick under the fence one-and-a-half course to stop erosion.

Mr. Fisk noted that the entire fence would be lowered when they install the 4-foot-high pickets and that is also why they would extend to the brick. He suggested also resetting the concrete pavers at the gate to align that area with the grade. The Commission noted that they do not have jurisdiction over paving.

Chair Spang noted that the new fence on the left will leave a gap between the retaining wall and the new fence above the retaining wall. The Commission agreed that the distance would be insignificant.

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

VOTE: Meche made a motion to approve constructing a new fence to match existing on the left side in terms of board spacing and layout, to close in both the left and right-side yard, painted to match the existing fence, and final details to be worked out with Commissioner Pattison. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

1 Pickering Street– continuation

Joseph Locke submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for building and fence restoration and renovation

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/13/22
- Photographs

Joseph Locke (Owner) and Leonardo Alves (Contractor) were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Meche stated that he and Mr. Pattison conducted a site visit to determine the repair of existing fence that was proposed, the proposed cap, and the removal of the window. There was a brick perimeter wall failure present on Broad Street, the cast in place obelisk in good shape. It is believed the failure was caused by water getting into the wall cavity making it unstable. The wall could be coated with plaster as a parge coat, and they could cut it down if necessary. On Pickering, there was a single wood cap, and they are proposing to rebuild it using the same masonry details, but it is unknown if the bricks will be salvaged and reinstalled. He suggested reinstalling the existing brick on the exterior and the new brick on the interior and to match the current profile. The proposed trim may be Azek, and he raised concerns with sky facing joints. On Warren Street, the applicant proposed to replace the gate as drawn, they could repair the obelisks, and they want to lower the top of the wall like the Pickering side with spindle detail to provide a view into the yard. Mr. Pattison noted that the obelisk posts need to be stabilized, could be repaired with epoxy, and steel used to secure them 1-foot below grade. The Warren Street wall is in good shape, and they are proposing to cut and cap the wall with fencing.

Mr. Alves noted that the perimeter fence at two old trees will be replaced, at Warren Street they can reinforce the obelisks with epoxy and steel bars, and it makes sense to retain what can be salvaged rather than demolish them. The Broad Street side has no cracks and will remain as is.

Chair Spang stated that the fence is designed around the use of the house and the fence at the location of the rear ell isn't as decorative as in the fence in the front and raised concerns with making the side fence as decorative being inconsistent with the house and noted that maintaining the granite obelisks does help mitigate that. Mr. Meche noted that the granite obelisk on the far right doesn't currently exist and suggested repairing the wall rather than cutting it and installing a gate to provide some transparency. Mr. Locke noted wanting to lower the wall for safety reasons and to see if anyone was hiding on the other side of the wall.

Mr. Pattison suggested retaining the granite obelisks to highlight that this is not the front entrance. He was also not completely in favor of cutting down the side wall height to add fencing above because someone could still conceal themselves behind a low wall. Mr. Meche noted two steps down in the wall are proposed. Mr. Alves replied that the architect may have wanted to replicate the front and made the side entrance into another main entrance. The

wall on Warren Street has no steps down, but on Pickering Street there are steps down with a white cap and spindles on either side of the gate. It will match the existing height at the corner from the other elevation. Mr. Meche noted that he would be okay with one step down not two, but he understands the desire for more safety. Mr. Pattison agreed.

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

Ms. Kelleher noted that paint colors and the infilling of a rear window are also proposed.

Chair Spang asked if a composite cap material painted to match was proposed. Mr. Alves replied yes, for longevity. Chair Spang asked if the front fence would be repaired or rebuilt. Mr. Alves replied that it would be restored to match existing, but it could be wood or composite for less maintenance. Mr. Meche suggested that if composite was proposed the fence should match the existing.

Chair Spang noted that if replacement top rail swoops were proposed to match the existing, these details were missing from the Warren Street elevation. Mr. Alves replied that the swoop could be replicated.

Chair Spang asked about the replicated gate details. Mr. Alves replied that he would replace the wood and reinstall the existing hardware and he would make the gate level and functional. Mr. Meche noted that the gate is plywood and asked if that would it be replaced. Mr. Alves replied that he would use wood. Mr. Meche noted that the Commission would want to see details for the cap, fence, etc. rather than a verbal description. Chair Spang noted that using solid panels defeats the purpose of opening the area for security purposes.

