

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
November 1, 2023

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, November 1, 2023 at 6:00PM via **Zoom Virtual Meeting**. Present were: Rebecca English, Larry Spang (Chair), Milo Martinez, Mark Meche. Staff: Patti Kelleher, Not present: Kelly Tyler-Lewis, Vijay Joyce.

3 Cambridge Street

Applicant requested to amend previously issued Certificate of Appropriateness for gutters.

Maura Cataldo was present on the call. Chair Spang noted that a K gutter had been desired, though the Commission had approved a half round. Ms. Cataldo expressed concern about half round gutters after speaking with contractor. Contractor indicated that they would not work on house because the approved half gutter would sit off of the fascia, meaning that water could get behind gutter between gutter and roof, causing potential siding rot issues (and potentially compromising fascia as well). Ms. Cataldo noted that current gutter sits tight to the house, whereas contractor noted half round would sit further out. Contractor proposed applying seamless gutter. Ms. Cataldo requested installation of original gutter proposal. Ms. Cataldo was unable to procure a spec sheet to present. The contractor was identified as Reynolds Gutter of Beverly, MA. Ms. Cataldo was of the belief that the proposed gutter was 5", slightly larger than existing wood gutter (which creates spillover).

Chair Spang clarified that the proposed gutter would be aluminum. Mr. Meche questioned if a K style gutter had ever been approved that was not in kind, to which Ms. Kelleher noted that there had not been one in several years (nor a request for K style). Ms. Kelleher noted that a K style had been approved for properties on Federal St and North St, noting that one of these was a replacement for a wood gutter. Chair Spang verified that precedent exists for their approval. Without a sample or cut sheet from applicant, Chair Spang was dubious that the K style would receive approval. Ms. English was hesitant to vote without needed information. Mr. Martinez was reticent to approve K style gutters given past instances where they were sought and approved. Ms. Cataldo noted that existing gutter had been installed 50 years ago. Mr. Martinez questioned if trim was removed to make space for gutter. Ms. Cataldo expressed belief that part of roof had been removed and noted that more remodels had occurred in 50-year span. Ms. Cataldo noted that half round metal gutters had existed in the 1930s or 1940s. Ms. Cataldo reaffirmed that contractor does not want to install half round gutters. Noting hesitation from Commission members, Chair Spang proposed that the applicant obtain more information to present.

VOTE: Ms. English motioned to continue the request to amend certificate to the next meeting. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

149 Federal Street—continuation

Joseph Archambault submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for fencing.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/20/23
- Slideshow/photographs

Joe and Kathy Archambault were present on the call. Ms. Archambault presented Photoshopped images of desired French doors and fencing as well as photographs of other similar fences around town. Ms. Kelleher noted that design and height of fence had been discussed at previous meeting. Ms. Archambault noted that 20 Oliver St had fence similar to applicants' home. Mr. Archambault noted that fences in question were 6' tall. A Google Map image of fence at 20 Oliver St was shown, a side street coming off of Salem Common. Chair Spang noted that this fence was not approved by Historic Commission since this home is not located within the boundaries of an historic district. Mr. Martinez clarified that historic plaques on 20 Oliver St are overseen and provided by Historic Salem Inc., a separate entity from the SHC. Ms. Archambault also flagged 8 Beckford Street as a model the applicants were fond of, which Ms. Kelleher noted was in an historic district. This style fence had gates/doors that closed at the mouth of the driveway. Ms. Archambault also noted 24 Warren Street as a fence model, which Ms. Kelleher noted was in a district. Ms. Archambault also noted 47 Broad Street as a property that was photographed, which Ms. Kelleher noted was not in an historic district. Ms. Kelleher also noted that Pickman Street was not in a district. Ms. Kelleher showed photographs from previous SHC design guidelines which featured privacy screening on top of fence, which was otherwise solid boards. Another photo sample showed a spindle top atop a solid fence.

Chair Spang noted that since the desired fence would be in the front of the house, a shorter picket or board fence would typically feature along street. Chair Spang advised that larger fences would typically be used to define a backyard at rear of house. The concern among SHC members was installing a tall board fence featuring along Federal Street. Ms. Archambault noted that a tall board fence was desired in order to provide privacy to first floor tenants to have a courtyard. Chair Spang expressed some openness to a low board fence with lattice or spindle top, which Ms. Archambault was amenable to.

Mr. Meche noted that nothing could be approved based on the lack of a specific proposal. As an alternative, Mr. Meche proposed a low ornamental fence at the sidewalk, in front of a larger board fence, that is, two layered fences. Mr. Meche requested the need to see a well-done drawing of a board fence with screening along its top. Chair Spang showed an image of fence from Walpole Outdoors website in line with Mr. Meche's comments, which Ms. Archambault lauded. Ms. English expressed hypothetical support of Walpole Outdoors-style designs but noted that not enough of a proposal had been shown to vote on.

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

149 Federal Street—continuation

Joseph Archambault submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior modifications.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/4/23
- Slideshow/photographs, drawings

A Photoshopped image was shown to note where French doors would land on existing addition. Chair Spang commented on the height of the doors—which seemed high—before affirming that stairs/steps would be needed to get up to the French doors. Ms. Archambault noted that the steps would eat into the

existing small yard. Chair Spang appreciated the drawing's expression of dimensions but noted that a drawing of the steps leading up to the doors would be needed. Mrs. Archambault noted that the landing would be 20" deep and 10' wide. Chair Spang noted that doors would be 6'5". Mr. Meche surmised that the doors as drawn would be too big, and that swinging inward would take up half the room inside the addition. Mr. Meche also noted that the doors (in appearance) may benefit from having sidelights. Chair Spang indicated the need to see more drawings of components as well as to know if the landing to the doors would or would not have handrails. Ms. Kelleher noted that 16 Kosciusko had seen approval of French doors at rear ell of house rather than on front. Mr. Martinez noted that Commission had rarely seen proposals for French doors that were so wide. Chair Spang noted that fronts of houses were more ornate than side ells and additions or rears. Mr. Martinez noted that making this addition's entrance so big would overshadow the front façade of the house. Chair Spang noted that a single door with side lites would also look ornate for a secondary entrance. Mr. Archambault asked if the double doors would be more acceptable if they were smaller. Chair Spang noted that Victorian homes sometimes had 2.5' doors to open and create 5' total. Mr. Meche noted that drawings would be needed in order to be able to get an approval.

With regard to opinions for altering or removing windows from the home, Chair Spang expressed favor for smaller windows.

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

358 Essex Street

Josiah Fisk submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for chimney removal and vent installation.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/2/23
- Slideshow/photographs

Josiah Fisk and Ryan Juckett, unit owners, were present on the call. A presentation was shown on proposed removal of single-flue chimney and installation of gas water heater vent. Mr. Fisk noted that area of chimney was leaking. Chimney currently has ventilation for gas hot water heater (heater needs to be moved to western wall, potentially, with a powered heater installed). Mr. Fisk was not of the mind that existing chimney was very old. The existing chimney was shown to be inordinately long; 7 feet were added after finding that the chimney did not draw very well. Mr. Fisk noted that other three chimneys on house are believed to be 18th century. Mr. Fisk noted that chimneys are not terribly visible from public ways, showing photographs taken from areas of Federal Street and Essex Street. Dimensions of the chimney in basement were shown. Aerial view of chimney locations was shown (four chimneys in total on property). An image of proposed replacement vent was shown. Mr. Fisk noted that the replacement vent could be seen while walking past the house but was somewhat obscured behind existing fence and electrical box. Mr. Fisk also noted that fence would be installed in the agreed upon design as well as post, to be painted black.

Chair Spang recommended that an electrical rather than gas water heater be installed. Mr. Fisk was open to on-demand hot water. Mr. Juckett noted that electrical panel would need to be re-done to alter water from gas to electrical. Mr. Fisk noted that three separate heaters would likely be needed.

Mr. Martinez questioned the height of the vent, specifically if it could be lowered. A new image was shown that indicated the vent at about 20" off the ground, which Mr. Martinez was more open to. Mr. Martinez specified that this would be painted to match the house. Ms. English and Mr. Martinez agreed that the planned removed chimney looks like a problem waiting to happen and were pleased to see other existing chimneys remain on house.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Meche motioned to approve application as submitted (Mr. Fisk recommended adding language about painting to match the vent upon installation). Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

374 Essex Street

Jim Sullivan submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for building modifications.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/1/23
- Slideshow/photographs

Helen Sides, the project architect, was present on the call on behalf of owner (who was absent). Within the past 5-6 years the carriage house in rear has been renovated into an apartment; house has apartment in the ell. Owners desire to integrate entire house into their single-family house. Ms. Sides noted that the ell is an addition and not very well constructed; and anticipated much structural work (remove partition walls that have been added over the years, for example). The owner proposes the following work: remove vestibule on driveway side; remove chimney in middle of ell (not visible from west standing view of Essex but potentially visible from standing at library [though not from Federal]); replace casement windows with new double-hung sash windows (diagrams of existing and proposed were shown during the meeting); remove all shutters on house; and slightly alter existing paint color. On back ell, rear entry portico will be added which will not be visible. Ms. Sides also spoke to and showed presentation on a variety of planned window alterations. Existing and proposed plans were shown, demonstrating where windows would be moved, removed, altered, and so forth. The plan would be to vertically align the windows on the south elevation, as they are not currently aligned. Existing elevations were shown. A new entry way was shown, which Ms. Sides noted would have a granite stair landing.

Chair Spang questioned if the house had been drawn or Photoshopped without shutters. Mr. Meche noted that shutters would not have featured in 1773. Historic Frank Cousins photos of the house were shown. Ms. Sides noted that the top Frank Cousins photo featured the applicants' desired result (though mentioned a new portico would feature in the rear).

Chair Spang questioned whether sash would be salvaged and/or match existing windows, to which Ms. Sides said that all of the salvaged sashes are the same.

Mr. Meche questioned the size of the 6 over 6 windows, and whether they would be four pairs of sashes mulled together. Ms. Sides noted that a stud pocket would likely be needed (not mulled), i.e. a single stud in between the windows covered with trim. Mr. Meche questioned how tall the windows would be from sill to head. Ms. Sides noted that head height of existing double hungs would be used, i.e. approximately 4' tall.

Chair Spang noted the tightness of corner windows on south elevation. The proposed paint colors would be Phillipsburg Blue with Swiss Coffee around the portico. Mr. Martinez was of the mind that alterations would improve the composition of the building. Mr. Martinez was not in favor of using blue on blue paint scheme. Martinez noted 15 Andrews Street is blue on blue (not Phillipsburg but nonetheless close; a Victorian gable end house). Ms. Kelleher asked if sashes were black, and if they would be staying black.

Ms. English questioned if carriage house would also be painted, for which Ms. Sides said yes.

Chair Spang identified the need for final look at details of windows (in terms of mulled together, stud or no stud) as a component of giving final sign-off approval and recommended adding language in motion to cover this.

No public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez motioned to approve the architectural changes to 374 Essex St (requiring detailed cut sheets of fabricated windows, specifically the planned kitchen windows), with paint colors to be discussed separately. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez motioned to continue discussion of paint colors to the next meeting. Mr. Meche seconded the motion. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

110 Federal Street

Mary Kate O'Donnell submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for architectural shingles.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 101/13/23
- Slideshow/photographs

Ms. O'Donnell was present on the call. Taylor Ferguson was also present, the roof installer, contractor of record. Timberline HDZ Shingles were planned and said to be very similar to GAF Timberline. Planned color would be charcoal or black. Mr. Ferguson was also open to Timberline natural shadow (NS) architectural shingles in charcoal. Mr. Ferguson noted 6:12 as the predominant pitch. Chair Spang noted that the Timberline NS shingles had been previously been approved at 6 Kosciusko Street, and clarified that no other work was being proposed, which Ms. O'Donnell affirmed.

