

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
September 15, 2021

A special meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, September 15, 2021, at 6:00 pm. **VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING.** Present were: Milo Martinez, Mark Meche, Vijay Joyce, Stacey Norkun, Mark Pattison, and Larry Spang (Chair) and Patti Kelleher (staff). Not present: Reed Cutting, Rebecca English

Update on Pioneer Village relocation project

Elizabeth Peterson (Exec. Dir of Pioneer Village and Witch House), Margaret Wood (Consulting Project Manager), Trish O'Brien (Salem Park and Recreation), and Virginia Adams (Historic Preservation Consultant) were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Wood stated that they last presented in June and sent along a memo summarizing what was last presented and additional information requested. They originally wanted to demolish the Camp Naumkeag buildings, which are in poor condition and weren't meant to be permanent, and to make a new home for Pioneer Village along with dialog for the native American tribe.

Members of the design team, some Historic Salem Commission members, HSI board members, and members of the public attended the site visit earlier in the summer. Residents spoke about the limited parking, need for bus drop-off and parking, and the business of the site. Requests were made for an updated site plan locating mature trees, leaving undeveloped space for the wildlife, and a revised overlay site plan showing existing vs. new building locations. They want to create paths without the price being exorbitant and the agreement was that this was a good use for the site.

The overlay site plan will help them determine if any other buildings can be reused, and there is some interest in using one existing building as a maintenance shed. The overlay plan will include proposed accessible paths, which will be a challenge on the site. The inventory forms from 1988 were updated by PAL with historic photos, expanded history of Camp Naumkeag including it's early development and how it was valued over time.

Chair Spang asked if Commission approval would be required. Ms. Wood replied that they are seeking only comments and feedback at this time. If they were to use federal or state funds, she is unsure if they should consult MHC. She didn't anticipate using those funds in Phase I, but that could change since they are only in the Conceptual Design phase. Funding for the Native American interpretation may be available from the federal government.

Chair Spang stated that the original buildings have been rebuilt and he is unsure if they've requested voluntary submission to MHC. He added that the building are in tough shape and would need to be re-created or reconstructed. The building layout on site is interesting because they frame the space rather than framing an object, in this case the new visitor center. He suggested the location of the structures reflect back to some of the prior history of the camp site rather than an entirely new layout oriented around the visitor center. Ms. Wood replied that the site was used as a tuberculosis camp and has an interesting history, although the site arrangement and the core concept wasn't clear. The proposed locations have greenspace and placing the Pioneer Village buildings elsewhere on the site will allow them to determine a dialog given by the opportunity the site provides.

Mr. Meche stated that Chapter 91 requirements may be triggered in addition to possible Federal or State funds. The standard to apply for the new maintenance shed would be adaptive reuse, and he asked if historical significance was determined. Ms. Adams replied that the camp structures have significance for their association as Salem's first camp for children suffering from tuberculosis and for its continued use for health-oriented summer programming for children into the 21st century. The historic photos have allowed them to trace the use of the camp. In 1916 there were open-air pavilions, enclosed buildings, and tent. In 1920, the tents are gone, all buildings are enclosed, men and women had their own cottages, and a central lodge had a porch. Many of those structures no longer exist

and those that remain were modified. Ms. Wood noted the interesting connection and story between the colonial settlers and Native Americans, and how communicable diseases impacted their culture after the settlers arrived.

Chair Spang asked about connections to Fort Lee as discussed at the site visit. Ms. Wood replied that it was her suggestion to show them all in one location and introduce Fort Lee. However, at this time they need to keep the process moving forward. They are convinced of the sites history but not about keeping the current set of buildings because keeping them all doesn't fit well on the site.

Mr. Martinez stated that the 1916 photo shows the importance of open space at the site including the open pavilion and tying it back to the use of the land. The event space for use in multiple weather conditions is good.

Public Comment:

Chris Meen, 50 Osgood Street. Asked if a new playground will be created at The Willows to replace the one being removed. Ms. Wood replied that it hasn't been discussed.

Christopher Patzke, 222 Lafayette Street. Landscape Architect and former Curator of Landscapes at Historic New England. He expressed serious concerns with the proposal to relocate Pioneer Village onto the Camp Naumkeag site. He noted that there are no landscape architects or landscape historians on the Historic Commission or project design team, and he urged the design team to reach out to professionals with landscape preservation knowledge such as Charles Birnbaum from The Cultural Landscape Foundation, Bob Page of The Center of Landscape Preservation, leadership at Historic New England, and other peers or colleagues. He encouraged the Commission to request Cultural Landscape Reports of both site, which have more rigor and analysis than inventory forms. He spoke with several local politicians and city employees that noted major issues with Pioneer Village including climate change impacts from sea level rise and accessibility of the site to visitors. Both sites are at risk, and he believes that allowing the destruction of two intact cultural landscapes would violate the Secretary of the Interior Standards and Guidelines for the treatment of historic properties. The money could be better spent protecting Camp Naumkeag. The existing Camp site could be made accessible rather than developing a new site. Both sites are similarly visible and have residential adjacencies that provide community policing. He sees a massive failure in regard to the treatment of Pioneer Village by the City, despite the refurbishment of Forest River Park whose plan completely ignored the abutting Pioneer Village in the master plan, which he finds beyond comprehension. The overall goal seems to be to allow the YMCA to construct a campground which means the destruction of the Pioneer Village cultural landscape as well as Camp Naumkeag, which is not a valid reason. Intension should be considered when evaluating the merit of this endeavor. Bob Page believes that both sites would be accepted on the National Register, which would ensure their protection on a state and federal level. By using only City funds, state and federal oversight can be avoided, which would ensure that the current best practices are being used to protect both landscapes. If Salem does not properly study and protect its historic resources, according to current practices, state and federal authorities are sure to question the merit of providing future funds. He strongly urged the Commission to reject the plans to destroy and relocate both sites, in his option this is not what proper stewardship resources looks like and history will not judge the destruction of these resources in a positive light. This appears to be the "Disneyfication" of history and creating a theme park environment. It would do Salem a huge disservice to destroy historic landscapes that currently have integrity and he hopes the Commission gives this serious thought.

Ms. Wood replied that Stimson Studio is the landscape architect that generated the proposed plan for the camp, and they do have a history of working with cultural landscapes.

Emily Udy, Historic Salem, Inc. and resident of 8 Buffum Street. Historic Salem, Inc. provided a comment letter, noted that the evaluation of reuse of the buildings could be further examined and the pavilion placed in a location that doesn't interrupt the proposed pathways. There is a strong desire to embrace using the history on the site, even though the existing buildings are in the way of what they would like to see on site. The camp has an equal or greater historical value, and it should be treated appropriately. If that is embraced, it could enhance the design rather than just trying to work around it.

Mr. Meche noted that although not in a historic district, it's a City owned historic resource. He asked what guides the Commission. Chair Spang replied that they are limited to demo delay review since they don't have jurisdiction over landscapes. Ms. Kelleher agreed and noted that the Commission is an advocate for historic resources and should provide feedback.

Cathy Harper, 3 Allen Street. Asked what makes the camp site appropriate in terms of authenticity, and the site that the settlers would have chosen to build these structures on. Ms. Wood replied that the orientation is different, but Elizabeth Peterson was seeking a waterfront site to relocate Pioneer Village that is not at risk of flooding like the current site. Also, Pioneer Village is not easy to find, and they want it to be more accessible and near other historic resources. Ms. Peterson added that this came about during the Canal Street construction project when the YMCA wanted to make permanent buildings at this area. They had a conversation about whether the function would be better suited in each other's location. Ms. Harper asked why the city isn't seeking money from any other sources because that money could have gone towards signage and advertising for Pioneer Village, which was highly used at one time. She also asked why the trolley line couldn't be extended to this location. The Willows isn't as sheltered, its built-on ledge, there is no fresh water source within walking distance or practical carrying distance. It seems as if this will become a theme park type development. She didn't know that the camp was a tuberculosis camp and that's an important point to make. Relocating a 100-year-old reenactment site that Salem promised to care for and placing it on a site with equal historical value doesn't make sense. Ms. Peterson replied that when they first conceived of this idea, they met with every preservation organization in the city to determine if there were concerns about the proposal but everyone thought it was a good idea. There is no intention to make this theme park like.

Ms. Norkun requested more info on the entire plot of plan the village currently sits on and asked if the area would be sub-divided and sold as waterfront property. Ms. Wood replied that this is parkland, as is the land at the camp, so selling off property is not part of the discussion. Ms. Norkun requested the cost and amount of taxpayer dollars being used. Ms. Wood replied that the \$3M Phase I funds are coming from the Witch House funds and Signature Parks Program and they hope the income will help fund the project. There has been no use of taxpayer funds with this project.

Chair Spang encouraged a discussion with MHC and an opportunity for them to provide input. Preserving/repurposing the camp buildings could be more thoroughly studied beyond showing them on a site plan, even though it would involve major reconstruction. He thanked them for their efforts to date.

Ms. Norkun left the meeting at this time.

18 Chestnut Street- continuation

Dorothy Kelleher submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace fence

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/3/21
- Photographs

Victoria Kelleher and architect Richard Griffin were present to discuss the project.

Chair Spang noted the Commission's visit to the site. Ms. Kelleher stated that Mr. Griffin created the design for a Cedar fence, with bi-fold doors, 8-feet long opening (two 4-foot-long panels), hinged, on rollers to allow it to open to allow a vehicle to enter the property. Standard fence sections would be placed on either side.

Chair Spang acknowledged the clever idea and asked if they will they be able to prevent the two sections from folding in on themselves in a strong wind, and if less modern wheels could be utilized. Ms. P. Kelleher agreed that the proposed wheels look industrial but other wheels can be used.

Mr. Pattison stated that he is pleased with the concealed posts and locks but is concerned with whether it's appropriate, how the neighbors would react to it, and whether the commission have the authority to approve it.

Chair Spang replied that they have jurisdiction over the fence but paving and landscaping are not within their jurisdiction. The neighbors were concerned with it being used as a 2-car driveway, however; the applicant said it would only be used during snowstorms, and how that gets managed is an issue because the next owner could want to park their all the time. Ms. P. Kelleher noted that the Commission has purview over the fence and on-site parking has come up before, and they've worked with property owners to retain as much of the fence as possible while acknowledging the lack of street parking. Chair Spang noted that he doesn't believe they can limit the fence operation. Ms. V. Kelleher added that she spoke to neighbors, many are supportive, and she can request letters from them. She could use what exists as a two-car driveway but that's not her intent, she wants a garden and patio area for her mother.

Mr. Meche stated that most local regulations want more parking space with limitation, and they can't use 1 vs. 2 parking spaces for their criteria. He recommended they vote on the design itself.

Mr. Joyce agreed with Mr. Pattison's fence post suggestions since it will be obvious that something is occurring on the opposite side of the fence and the proposed design is an elegant solution for concealing the bi-fold elements. Mr. Griffin noted that they would use 4-foot deep sonotubes with pipe sleeves for the cane bolts to secure all four points to prevent the bi-folds from buckling and there would be one at each hinge and where the two sections meet.

Mr. Martinez asked if the two end fence pickets will abut one another. Mr. Griffin replied that the pickets will be off-set approximately 6-8-inches apart. Chair Spang asked if there will be a space at the hinges to match the xxx. Mr. Meche noted that the proposed design closely resembles the current fence.

Public Comment:

Lou Sirianni, 6 Botts Court. Asked the Commission to always consider precedent and context. The applicant wanted to pull in one car between the house and the fence to allow a handicapped accessible van onto the property and a 12-foot-wide opening will accommodate that. Botts Court properties have mostly one parking space and another has tandem parking for two vehicles. He asked that they consider allowing a 12-foot wide opening.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Victoria Kelleher stated that the fence didn't exist before 1970, the site was side open. Mr. Sirianni has 5 parking spaces including a 2-car garage, one space that was once behind a gate that may be wider than 12-feet that can be used for tandem parking, as well as a parking a vehicle in front of his front door, so not everyone has 1 parking space. Chair Spang noted that precedent means having dealt with similar request in the past. Mr. Sirianni replied that 4 vehicles on Botts Court are in single spaces, there is tandem across the street from the applicant, but his property is the largest lot on the street. The characterization is inappropriate characterization, and he wants the result to look like it belongs.

Chair Spang stated that the only new requests are to conceal the 4 posts behind the pickets and a revised wheel selection. Mr. Martinez noted that the applicant has made a lot of effort to make the proposed fence and gate appropriate.

Mr. Griffin presented three additional fence and gate options, a version without posts, a version with posts at either side of the fence, and a version with posts at either end of the bi-fold gate, pedestrian gate, and at each end gate. Mr. Pattison preferred the fence without any posts. Mr. Griffin noted the existing post at the far left connected to the neighbor's fence, so one post to the far left would be visible in the no-post option. Mr. Meche noted that the version with no posts is the most similar. Mr. Martinez agreed.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to accept a 16-foot-wide bi-fold fence and 3-foot-wide pedestrian fence, with all post to be concealed behind the fence, only 1 corner post at the far left at the neighbors abutting fence, the applicant to provide plans of this version, final hardware selection to be approved by members of the Commission,

and the fence color to match the existing trim color of the house. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

262 Lafayette Street, Unit 2– continuation

Justine Kolsky submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/23/21
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant requested to withdrawal the application.

VOTE: Mr. Pattinson made a motion to approve the request to withdrawal without prejudice. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

33 Carlton Street, Unit 3- continuation

John Osborne submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for HVAC mini-split system

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/6/21
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant is continuing to work with the building's owners and has requested to withdraw the application at this time

Mr. Meche left the meeting at this time.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve the request to withdrawal without prejudice. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

171 Federal Street - continuation

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/2/21
- Photographs

Mr. Meche returned to the meeting at this time.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the Window Woman is giving providing a quote to the applicant and the applicant has requested a continuance.

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

3 Lynn Street

William Hoysradt and Jeffrey Carlton submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for architectural roof shingles

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/31/21
- Photographs

Jeffrey Carlton was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Carlton stated that the copper gutters were approved in an application submitted by the previous owners, and it expires in April. They purchased the home in July and will work with the previous roofer, J.B. Kidney. A darker architectural shingle was approved for the rear addition, and they want to use that same shingle on the main structure of the home. They estimated that the rear roof was redone within the past 5-years, and it is not visible from the street. Ms. Kelleher stated that the same CertainTeed Landmark shingles have been approved at other properties in several color options.

Mr. Martinez asked what exists on the roof. Mr. Carlton replied a light grey 3-tab shingle. Mr. Joyce noted that the black on black should be non-conspicuous, the street angles down towards the river and the lower vantage point could reduce its visibility. Mr. Pattison added that the lower roof pitch will also makes it less visible.

Public comment:

Joyce Kenny. Believes these shingles were not approved although another house had these shingles, and she is not in favor of the proposed shingles since the existing are 3-tab.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the approval of architectural vs. 3-tab shingles has been a struggle for the Commission in the past. The Commission did find that if there is a uniform color it diminishes their 3-D appearance as well as the appearance of the angle cut. Mr. Martinez noted that he had no problem with this solution.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve the CertainTeed Landmark shingle in the color Moire Black and to extend the existing certificate for gutters for a year. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Meche, Spang, were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the certificate will now expire in March 2022.

123 Federal Street

Paige Dunsmore submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a fence gate

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/19/21
- Photographs

Paige Dunsmore and Cali Fidopiastis were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Dunsmore stated that they are finishing the fence at the house, the gate will be straight across and will match the style of the fence. There is a metal hole in the driveway used to secure the previous fence that will be reused. Ms. Kelleher noted that this will replicate the gate that was removed.

Chair Spang asked if the post and picket size will be matched. Ms. Dunsmore noted that there will be two gates that close in the middle, one swings towards the house and the other to the lawn. They meet in the middle and the cane bolts will insert into the hole of the driveway. Mr. Pattison asked if there will be diagonal bracing. Ms. Dunsmore replied yes, at the back side of the gate. Chair Spang noted that the diagonal bracing will be visible from the front. Mr. Pattison noted the farm-like look to the bracing and asked if Patriot Fence would fabricate bracing with metal bracing that was not visible through the fence. Chair Spang noted that the center post would need to touch the ground and suggested the matter be continued to finalize details. Mr. Meche stated that he is okay with diagonals and recommended approval with assistance by a Commission member with finalizing the details.

Public comment:

Joyce Kenney. Heavy snowstorms would compromise the gates' ability to open and close because the snow will need to be cleared so the gate can operate. Chair Spang agreed.

Christopher Patzke, 222 Lafayette Street. The diagonal bracing is a structural member, period appropriate, and it's the correct way to build the gate for a house of this era.

Ziggy Hartfelder, Monroe Street. Thanked the applicants for their hard work on the gate, the design looks wonderful, and she hopes the Commission helps move this forward quickly.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to approve an approx. 12-foot gate, pair of gates, to match the fence design, with black iron hardware, subject to hardware and miscellaneous details such as diagonal bracing, to be approved by Mr. Pattison and Mr. Martinez. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Meche, Spang, were in favor and the motion so carried.

122 Derby Street

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/20/21
- Photographs

Robert Burkinshaw and Jacqueline Burkinshaw (daughter) were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Burkinshaw stated that the clapboard shed addition was not structurally supported. The Building Inspector didn't see any historical value in it, was unsure of its previous use, and since it was only being held up by four corner posts, and the roof was 6-inches thick of tar and rock, he was concerned that it could cave in so he recommended immediate demolition. They are trying to get a foundation put in and to recreate the shed without the chimney. Chair Spang noted that the Building Inspector has jurisdiction to order a demolition, and he requested that documentation from the Inspector be submitted for the record. Ms. Kelleher corroborated the Inspector's statement and stated that she would request the document.

Chair Spang asked if the applicant would rebuild on the same footprint to match with clapboards down to the ground. Mr. Burkinshaw replied yes. Mr. Meche asked if plans were submitted. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Inspector will not require plans. Mr. Meche suggested requesting plans.

Chair Spang asked for the proposed use of the shed. Mr. Burkinshaw replied storage. Mr. Martinez suggested constructing a structure with more intention rather than an exact replication. Mr. Meche asked if any details were salvaged, otherwise they won't be an exact match. Mr. Burkinshaw replied that no details were salvaged. Mr. Meche noted that the new structure would need to be code compliant.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the Commission had previously approved all new first floor windows on the main building. Mr. Burkinshaw noted that the new windows were delivered.

Chair Spang agreed with Mr. Meche regarding reviewing drawings and details of what is intended. Chair Spang noted that returning the structure to what previously existed is a request for a Certificate of Non-Applicability rather than a Certificate of Appropriateness in the eyes of the Building Inspector. Mr. Martinez reiterated his suggestion for a new addition that was better and questioned recreating the chimney. Chair Spang, Mr. Meche, and Mr.

Martinez suggested adding a gable roof. Chair Spang noted that a change in roof pitch will keep water from being deposited onto the neighboring property which isn't permitted, it would help with waterproofing, and it could create more of a courtyard area. Mr. Burkinshaw agreed with improving the look of the shed to give it more character. Ms. Kelleher suggested a continuance to the October 6th meeting so plans could be generated.

Public comment:

Joyce Kenney. Requested the name of the Building Inspector that made the determination. Ms. Burkinshaw replied Steve Cummings.

Kenmore Commass, abutter. In favor of making improvements and seeing this project move forward. The current roof pitch directs water to the courtyard where flooding is already an issue on both of their properties. He encouraged runoff to be directed toward the street or to the right of the shed.

Chair Spang asked if the shed had gutters or downspouts. Mr. Burkinshaw replied no. Chair Spang suggested gutters and offset gables to shed water away from the neighboring property.

Mr. Meche asked if the existing rooftop split system approved. Mr. Burkinshaw replied that it was replaced with the same system.

Mr. Martinez encouraged a discussion on chimney removal since chimney's are part of the historic fabric to the streetscape and have their own characteristics.

Mr. Burkinshaw stated that the store was once a grocery store, and the shed was a smoke house. Mr. Meche suggested reconstructing the chimney from the roof up only. Chair Spang and Mr. Joyce agreed and encouraged it be incorporated into the design of the new roof. Mr. Meche remained undecided. Chair Spang offered to help with the proposed design.

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

FY22 Community Preservation Plan – Request for Comment/Input – continuation

Ms. Kelleher stated that she drafted a letter similar to the letter submitted last year, she recommended adding a comment that all project receiving CPA funding under the category of historic preservation submit design plans to the Commission for approval before the project commences. While preservation restrictions are being placed on private properties that receive CPA funds, that doesn't occur until after the project begins and there is no way to ensure the projects are meeting the Secretary of the Interior Standards, i.e., with a repointing project, there is no step to ensure the correct mortar, tooling, etc. are being used before the project starts. She recommended that all projects go through the Commission before they begin and that the Commission inform her of additional items to add.

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

Other Business:

a. Meeting Minutes;

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to approve June 2, 2021 regular meeting minutes. Mr. Martinez second. Roll Call: Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Meche, Spang, were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to approve June 16, 2021 regular meeting minutes. Mr. Martinez second. Roll Call: Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Meche, Spang, were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to approve June 30, 2021 regular meeting minutes. Mr. Martinez second. Roll Call: Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Meche, Spang, were in favor and the motion so carried.

b. Violations;

Ms. Kelleher suggested they continue violation discussion to the first item on the next meeting's agenda.

Other

34 Broad Street:

Ms. Kelleher stated that the building renovation certificate expired, and the applicant requested an extension.

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

6 River Street

Ms. Kelleher stated that a certificate was given in 2018 to paint the building a new color; however, only two sides were painted the new color and the side elevation is visible, but the rear is not. A 1-year extension would allow the project to be completed without a violation. There is some neighborhood concern with the delayed project and there being no current authorization to allow them to complete the work.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to authorize a 6-month extension to the certificate to Feb 20, 2022. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. Roll Call: Martinez, Pattison, Joyce, Meche, Spang, were in favor and the motion so carried.

Forest River Bathhouse

Ms. Kelleher stated that progress photos were added to the September 15, 2021 application folder. She commended the Historic Commission for encouraging restoration of the building and noted that the addition is only slightly visible.

Salem Athenaeum

Ms. Kelleher stated that the project will be noticed for the October 6, 2021 meeting.

Design Guidelines

Ms. Kelleher stated that the draft guidelines will return on October 20, 2021 meeting.

Adjournment

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:20PM

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Preservation Planner