VOTE: Meche made a motion to continue to September 14, 2022. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Chair Spang stated that the rear window is visible from Warren Street and asked if it would be framed out or covered with clapboards. Mr. Meche noted that the window is walled over from the inside. Mr. Alves noted that he could install the frame or install a dummy window. Ms. Kelleher noted that the existing window is 6 over 1. Mr. Meche stated that there is flat board trim at the perimeter and head, it's not a prominent window but it is visible. Chair Spang stated that they want to keep the frame to show that there was once a window. Mr. Meche noted that the interior use is existing rather than the creation of a new window. Mr. Alves noted that the existing window may be leaking. Mr. Meche noted the existing 6–8-foot overhang. Mr. Alves stated that he could install clapboards at the opening and within the existing window frame.

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

VOTE: Meche made a motion to approve installation of clapboards at the window opening and retaining the window trim. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Locke stated that three possible body colors are proposed including: “Coastal Plain”, “Faded Flaxflower”, and “Windy Blue” by Sherwin Williams, and the painting would begin when it was weather appropriate. Ms. Kelleher noted that Colonial Revival homes would use light colors, but the colors look dark in the 1984 black and white inventory photos. Colors used would be greys, yellows, or light greens with white trim. Mr. Martinez stated that all colors could work for a house of this period. Chair Spang suggested a painting sample on the façade for Commission members to review. Mr. Locke noted that the house was originally yellow. Ms. Kelleher noted that the property file reference a Buff color only. Mr. Martinez suggested approving all 3 and have Commissioners review it on site but suggested the trim color match the trim color of the fence. Mr. Locke noted that the trim color will remain. Mr. Meche stated that the brick color is strong, and it will act as a paint color. Ms. Kelleher suggested paint swatches be installed prior to September 14, 2022, Commission meeting.

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

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to continue to the September 14, 2022 regular meeting. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

143 Derby Street– continuation

Stefano Basso of SV Design submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate house and construct new free-standing building

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/30/22
- Photographs
- Plans by SV Design

Stefano Basso of SV Design, Pavel Espinal and Peter Lutts (owners) were present to discuss the project.

Chair Spang stated that the design team believed the revised design would be more appropriately sized for the site. Mr. Basso stated that they revised the drawings in the last 2 weeks to address the Commissions concerns. Knowing more work is needed that could be resolved through an approval with conditions, allowing them to move beyond Schematic Design to Construction Documents. The property fronts Derby and Daniel Streets and is surrounded by 2-1/2 to 4 story buildings, most with clapboard siding. They have an existing parking lot on the corner and Sanborn maps show more density on the site previously. They would borrow massing from neighboring building but not replicate historic details.

Building A would have a carport addition with 4 parking space, add front entries with patios, and would replicate traditional details. At Building B, they would construct 3 townhouses with a garage door off the drive aisle and patios under Daniels Street to make the buildings engage with the street level.

The Commission comments received two weeks prior regarding Building A included: the addition needing to feel more detached and subordinate, the gable roof of existing building no longer ties into the addition, they are now using a different connection with different roof line and siding material. In response they have added a small roof deck on the top floor roof, the connector has vertical board and batten façade, and centered a 2nd floor window over the new rear entry to identify the different space. They also lightened the trim on the rear barn, rake and eave trim since the previous design had a heavy dormer. They broke up the dormer into three separate gable dormers with less of an overhang and would match the existing commercial trim details at the front entry.

At Building B, the townhouses include a continuous sill profile wrapping the bay with flat paneling. Along Daniel's Street, they created some hierarchy at the main roof cornice line and third-floor break line. The pedestrian experience now includes white board fencing, gates aligned with the entry door and downlighting, along with an opportunity to incorporate plantings at the street and between the yards. The balusters at the roof top deck were switched from more traditional to cable rail to make them less noticeable.

Mr. Basso stated that they currently only have 3D renderings to show and no elevations. Chair Spang suggested that some of the proportions seem off in the renderings, which could be clarified through elevations. There is an existing ell off the right side of the original building and this house has a lower angle to the roof vs. the higher angle at the new rear barn which has a higher angle, so they would need elevations to determine how the two roofs would meet.

Mr. Martinez raised concerned with Building B's third floor having shingles like a mansard roof. Mr. Basso replied that the upper façade was shingled to break up the height of the three-story building. They didn't think a mansard roof was the right detail for this neighborhood or that a single skirt board detail would be sufficient, a standing

seam metal roof at the third-floor line, or a flared detail would be appropriate given the context of the neighborhood. He didn't want the design statements made to be loud. Mr. Martinez noted that it looks like a triple decker trying to be a mansard but it's coming off very flat but should be one or the other and commit to that. Chair Spang agreed, noted that they were trying too hard to hide the three-story height, but there are taller buildings in the surrounding area. Mr. Basso suggested a color change rather than a material change. Mr. Meche agreed and raised concerns with the corner rather than the street edge. The yellow triple decker has a vacant lot and the proposed doesn't seem like a corner building, since the southernmost unit on Derby Street could have no bays and be more like the building across Daniels Street to make the corner stronger, rather than repeating the same trapezoid treatment. A new two-story ell is proposed with a wider footprint which will be visually challenging, but as a new element it should be different from the historical building.

Chair Spang noted that the gable on the original building facing Derby Street is one pitch, the gable dormer on the new barn facing Derby Street is a new pitch, and the side gable of the old building is also different. He suggested using one shed dormer at the rear to not compete with the main structure. Mr. Basso noted that the old plot plan indicated an earlier addition, and the original pitch was 8 and the new side pitch is 7.

Chair Spang stated that the new recessed door has no canopy, but the new Derby Street door has a small coverage. He suggested doing something interesting at the corner since other buildings front Derby Street, and the proposed front Daniels Street. Mr. Meche suggested adjusting the corner unit footprint to make it different. Mr. Basso replied that they've received zoning approval for the current footprint and due to clearances for the drive aisle they include no overhangs. They wanted to bring the building away from Daniels Street by approximately 5-feet but wanted some undulation along the façade to provide some relief. They don't have space to shift the bay to the corner and they are matching the setbacks from the neighboring building. Chair Spang stated that he has fewer concerns with the Daniels Street façade and suggested applying a different end cap to differentiate the corner unit. Mr. Basso suggested a different siding, clapboard, or a different window scheme. Chair Spang agreed since most triple decker's have a detailed frontage and flat side elevations. Mr. Meche suggested the corner building become larger to in-fill the setback area. Mr. Basso replied that they have 15-feet on one side and 10-feet at the front and suggested adding a break like a rowhouse.

Public Comment:

One member of the audience remained muted and was unable to provide comment.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Spang suggested a continuation to review elevations. Mr. Lutts noted that they would return for final design review and suggested the façade changes and details be reviewed at a future meeting. Mr. Martinez suggested an approval of massing.

VOTE: Meche made a motion to continue to the September 14, 2022 regular meeting. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

394 Essex Street

Aaron Samuel Ross submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace siding and paint colors (amended application)

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/11/22
- Photographs

Aaron Samuel Ross (Owner) and Ross Rodrigues (Contractor) were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that they want to replace the existing siding on the 4-unit building, which was constructed in the 1980s, with Hardie fiber cement board. It currently has MDF siding that is deteriorating, particularly on the upper portion of the house. They would install a similar profile with a modern material for longevity and other Historical Commissions have approved such a product. The proposed colors are “Evening Blue” or “Iron Gray” with a 6 ¼” reveal, installed with the smooth façade to the weather, with white Hardi trim. They considered PVC but it may not be acceptable given its vinyl replacement windows and aluminums sliding doors. They want to match the rest of the neighborhood, but this is not a historical home.

Mr. Meche requested the Hardie line being proposed. Mr. Rodriguez replied standard, HTZ 10. Mr. Meche noted that the proposed is close to an in-kind substitution and asked if the corners would have pre-formed mitered caps. Mr. Rodriguez replied that the Hardie siding would be installed to the corners to preserve the 1980’s styling unless a corner board was requested to match the look of the neighborhood. Mr. Meche, Mr. Martinez, and Mr. Pattison noted their preference for the saw cut edge with lapped corners.

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

VOTE: Meche made a motion to approve Hardie Board in lieu of simulated clapboards to closely match existing details, in either Evening Blue or Iron Gray. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Rodriguez noted that some trim details were replaced with a picture frame style, or they could do create something new and replicating a sill nose in a new material, however, multiple details exist due to numerous repairs over the years. Mr. Meche noted that he had no concern with using Hardi Trim at the windows. Mr. Pattison noted his preference for adding windowsills rather than picture frame trim. Mr. Rodriguez noted that there are sills on the front face, but the left side is what faces Essex Street. Hardie does not make a sill nose, but it could be recreated using PVC, and white PVC may not be a paintable surface. Chair Spang noted that Azek will look less like plastic.

Meche amended the motion to include matching the windowsill profile, material substitutions are acceptable with window and door trims, and the cellular PVC to be painted. Seconded by: Martinez. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

16 Bentley Street

Eda Matchak submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for building repairs and paint colors

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/28/22
- Photographs

Eda Matchak was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Matchak stated that they are two 3-unit buildings in their condominium association, the other being 134 Essex Street, which was repainted 2-years ago. This area can be seen from Derby Street; however, the house wasn’t painted appropriate historic colors and the proposed colors are more complimentary to the neighboring buildings. The proposed colors come from the historic paint color line by Benjamin Moore. The body would be “Ansonia Peach”, the sashes and trim “Navajo White”, the three entry doors “Inkwell Black” to match the adjacent building in their condominium association, the foundation would be “Cement Gray”. Any repairs to the rotted wood trim and clapboard on the building’s exterior would be in-kind repair.

Mr. Martinez raised concerns with black color proposed on the stair risers and noted that typically the risers are light, and treads are dark. Ms. Matchak had no concerns with changing the tread color to match the dark color of the door and suggested using “White Dove” for the riser color, which was used at the neighboring building.

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

Mr. Pattison requested the date of house. Ms. Kelleher replied that the home is listed as a Victorian style from 1900 on the inventory form.

The Commission agreed to the use of “White Dove” as the riser color to match the neighboring building, which is appropriate with the age of the house.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to approve as submitted with the riser color to be White Dove. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

23 Winter Street

Michael and Wendy Gunning submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace gutters

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/28/22
- Photographs

Michael Gunning was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Gunning proposed installing new Fiberglass gutters, retaining existing downspouts at either end, and painting the new gutter to match the existing home color. He noted that the current gutters are wood and may be 20 years old. New gutter would only be applied at the rear of the home as a test for a possible installation on the front.

Mr. Meche noted that Fiberglass comes in different shapes and asked if the flat bottom is proposed. Mr. Gunning replied yes, the 5-inch K style gutter is proposed and the existing double fascia they have to remain or it will be replaced in kind, the soffit detail will also remain.

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

VOTE: Meche made a motion to approve as submitted. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

15 Chestnut Street

Peter Gordon and Karen Hayes submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fence

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/01/22
- Photographs

Peter Gordon was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Gordon stated that the section of proposed replacement fence is in the rear yard, it is hard to see from Chestnut Street but more visible from Cambridge Street. The current fence is heavily weathered and surrounded by vegetation and trees, the proposed fence is similar to the existing north and south fence, it would be a standard

board fence, 5-feet high with two horizontal boards. The east and west fence is custom and at a not a standard height (approx. 4-feet 8-inches) and the entirety of the fence would match.

Ms. Kelleher stated that in 2021 the Commission approved a fence at the adjacent property on Broad Street. Mr. Gordon added that another neighboring fence was also approved, the top of the new fence would be approximately 1-foot lower because the neighboring fence is on top of a retaining wall and it currently doesn't align either.

Mr. Meche asked if each fence panel will be stepped and noted that there is a slight rise in the elevation at the neighboring yard, but the proposed would be an improvement. Mr. Gordon replied no, the fence would be level and noted that the current side yard fence has exposed posts are approximately 6-feet apart, the posts stick up 2-3-inches above the top of the fence and each post sits between each panel, making them visible and not hidden. The fence is more than 60 feet away from Chestnut Street and the new fence would be left natural to weather.

The Commission discussed the recently approved neighboring board fence seen from Chestnut Street that was not constructed as approved and would require modification.

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

Mr. Martinez stated that the Commission would want the fence to be built like 14 Broad Street should have been built, so the fence posts are not exposed to the abutters, the posts should face his property and not out. Mr. Meche noted that this would the replacement of the fence would then be in-kind, despite there being no post caps. Ms. Kelleher noted that the proposed fence has exposed posts centered on the posts.

The Commission to conduct a site visit the upcoming weekend.

VOTE: Pattison made a motion to continue to the September 14, 2022 regular meeting. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

11 Hathorne Street

Michael Murray submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for architectural roof shingles

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/1/22
- Photographs

Michael Murray was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Murray requested to replace the existing asphalt shingles with CertainTeed Landmark. Ms. Kelleher noted that the product was approved by the Commission for the home next door. Mr. Murray added that he would replace the bay roofs and entry door hood and noted that architectural shingles were used previously but there are current leaks, so repairs are required.

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

VOTE: Meche made a motion to approve as submitted. Martinez seconded the motion.

Mr. Martinez noted that rubber is used over the door hood and the door hood at 9 Hathorne Street is shingled. Mr. Meche asked if the rubber would be replaced in-kind. Mr. Murray noted the rubber would be replaced with asphalt shingles.

Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

43 Chestnut Street

43 Chestnut Street LLC submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fence sections and gate

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/28/22
- Photographs

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

VOTE: Meche made a motion to continue to the September 14, 2022 regular meeting. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

25 Warren Street

Megan Millar and Joel Nentwich submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace porch with new addition

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/27/22
- Photographs
- Plans by Helen Sides Architect

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant requested a continuation.

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to continue to the September 14, 2022 regular meeting. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

57 Warren Street Unit 2 Unit 1 (Incorrect unit number was advertised)

Jessica Santos submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for mini-split system

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/2/22
- Photographs

Ms. Santos was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Santos stated that she would like to convert the oil tank system to a more efficient heat pump, for her first-floor unit in the three-unit building. Others have already converted their systems. She proposed 1 heat pump on the right side of the house with 3 mini-splits at the rear, one on the Warren Street side and one between her and 55 Warren Street. The two existing units aren't visible and the third for unit is minimally visible.

Chair Spang noted the existing conduit at the 3rd floor unit is visible at the front elevation. Ms. Santos replied that the current unit owners are not the owners that made that change. Chair Spang suggested a site visit to also determine possible screening options. Ms. Santos noted the fence that encloses the opposite side yard where the rear units are not visible. She suggested one vent be piped next to an existing downspout, and another would go across and the bottom edge and up, next to an existing line, and the third would be at the rear and not visible to the street. The proposed configuration is for 1 exterior unit with 3 lines. Chair Spang stated that the Commission would want to rationalize the current configuration. The Commission agreed to a site visit the upcoming weekend.

Public Comment:

Greg Niemann spoke in favor of installing a new system behind the bushes where the current ones aren't visible.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Martinez suggested going through the wall and into the basement so the lines travel through the house, rather than around the exterior.

VOTE: Meche made a motion to continue to the September 14, 2022 regular meeting. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

9 Hathorne Street

Greg Davis submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for building modifications (after the fact)

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant was present earlier in the meeting but has since left the meeting. She noted that 2 windows were enclosed at the interior, and they were covered over at the exterior.

Chair Spangs suggested installing the window trim where the windows were removed, removing it as completed, or reinstalling the windows and the applicant would need to determine what to do at the interior. The applicant knew he needed approval to remove windows and to keep some sense of the rhythm of the windows on the exterior. He noted that when he visited the site there was a piece of plywood at the two openings, but he understood that to mean the new windows would soon be installed. Mr. Meche suggested asking the applicant to return for review. Mr. Martinez noted that installing the window trim and sills should be sufficient. Chair Spang stated that the removal of the trim stops the rhythm of the façade. The Commission discussed how violations could block the sale of a property.

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

VOTE: Martinez made a motion to approve installing a sill and trim and in-filling it with clapboards to match the neighboring windows. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Pattison, Martinez, and Chair Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business:

- a. Meeting Minutes: None
- b. Violations: None
- c. Correspondence: None
- d. Other:

Ms. Kelleher stated that two applications were submitted that could be reviewed under the minor change category. The first involved adding bathroom vents on a house on Lafayette Street, one above a window and another at the roof. The vents are for the interior rooms and can't be moved, but they would be painted to match. Chair Spang noted that if Ms. Kelleher received no response from the abutters notifications there would be an administrative approval. Mr. Martinez suggested a HideAVent that lays flat when closed and would abut the façade material. Ms. Kelleher replied that the shakes are large and would not hide the vent. The Commission agreed to process the application as a minor change.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the second application is for a small roof vent proposed at a rear roof that most likely would not be visible. Mr. Martinez requested the applicant clarify the exact location. The Commission agreed to process the application as a minor change.

Ms. Kelleher requested any new information on the historical preservation experience to add to the Commission members training.

Chair Spang stated that Camp Naumkeag opposers are still requesting information.

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner