

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
October 5, 2016, 2016

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, October 5, 2016 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Kathryn Harper (Vice Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, David Hart, Joanne McCrea, and Larry Spang.

380 Essex Street - continuation

Jay Famico submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a shingle roof and install solar panels.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: August 23, 2016
- Photographs
- Solar panel specifications

Colleen Bowdren represented the applicant.

Chris Miller and Harrison Piper from Sunbug Solar were also present.

Ms. Bowdren presented some alternative comparisons with original proposal and alternative plans.

Ms. Herbert asked if the owners had considered panels on carriage house.

Ms. Bowdren replied that tree canopy shades the carriage house.

Mr. Hart asked for clarification on the applicant's proposal.

Mr. Miller stated that the Commission's recommendations at the past meeting were evaluated and he presented the identified deficiencies in the alternative panel designs.

Ms. Bowdren replied that she is not changing her proposal.

Ms. Bellin asked for clarification on the percentages presented and how they were calculated.

Mr. Miller replied that it is based on total kilowatt production.

Ms. Bowdren replied that it was based on estimated first year production of kilowatts. The original production is 7,724 kw.

Mr. Miller stated that it is just an estimate that has not considered a potential shadow cast by a balustrade.

Ms. Bowdren reported that she asked City Solicitor Beth Rennard whether a 25% decrease in production is reasonable. She noted that California law has a 20% threshold for reasonableness.

Mr. Cutting asked if the California law is related to historic buildings.

Ms. Bowdren replied that she was not sure.

Ms. Bellin asked for more clarification on the California law if possible.

Ms. Herbert recommended that the Commission review the proposal as if balustrade was in place.

Mr. Miller presented two options to respond to the Commission's comments – option 2 includes row of traditional panels and row of rotated panels while option 3 includes row of panels with additional panels on flat roof.

Mr. Spang asked about the panel's lifespan.

Mr. Miller replied that the industry standard is 30 years with a possible ½% degradation per year.

Ms. Herbert asked if the panels would be rented or purchased.

Mr. Mill replied that they will be purchased by the property owner.

Ms. Herbert asked about the difference in heating costs.

Mr. Miller replied that the costs would be \$1,300 per year for option #1, \$1,000 per year for landscape option #2, and \$980 for option #3.

Ms. Herbert asked if the figures considered capital investment.

Mr. Miller replied that it is evaluated into the figure.

Ms. McCrea asked how many panels have been installed by SunBug.

Mr. Miller replied that the company has more than 1,000 sales and 890 installs with many located in historic districts.

Ms. Harper asked if the proposal includes panels on the addition.

Mr. Miller and Ms. Bowdren stated that the addition does not face south.

Ms. Kelleher asked if solar company has explored City's fire codes relating to solar panels.

Mr. Miller stated that has not yet explored but felt that the proposal complies.

The Commission discussed the situation of this particular house and the history of the balustrade, noting that the Commission does not wish to preclude the reinstallation in the future. The Commission is not requiring the owner to reinstall the balustrade. Therefore, the panels would not be impacted by the shading until the balustrade is installed.

Mr. Spang asked if it was possible to shift the panels up further on the roof.

Mr. Piper replied that this shift may require specialized racking and may result in the panels overhanging the widow's walk. He stated that it may require engineering to assess wind shear.

Ms. Bowdren stated that she and Mr. Famico hope to reinstall the upper level balustrade.

Mr. Miller asked if the upper balustrade could be a compromise.

Ms. Bellin and Mr. Spang asked if possible to do a combination of options 2 and 3.

Mr. Miller asked for clarification on whether Commission was requiring the installation of the balustrade. Expressed concern that balustrade would alter Sunbug's projections of performance.

Mr. Piper stated that footprint of the flat portion of roof would require panels to be angled.

Ms. Bellin expressed her opinion that the angled panels would not be highly visible.

The Commission agreed, noting that they were trying to ensure that the solar panels would be successful while allowing the balustrades to be reinstalled in the future.