No public comment.

Chair Spang noted that smaller roof is not being replaced and clarified that distinction between the two existing and proposed would be so subtle as to not be noticeable. Mr. Martinez noted that Google Earth overview seemed to show different shades across three roofs on the house indicating that they were already mismatched.

VOTE: Ms. English motioned to approve application with Timberline NS Charcoal architectural shingles. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

381-385 Essex Street – Grace Church

Grace Church submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace portion of roof with architectural shingles.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/17/23
- Slideshow/photographs

Eric Wagner was present. Mr. Wagner noted that a piece of roof (circled yellow in image) visible from street is proposed to be changed from slate to architectural shingles. Building dates to 1927; original slate shingles are still extant. Over the years, leaks were repaired with tar, thus destroying some slate shingles for future use. Leaks have been progressively getting worse on this section of roof (over what was referred to as the “lady chapel”). The leaking was said to be worse as ever, with eight drip pans currently in use. The goal was to replace with architectural shingles as opposed to slate. Any other changes would be made in-kind, including patching mortar if mortar repairs were deemed necessary. Ms. Kelleher noted that main building slate roof would be preserved. Mr. Wagner proposed CertainTeed product “Highland Slate” in New England Slate color, which was said to emulate slate. Mr. Wagner noted that this product had received approval in the past. Mr. Wagner noted that a Belmont style was considered but ultimately deemed too three-dimensional. Chair Spang clarified that “Highland Slate” was desired by the church.

Ms. English questioned how new roofing would adjoin slate roof. Mr. Wagner noted that an intersection exists with a copper valley (to be replaced in-kind). Chair Spang showed an aerial view where separate roofs come together on roof. Mr. Wagner noted roofer’s belief that 200 sq ft of slate can be preserved. While not approved or requested in the past, Ms. Kelleher noted that the proposed shingle was flat with a clipped edge and not three-dimensional. Mr. Martinez remarked that Slateline has typically received approval but expressed concern about only replacing a patch/section of slate roof. Mr. Martinez remarked that slate has a distinct sheen, whereas asphalt shingles are matte and would not reflect light the way the slate does. Mr. Martinez advised applicant and Commission to be aware that new roof is going to look a lot different from real slate (i.e. will be obviously not slate). Mr. Martinez proposed pressed metal or composite as a better fit, citing house at corner of Lynn and Andover that utilized pressed aluminum. Mr. Wagner had not considered alternatives other than what the installers had proposed, which was asphalt shingles. Mr. Wagner had not considered the reflective nature of slate given no direct head-on view of the shingles exists from street. Mr. Wagner noted that a water barrier underlay would be installed under any new installed shingles (another CertainTeed product).

A Permalock product was shown as part of a recent application, which members remarked on the shininess of. Mr. Meche noted that different color options would be a consideration if a Permalock

product was used. Ms. English noted that former Commission member Jamie Graham had previously noted the Permalock ought not be recommended for future use as it did not appear historically appropriate upon installation. Mr. Meche expressed concern that aluminum and copper were incompatible. Chair Spang proposed a site visit to further assess the piece of roof being replaced in order to identify an appropriate replacement material.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez motioned to continue application to allow time for a site visit to further assess roof condition and identify an appropriate replacement material. Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

36 Derby Street

Stanley Wrobel submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for roof vents.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/17/23
- Slideshow/photographs

Mr. Wrobel noted that an energy assessment/audit had flagged improper venting occurring in upstairs and downstairs bathrooms. Vent in roof was proposed for upstairs, where a bathroom fan already exists in ceiling of that room.

Chair Spang noted that repairs were discovered at property that had not been approved, including changes of paint color, trim replacement, and installation of electrical service without an application. Chair Spang noted that rake repairs were performed (on rakes that had experienced rot). Ms. Kelleher added that window trim was different (the house now features trim where there had previously been no exposed trim). Mr. Wrobel responded that applicants undertook the trim work given their belief that doing so would be more historically appropriate. Chair Spang affirmed that trim, sills, and edge detail on trim were all new. Ms. Kelleher noted that storm windows had been removed, perhaps revealing/exposing edge details that had previously been obscured. Mr. Meche clarified that applicant had selectively removed some shingles, which Mr. Wrobel affirmed. Mr. Meche and Chair Spang noted that additional electric boxes had been added. Chair Spang noted that foundation had been painted a new maroon color. Ms. Kelleher requested paint colors that had been used from Mr. Wrobel. Mr. Martinez questioned what house colors were approved for decking area (gray to match house and white to match trim, Ms. Kelleher responded). On Mr. Martinez's recommendation, Chair Spang requested that the applicant submit a new application wrap up work that was done which could be advertised to the public for appropriate input.

Discussion returned to proposed wall vent and roof vent. Cut sheets were shown. Proposed locations of vents were shown. Mr. Meche questioned if bathroom exhaust was truly below a window. Mr. Wrobel noted that the vent could be moved there or elsewhere depending on counsel from Commission, reiterating that an existing bathroom fan is in the ceiling. Chair Spang clarified that side vent and roof vent would be painted to match.

No public comment.

Mr. Meche questioned others' feelings about louvered vent kit. Mr. Martinez recommended a Hide-a-Vent product.

Chair Spang noted that applicant would need to return to December 6 meeting to discuss after-the-fact discussion of work done without review.

VOTE: Mr. Meche motioned to approve application, Mr. Martinez amended the motion to specify that the roof vent would be moved further right and match height of existing vent (placed on side of other vent; lined up with existing vents, or potentially put in place of the plumbing vent which is currently in a state of disuse). Ms. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

20 Hathorne Street

Discussion and vote. Intent to proceed with issuance and recordation of a Clerk's Certificate as to Violation for paint colors and window replacement not approved by Commission.

Ms. Kelleher noted that a prescribed process exists when work performed on a property is found to be in violation of SHC protocols. In the current case, two violation notices had been sent out to owners, both for paint colors (which were denied) and replacement windows for which no application was received. The next step was to hold public meeting to discuss the violation(s), as part of public record, before recording a Clerk's certificate of violation with the Registry of Deeds. This public meeting would allow members of the public to contribute to discussion. A photograph of the property in question was shown. Ms. Kelleher noted that the property is occupied. Mr. Martinez also noted that an inappropriate stair condition still exists (as shown in photograph, what appeared to be a temporary entry stairway construction).

Public comment:

Scott Moore, one of the owners of the property, was present. Mr. Moore apologized, suggesting that first two notices had not been received, though the most recent notice had been received. Mr. Moore expressed desire to converse with SHC for recommendations moving forward.

Chair Spang noted that an application would be needed to cover paint colors. Ms. Kelleher noted that a request to approve white paint color after-the-fact had been received and denied by SHC. After this denial on paint color, the applicants had never returned before the Commission with alternative paint color scheme. Ms. Kelleher recommended that the owners submit a new application with new color scheme that was more appropriate for this style of house (i.e. not a single color scheme; different colors for trim, body/clapboards, etc.). Ms. Kelleher also recommended including language on after-the-fact approval of window replacement. Mr. Moore noted that 30 days would be ample time to allow submittal of new application. Mr. Meche questioned whether applicants should be given so much extra time to put together an application given the amount of time which had already elapsed on the violations in question. Mr. Meche noted that credible paint colors needed to feature in the upcoming application, i.e. a specific plan. An agreement was reached that the applicants would submit a new application to begin to resolve existing violations by November 20, for discussion at December 6 meeting.

VOTE: Ms. English motioned to defer vote on Clerk's issuance to November 21 unless the applicants submitted a new application by November 20. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

Minutes

VOTE: Ms. English motioned to approve meeting minutes for May 3, June 21, August 2, August 6, September 6, and October 4. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Martinez, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Adjournment

VOTE: Mr. Meche motioned to adjourn. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting adjourned at 10:04PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Dan Graham, Historical Commission Clerk