

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
October 4, 2017

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, October 4, 2017 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Reed Cutting, David Hart, Susan Keenan, Lawrence Spang, and Jane Turiel.

14 Beckford Street

Richard and Cynthia Griffin submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new paint colors.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/18/17
- Photographs
- Paint chips

The applicants Richard and Cynthia Griffin were present.

Mr. Griffin stated that the house was built in 1733 although the historic home plaque says 1700. The applicant had photos dating back to 1926 showing the existing house painted red. They proposed to paint the house a darker color and an associate from Waters & Brown suggested a dark grey with a green undertone and cream accents. Many of the neighboring houses are more pastel colors. The guidelines mentioned that reds and browns were period colors for this era.

Mr. Spang asked if the garage would be painted. Mr. Griffin replied no, it is brick and will not be painted.

Ms. Herbert stated that she approved of the body paint, door, and trim color. Mr. Griffin replied that the window trim and door and shutters would remain black and the garage door will be grey. The proposed colors are: Jail House rocks (grey) and America's Cup (cream).

There was no public comment.

Mr. Hart suggested painting the door a third color. Mr. Griffin replied that the black door was replaced in 2002 and the carpenter led them to believe that a dark colored door could crack.

Ms. Herbert asked what the door was made of. Mr. Griffin replied oak.

**VOTE: Ms. Keenan made a motion to approve the new paint colors. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

*Mr. Cutting arrived at this time.*

183 Federal Street - continuation

Anne Murray submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to a install ductless HVAC system with condenser unit and exterior duct pipes.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/3/17
- Photographs
- Slim duct technical specifications

The owners Anne Murray & Michael Brennan were present.

Mr. Brennan stated that they will install a new fence to shield the existing condenser unit (which will be moved back) and the new unit. He stated that he has also redesigned the system to a single pipe that will follow the building as closely as possible.

Ms. Herbert noted, following the SHC site visit, that the applicants have modified their new plans and that both units will be behind the fence and the piping will match the house color.

Ms. Kelleher reported that Tim Jenkins submitted a letter on behalf of Historic Salem Inc. HSI expressed concerns with ductless HVAC systems and exterior piping that is visible from the street. Painted piping will mar the view of the building. It should be installed at the rear and piping should be below the cladding and close to the building. He asked if the applicants will eliminate the window A/C units.

Mr. Spang asked about the piping destination and suggested that the piping be run along the eave edge to eliminate the jogs. Mr. Brennan replied that between windows at the ceiling level a flexible hose would be needed which would draw more attention to it. The Commission and Mr. Brennan discussed piping orientation.

Ms. Herbert noted that the applicant had reduced the number of pipes needed from 2 to 1 and that both units (the existing and new) will be behind a 4-foot high fence. She recommended that the fence be a flat board capped period style fence with no spacing.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve the application with modification to the plan to run piping along the corner board, then horizontal, then pipe to follow eave line, and a fence to conceal the condenser units. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 15 Broadway

Brimpts Realty LLC submitted an application for a waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance for the demolition of a wood-frame building.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/14/17
- Photographs

The applicant David Clarke of Brimpts Realty LLC was present.

Mr. Clarke stated that the plan is to use the property as a work shop. The new building will have wood shingles not steel. Currently the structure is an old shed with parking. He will be constructing a 4 bay garage/workshop. The building will be turned perpendicular to the street so vehicles can enter directly from the street and not from a driveway.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the applicant has received a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals for the new construction. She asked if any neighbors attending any of the previous meetings for this project had any issues with the change in building orientation. Mr. Clarke replied no.

Mr. Cutting asked if parking would be lost. Mr. Clarke replied no, there will be 11 parking spaces in front of the building.

Mr. Spang asked if the building had been affected by flooding. Mr. Clarke replied no, the flood plain delineation is just beyond his property, at the McDonald's which is at a lower grade.

Ms. Herbert asked if the applicant had flood insurance. Mr. Clarke replied that as of 2014 the laws have changed and it is no longer needed.

There was no public comment

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the waiver of the demolition delay ordinance. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

265-267 Lafayette Street - continuation

265-267 Lafayette Street Realty Trust submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to rebuild front porch.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/12/17
- Stair Design
- Mock-up of railing

The owner Madeline Frisch and her brother were present.

Mr. Frisch stated that they are rebuilding the front porch to the same dimensions. They will replicate the 30” high top rail. The existing floorboards would be rotated to run across the building. Currently they run from the house towards the street, which leaves an unfinished edge when approaching the steps. They are separating the porch flooring design into three sections because the boards won't cover the full length. The base of the porch columns, which have been altered, will also be redesigned with mitered corners for a finished look and molding under cap. They will run a duplicate molding at the top so that the columns match. A base molding could be added. Ms. Herbert stated that the same molding be used at the bottom of the columns to finish off the look.

Ms. Herbert asked if the segmented pattern of the floorboards will line up with the stairs. Mr. Frisch replied not necessarily; however, they will line up with the columns.

Ms. Herbert asked if the concrete at the driveway entrance will be replaced with brick. Ms. Frisch replied that the City installed the concrete because the brick that was there was in poor condition

Mr. Frisch stated that the proposed decking is called Ipe decking. Waters & Brown recommended that it weather to grey, but after 6 months it could be oiled to a darker finish. Mr. Frisch requested permission to oil it in the future if they didn't like the weathered look.

Mr. Spang suggested the applicant approach the Building Department for determination of the required railing height. Mr. Frisch replied that the porch is not high enough to require a 36” high railing but he will verify that with the Building Department. Mr. Frisch stated that he has the historic photos to prove that the historic railing design is being followed. Ms. Herbert noted that she will review another project on Lafayette with a similar issue to help build a case for maintaining the same railing height if necessary.

Mr. Hart noted that this is a replacement but suggested that the 4” railing spacing also be reviewed by the Building Inspector.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

175 Federal Street

Adam Krauth and Nicole Bergman submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter attic window on rear elevation.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/27/17
- Photographs
- JB Sash & Door Co. window proposal dated 5/11/17

The owner Nicole Bergman was present.

Ms. Bergman stated that her home was built in 1790. They want to replace an existing rear wood window with a vinyl one because a custom wood window was estimated at \$1000 and a vinyl window would last longer. The existing window is used often but doesn't fit inside the frame properly due to water damage and the proposed window would be casement no storm window would be needed.

Mr. Spang asked for the existing window style and dimensions. Ms. Bergman replied double hung & 24"Wx30H." A two foot high double hung window only provides one foot high air space and a casement would allow for airflow through the entire opening. The first floor front windows have been approved for replacement with windows by JB Sash but this proposal is for a completely different window.

Ms. Herbert stated that she and Mr. Kelleher conducted a site visit and all of the windows have issues. Ms. Kelleher noted that one window is 2 over 2 and has sash cords but the remaining are 6 over 6 and were altered at one point to fit into the openings after their sash cords were removed. Ms. Bergman added that the windows are friction fit and must be propped up to keep them open.

Mr. Spang asked if the window in question can be seen from Fowler Street. Ms. Kelleher replied technically but there is limited visibility.

Ms. Herbert asked if the proposed window will disturb the historic look of the building. Ms. Bergman replied that the new window would open out towards the chimney and it could have muntins to resemble the other windows.

Mr. Hart stated that he would like a drawing.

Mr. Cutting asked for the number of panes. Ms. Bergman replied 6 over 6 currently. Ms. Keenan proposed 4 over 4. Mr. Cutting suggested 6 over 6 to match the others.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant could provide catalog cut sheets for both options. Ms. Herbert stated that drawings should be 6 over 6, have dimensions and exterior muntins to resemble the other windows. Ms. Bergman noted that she would get cuts for both 6 over 6 and 4 over 4.

Ms. Herbert suggested the applicant also contact The Window Woman to see if she can improve the existing window. Mr. Spang suggested that local carpenter Steve Whittier could frame out the existing window at a lesser cost. Ms. Kelleher noted that she would send that information to the applicant.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

88 ½ - 90 Federal Street

Leo Kraunelis submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a new fence and replace rear roof with architectural shingles.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/19/17
- Photographs
- Sketch of fence locations

The owner Leo Kraunelis was present.

*Ms. Herbert recused herself and went to sit in the audience.*

Ms. Kelleher noted that the applicant's proposal has changed.

Mr. Kraunelis stated that the slate roof has valley leaks and rot in a location visible to the street. They've received quotes for asphalt and for slate repair and the slate repair estimate was more costly than new asphalt at the leak. Since the application was submitted they have received a more reasonable quote for slate repair that they would like to move forward with. Ms. Kelleher added that the applicant is withdrawing asphalt application and will replace the slate in kind.

Mr. Kraunelis stated that the existing fence at the side yard abuts the neighbor and was tied to posts on the cinderblock retaining wall. A section of cinderblock wall was damaged on driveway side and he would like to cut off the steel posts and cap the wall with blue stone and stucco the wall.

Mr. Spang asked when the wall was constructed and if the wall is visible from Federal Street. Mr. Kraunelis replied that the wall was built in the 1960's and it is only partially visible through the driveway. The wall will have a blue stone cap 1 ¾" thick (the standard thickness) with a ¾" - 1" lip on each side.

There was no public comment

**VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve removal of the pipe posts, repair the damaged cinderblock wall and apply a stucco finish to the wall, the installation of a new bluestone cap on top of the wall 1 ¼"-1 ¾" thick with a 3/8" - ½" overhang, and to repair the slate roof in kind. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Ms. Kelleher noted that she will conduct a site visit to close out painting portion of project.

95-97 Federal Street

Discussion of a Certificate of Appropriateness violation.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/17/17
- Certificate of Appropriateness: 9/9/17
- Photographs
- Contract for project: May 2, 2017
- Contractor's explanation for the changes in the method of installation

The property owners Robert and Janet Kendall were present.

*Mr. Hart recused himself and went to sit in the audience.*

Ms. Kelleher reported that the installation of the HVAC system didn't comply with the certificate that was approved by the Commission.

Ms. Herbert stated that two new small units were supposed to be flush with the foundation and below the building's water table. Instead, one large and one small unit were installed on 18" stilts, extending approximately 7 feet away from the buildings foundation. The piping was supposed to be flush with the downspout and run along the water table but was installed higher. The transom over the historic door was removed and replaced with plywood with a pipe running through it to feed an interior wall mounted unit. Ms. Herbert noted that she reviewed the applicant's contract with the HVAC installer after the fact and discovered that the removal of the kitchen transom window was included in the contract. The applicant did not present this change to the Commission. Ms. Herbert expressed her understanding that the condenser units were installed perpendicularly to maintain access to an existing water spigot and because of potential heat damage to a neighboring tree. Ms. Herbert conducted two site visits, one of which was with the contactor who explained that the unit at the window could be moved and the transom reinstalled. Ms. Herbert noted that the existing hose bib is in the electric room but could be moved to exit from the Boiler Room where the spigot would be accessed from the driveway and not in the landscaping. She stated that she believed both changes would be an improvement. There is an option to put the units on a pad instead of the stilts but the units would need to be regularly cleared of any snow. She also noted that other owners have installed condenser units on decks and also enclosed them in a cabinet for minimal visibility. Changes can be done to minimize the effect but those changes could have also been discussed with the Commission before the project got to this point. She noted that new shrubs planted by the applicant help to conceal the smaller unit but the larger condenser is much bigger and higher. Evergreens can become overgrown or die off if they don't get maintained.

Ms. Herbert stated that a cabinet could be built around the units to help conceal it, the piping could be moved closer to the water table once the hose bib is moved and the piping could also be moved closer to the downspout, and the transom can be reinstalled.

Mr. Spang asked if the units were for both heating and cooling. Mrs. Kendall replied yes, which is why the second unit is so high. He stated that the contractor told them it would cost \$4,000 to relocate the units to the deck or move the compressor. Ms. Herbert noted that it is a manufacturer's suggestion to mount the units on stilts if there is no guarantee that the area can be kept clear of snow but it is not a requirement.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the Contractor received a building permit from the Building Inspector based on the Commission's approved design so there should be some recourse if he didn't follow the installation contract. She noted, however, that the building permit wasn't filed until after the system was installed and the contractor never applied for an electrical permit.

Mr. Kendall noted that the contractor provided an explanation in his e-mail which was submitted to the Board. Mr. Spang asked if the modifications were due to field conditions and if the Kendalls had approved them. Mrs. Kendall replied that she did approve the changes without knowing that it also needed the Commission's approval. The changes at the transom were done because the contractor said the cross bracing in the wall couldn't be cut to allow the installation of the wall unit. The exterior condenser units were arranged to maintain the airflow around them even though they wanted them out of sight. The contactor insisted that they be mounted high because of the snow.

Ms. Keenen asked for the name of the installation company. Mr. Kendall replied Dry Air Systems.

Ms. Herbert noted that May 2nd is the date on contact and this project was discussed at the 6/7/17 Commission meeting, so the applicants knew what was to be installed.

Mr. Kendall reported that their contractor has stated that it would be possible to install a custom pane of glass cut to allow the piping to go through the glass. The glass would be opaque in a smoky grey color to resemble the look of the first-floor translucent transom.

Mr. Spang stated that this type of glass is called spandrel glass. He asked if the transom was visible from Federal

Street. Ms. Kelleher replied that it is visible from the street.

Ms. Herbert stated that it is her understanding that the pipe can be moved.

Mrs. Kendall replied that an interior cabinet blocks a third of the A/C unit. Ms. Herbert replied that the Commission does not make decisions based on interior layouts/cabinetry. Mr. Kendall suggested that a piece of wood be installed behind glass to attach the unit over the door. Mr. Spang noted that it would be spandrel glass and give the illusion that it is open. Mr. Kendall replied yes, the frame was existing only the glass was removed.

Ms. Herbert stated that the pipes should have been flush with the water table and the downspout. Ms. Kelleher added that visibility was a concern since the piping was installed below the window and not along the skirt board and it was painted to match the house color.

Ms. Herbert noted that the arborvitaes grow quickly and may conceal the condenser units but that doesn't change the fact that the units and their locations were not what was approved. She noted that the owner of Unit 1 in the building has stated that he also plans to install a ductless HVAC system. She reiterated that the Historic Commission should have been notified of the changes needed.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the contractor was present and involved in the discussion at the 6/7/17 meeting. Mr. Spang added that the Contractor deviated from the plan they agreed to.

Ms. Herbert stated that the contractor knew that two small units would not be enough for the 4 heads within the house. One unit would have needed to be slightly higher and larger.

Mr. Spang noted that various pieces of this project are unacceptable and asked if the applicant had fully paid for the work. Mr. Kendall replied yes and noted that the system is fully operational.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the permit was issued and the work had to comply with Historic Commission and therefore the building permit is invalid as the work was not in accordance with what was requested and approved by the Commission on 6/7/17.

Ms. Herbert noted that Historic Salem, Inc. has discussed not allowing this type of installation unless it is in the rear of the building only.

Mr. Kendall replied that the porch location would be great but the rooms being serviced are required to be no more than a 50-foot distance from the compressor. Ms. Herbert replied that the piping could be run inside and chased.

Mr. Spang asked if the contractor who was present at the 6/7/17 meeting did the installation. Mr. Kendall replied no, he was the manager and not the installer. Ms. Herbert read a portion of the minutes from 6/7/17 meeting describing what was agreed upon by the contractor, the owner and the Commission. Ms. Kelleher suggested that there be a discussion regarding what the contractor proposed vs. what was installed and the Contractor should attend the next Commission meeting.

Ms. Herbert recommended that the applicant get a quote to relocate the piping, turn the units 90 degrees and move the units closer to the foundation. She also recommended that the Commission consider the installation of a new spandrel glass for the transom but stated that the pipe should be relocated to enter through the clapboard and be piped into the side of the wall mounted unit. Ms. Herbert stated that she will give the applicant the contact information for the Mitsubishi regional manager, and to contact Cranney to determine how the interior unit at the transom can be piped without relocating the unit, and asked Ms. Kelleher to contact the applicant at 183 Federal Street, an HVAC professional who installs these systems, to consult on the matter.

Mr. Spang stated that the applicant should return to the Historic Commission before moving forward with any changes to the system. Mr. Kendall questioned whether the 14-year warranty would be void if another company were to do the

work. Ms. Herbert replied not if the owner of 183 Federal Street only consults.

Mr. Spang stated that the details and conversations discussed at the meeting need to be added to the motions to ensure that items are being installed as directed.

There was no public comment

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue to the next meeting. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### Approval of Meeting Minutes

Ms. Kelleher noted that meeting minutes will be reviewed at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

#### Other Business

Ms. Kelleher reported that there was no other business to discuss.

#### Violation Notices

Ms. Kelleher reported that there were no violation notices to discuss.

#### Correspondence

Ms. Kelleher reported that there was no correspondence.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Keenan seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Community Development Planner