Ms. Bowdren asked if Commission would consider approving option 2 with additional option to add panels on flat roof.

Mr. Miller stated that there would be additional costs to installing flat panels on the flat roof.

Mr. Cutting noted that the Commission's guidelines do not recommend panels on the front slope of a roof and the Commission is trying to find the best solution.

Mr. Miller expressed concern about contractor's need to access flat roof to install widow's walk balustrade.

Ms. Harper questioned whether Commission would consider forgoing widow's walk for the perimeter balustrade.

Ms. Bellin replied that she could not support that scenario.

Mr. Spang presented a sketch of the Commission's suggested panel design solution with panels on the upper portion of the front slope and panels on the flat portion of the roof. He noted that this design allowed for approximately 1' in width around the flat portion to allow for the widow's walk balustrade to be installed in the future. If the panels are tilted landscape, there could be approximately 3 feet left, leaving roughly 2' for widow's walk. The front slope panels would not be overhanging and would not interfere with widow's walk.

Mr. Miller replied that this scenario - option #2 with additional panels on flat roof – would be possible if determined feasible by engineer.

Ms. Herbert noted that any decision by the Commission to approve solar panels on the front of the roof should note that there are special circumstances at this property.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

David Askey, owner of 376 Essex Street, expressed his support for solar. Expressed concern about a highly reflective surface but does not appear to be concern.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin motioned to close public comment, Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Miller clarified that the dimensions of the flat portion of roof were approximately 8' x 26'; the panels are 40" x 65" and there was approximately 125" from the front edge of the sloped portion of the roof to the top edge.

Ms. Bellin questioned whether rear of widow's walk balustrade would be visible from a public way. If not, then perhaps the Commission does not need to require space for rear balustrade, which would allow panels on flat portion to be placed back further.

Mr. Piper stated that by not installing rear balustrade, more panels could be installed on flat roof.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve the installation of solar panels with the following conditions: On sloped portion of façade roof, panels to be designed such that the top of the array aligns with the top of the sloped roof. Roof panels to be installed in portrait and landscape layout to allow approximately 20" clearance along eave edge of roof to allow for reinstallation of perimeter balustrade at a future time. On flat portion of roof, allow 2' clearance along edges of roof to allow reinstallation of widow's walk balustrade at a future time. Panels may be installed flat or sloped at the owner's option.

Ms. Herbert recommended the following amendment be added to the motion: "this is a special circumstance and would allow the future reinstallation of widow's walk and perimeter balustrade".

VOTE: Mr. Spang amended his motion to add the following: This motion acknowledges that this is an unusual condition that is not intended to establish a precedent for future solar arrays in the district. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

1½ Cambridge Street

Judith Kearney submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to rebuild chimney and for new paint colors.

Documents & Exhibits

- Applications: September 8, 2016
- Photographs
- Proposal from The Chimney Company dated 11/6/15
- Paint samples

Judith and Jim Kearney were present.

The Commission discussed the request for new paint colors.

Mr. Hart noted that 6 Cambridge Street has similar color scheme.

Mr. and Ms. Kearney stated that they selected color based on Wayside Inn. The door will be painted a black/dark green color.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to close the public hearing. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made motion to approve the paint colors as presented. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Commission discussed the request to rebuild chimney.

Mr. Hart asked if new brick would replicate color and appearance of existing brick.

Mr. Kearney stated that he was not sure, he was proposing to use bricks recommended by mason.

Mr. Hart asked if chimney dates to the relocation of the house in 1946.

Mr. Kearney stated that he believed chimney was original to house and not built after house was moved.

Mr. Cutting recommended condition that new bricks match original appearance of brick.

Mr. Kearney expressed his desire to change chimney corbelling slightly as he prefers the proposed design, which is similar to chimney design at the Andrew Safford House.

Mr. Hart and Mr. Cutting both stated their preference to have chimney rebuilt to match existing design.

Ms. Herbert replied that a rebuild would then qualify for a Certificate of Non-Applicability.

The Commission and applicant discussion whether entire chimney was moved intact in 1946.

Mr. Kearney stated that he knew that interior of chimney was moved intact but did not know whether exterior portion of chimney was moved intact and is as originally constructed.

Ms. Herbert asked how much of the chimney was to be rebuilt by the mason.

Mr. Kearney replied that the mason has reported that rebuilding with existing brick is not possible as brick is not salvageable.

Mr. Spang noted that to get uniform look of bricks, it would be preferable to use all new brick and not reuse existing brick for portions of chimney.

Ms. Herbert asked the applicants why they are not proposing to rebuild with same design.

Mr. Kearney replied that it was an aesthetic preference.

Ms. Bellin asked if rebuilt as existing, would it impact ability to install a chimney cap.

The Commission and applicant agreed that mason could configure cap to fit on the rebuilt chimney.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Spang seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to allow in-kind rebuilding of chimney to match existing color and size of bricks, color of mortar, and design, dimensions and outward appearance of chimney. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Five members were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve proposal as submitted. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. Four members were in favor and the motion so carried.

The Commission discussed the applicant's request to install a new stainless steel chimney cap.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve chimney cap as proposed with proviso that cap to be painted black. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

60 Grove Street

MRM Project Management, LLC submitted a request to waive the demolition delay ordinance to demolish a 1912 wood frame building.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: September 14, 2016
- Photographs
- Existing Conditions Plan dated 9/14/16 and Temporary Open Space Plan dated 8/25/16 by Griffin Engineering Group

Rob Griffin of Griffin Engineering was present.

Mr. Griffin presented the proposed reuse of the site and the owner's request to demolish the existing building. He noted that the previous plan was to renovate the building for commercial use. However, it has been determined that building cannot be reused and the owner is now proposing to redevelop parcel as a temporary green space.

Mr. Spang asked if any new building on the site would need to be set back from edge of canal.

Mr. Griffin replied that the zoning does not allowed non-water dependent uses within the bank of canal. Chapter 91 restrictions also limit reuse of the parcel, as well as reuse of existing buildings.

Ms. Herbert asked for clarification that open space is temporary.

Mr. Griffin replied in affirmative.

Ms. Herbert asked if demolition of building would limit options for future building since the property would lose grandfathered status.

Mr. Griffin replied in the affirmative but the building is so deteriorated that the loss of grandfathering is not as impactful. He reported that the Planning Board has approved commercial use of parcel in the future, with the stipulation that new building/use would be publicly accessible.

Mr. Spang asked for clarification on the proposed site layout plan, noting that it appears site would be difficult to rebuild.

Mr. Griffin reported that present owner owns several parcels and have received approvals for new buildings by the planning board.

Ms. Kelleher asked if interior photographs have been taken of the building.

Mr. Griffin replied that he is not sure, but noted that similar requirements were made for the demolition of other buildings on property.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to close the public hearing. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the owner has sent a notice of project change to MHC for the building demolition but MHC has not yet commented.

Ms. Herbert asked for the demolition timeframe.

Mr. Griffin replied before winter.

Ms. Herbert suggested that the Commission notify MHC of any decision relative to this property.

Commission discussed whether decision should be contingent on MHC response and agreed that the Commission's decision was separate from MHC or other necessary approvals.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the waiver of demolition delay ordinance with the proviso that the owner provide measured drawings of exterior elevations and footprint plans, ¾ view photographs of all exterior elevations, and overall interior photographs. The Commission acknowledges that other agencies may also have jurisdiction over the proposed demolition. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

81 Derby Street

The Commission discussed the installed windows and the concern that windows appear to be undersized.

Mr. Hart noted that in the future Commission should require windows to be 5' high.

Mr. Bumagin agreed but concern about bedroom in interior.

Ms. Kelleher left the room.

Ms. Kelleher returned at this point in meeting.

Mr. Bumagin presented proposed plans for venting.

Mr. Hart asked if vent was required for bathroom.

Mr. Bumagin replied that he is building a “tight house” and would be installing a bathroom fan that would run continually.

Mr. Spang asked if it was possible to run all vents to the back of the house.

Mr. Bumagin replied that vents would conflict with deck.

Ms. Herbest asked for height of pipes.

Mr. Bumagin replied that he believes pipe to be 3’ above grade to meet code.

Ms. Herbert asked if possible to elevate pipes.

Mr. Bumagin replied that there is a maximum distance for run and not sure if a raised pipe would be preferable to the proposed basement location.

Ms. Herbert responded that elevated venting could be a circular vent that is flush with the building wall.

Mr. Bumagin replied that his contractor does not recommend using circular vents.

Ms. Bellin asked for clarification on venting from basement windows.

Mr. replied that four vents would be installed with some out straight.

Ms. Kelleher asked if possible to install landscaping or fencing to screen vents.

Mr. Bumagin replied that could consider landscaping or fencing but concerned that landscaping might not survive.

Ms. Herbert asked how basement windows on Derby Street elevation would be treated.

Mr. Bumagin replied that the intent is to close windows and parge to match foundation.

Mr. Spang asked how windows on the side elevation would be treated.

Mr. Bumagin replied that windows would also be closed, bricked and parged.

Mr. Hart asked for clarification on drawing 3.1 which shows several appendages on building.

Mr. Bumagin replied that they are vents for gas fireplaces. The drawing shows 3 vents, but only two vents are required. He asked the Commission whether they preferred one near front corner of wall or one on roof.

Ms. Bellin asked for clarification on how basement windows will be treated since drawings show existing windows.

Mr. Bumagin replied that he was open to suggestions from the Commission.

Ms. Herbert suggested that windows be closed and parged.

Ms. Kelleher left room to print existing conditions photographs.

Ms. Kelleher returned.

Mr. Bumagin requested replacement of basement windows on rear and west elevation with new awning windows with all other basement windows to be closed and parged. .

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve installation of pipes as submitted with condition that pipes are painted to match foundation. Basement window openings are to be filled in and parged. Applicant has option to retain window openings on the west elevation and infill them with new windows. Applicant to install landscaping or fencing to screen pipes. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the location of vents as presented on drawings 3.1 and 3.2 with a preference that vents on west elevation be placed on the body of the house. Vents to be painted to match body of house. Mr. Hart seconded motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the location of gas and electric meters on field (east) side of house. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the new fir door with lights as presented. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the installation of house numbers as presented with proviso that numbers to be brass not plastic and comply with City requirements for size. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve installation of lattice and balustrade on entry stair to match similar elements on rear deck. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

The Commission discussed the proposal to add condenser units.

Mr. Spang requested both units to be placed at rear of building to limit the amount of protrusions and mechanicals on the field side since intent was to improve this elevation,

Mr. Cutting questioned whether it may be less intrusive if placed at corner and not at rear near decking lattice.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve installation of two condenser units at rear (south) of building. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Bumagin asked for clarification on the requirement for a 1½” reveal to be added to roof edge.

Mr. Spang explained the requirement and discussed with applicant whether detail was correct as built. A trim board is needed to finish edge of roofline.

Mr. Bumagin stated that he would check with contractor on the roof edge detail.

FY17 Community Preservation Plan – Request for Comment

Ms. McCrea presented overview of CPA project status.

The Commission discussed the previous letter submitted to the CPC in 2015.

Mr. Hart recommended adding language supporting use of CPA funds for private non-profit organizations.

Approval of Meeting Minutes for September 21, 2016

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the minutes of September 21, 2016 with changes noted. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

40 Derby Street

Ms. Herbert presented photographs of the new porch railings and stair railing added to the two-story porch at 40 Derby Street. She reported that the design of the railings did not meet the Certificate of Non-Applicability issued for the property for in-kind repairs.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to send a violation notice to the owner of 40 Derby Street. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to adjourn. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner