

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
November 4, 2015

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, November 4, 2015 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Kathy Harper (Vice Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, Susan Keenan, Joanne McCrea, and Larry Spang.

5-7 Chestnut Street

John & Donna Seger and Blake & Nina Anderson submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to reroof with architectural shingles. The proposed shingle is a Slateline in a English Gray color.

John Seger was present.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/14/15
- Photographs

Mr. Seger stated that the current roof is only 15 years old. The shingles, made by IKO, are failing already. They would like to replace the entire roof. The existing shingles have some texture, though they are not architectural. The side of the dormers have shingles that are made to look like slate. He showed the Commission a sample of the Slateline shingle in English Gray.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Bellin asked if the Commission has approved this shingle in the past.

Ms. Harper responded in the affirmative.

VOTE: *Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the application. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

The Commission then compared samples of the GAF Slateline with the Certainteed Hatteras shingles. The Hatteras shingle was found to be slightly wider than the Slateline shingle with wider cuts.

41 Washington Square

Robert Scholten (39-41 Washington Square Condominium Association) submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to repair the rear porch in-kind. The exception is that he proposes to remove the solid panel railing on the upper level and replace it with a bannister type railing to match the existing railing on the stairs.

Robert Scholten was present.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/19/15
- Photographs
- Rendering

Mr. Scholten stated that he recently purchased the property. The reason they would like to change the solid panel balustrade is because it is retaining water, which is in turn resulting in rot.

Ms. Herbert commented that if they prefer the solid balustrade, they could add a weep hole to the bottom.

Mr. Scholten responded that they would prefer the bannister. It would match the railing and other porches. It will be painted white to match the existing porch.

Mr. Spang asked if they will be changing out the screening beneath the porch.

Mr. Scholten responded in the negative.

Mr. Reed asked when the porch was constructed.

Mr. Scholten responded that he believes the porch was constructed in the 1990s when the building went to condominium. It does not appear to be at all similar to the porch that was there in the 1950s, which was larger and had round columns.

Mr. Reed stated that he sees no issue with granting this Certificate given that the porch is not original to the building and the application is to remove a feature that is not in keeping with the style of the building.

There was no public comment.

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

2 Chestnut Street

William Raye submitted an application for a Certificate of Non-Applicability to repoint the front of the building and repair the damaged brownstone headers. The mortar will be 5 parts sand, 1 part cement, and 1 part lime. The brownstone will be repaired using Silpro VOH with extended set time. The rotted wood on the side of the building facing Summer Street will be replaced in-kind.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/19/15
- Photographs
- Email from William Raye

Mr. Spang expressed concern with the Commission specifying a mortar mix that may not match the existing mortar.

Ms. Herbert responded that the Commission has done this before. This is a mortar mix recommended by Mr. Hart.

Ms. Bellin asked if it is possible for the mortar to match the existing without using this specific mortar mix. She would be hesitant to change the language on the certificate to go against what Mr. Hart recommends.

Mr. Spang stated that on the recent North Street Fire Station project, it took a long time and many sample tests to get the mortar color to match the existing.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: *Mr. Spang made a motion to approve application, the repointing to match the existing, similar to a historic mortar mix such as 5 part sand, 3 part lime, and 1 part cement, color to match the existing. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.*

217 Essex Street – Section 106 Review

As a continuation of a previous meeting, in accordance to the Section 106 review process, EBI Consulting requested comments from the Commission on whether a proposed telecommunications facility at 217 Essex Street will have a potential effect to historic properties.

The Salem Redevelopment Authority and the Historical Commission both previously commented on the project and proposed different opinions on how the antennae should be concealed. The revised design proposes two antennae to be installed within a single 6'-6" x 6'-6" x 12' fiberglass chimney that will sit flush with the southwest corner of the roof. The third antennae will remain flush mounted and painted to match the penthouse.

Andrey Tsikanovsky, Martin Lavin, and Thomas Hildreth were present.

Documents & Exhibits

- Letter from EBI Consulting: 10/28/15
- Revised drawings: 10/28/15
- Letter from McLane Middleton: 11/3/15
- Renderings

Mr. Hildreth stated that this is the 3rd time they have been before the Commission. He summarized that the Commission originally approved the faux chimney over the antennae on a visible steel structure. At a meeting with Ms. Herbert and several members from the Design Review Board, they proposed two taller chimneys. That design was then refined to the design they are proposing tonight. It includes a shorter chimney that is right along the face of the building and a balustrade.

Ms. Herbert asked about the design of the balustrade.

Mr. Tsikanovsky stated that there is precedence in the area for brick chimneys with the same plane as the outer wall and the balustrade.

Ms. Herbert responded that although the balustrade does not hide all of the equipment, it detracts from the other antennae.

Mr. Spang asked if the chimney could be any narrower.

Mr. Tsikanovsky responded that the panels are thicker than those used in the past. They now have the texture of brick and grout lines.

Mr. Hildreth stated that four antennae will be located inside, so it cannot be any smaller.

Mr. Spang stated that a slight set back of 6" may be better so that it is obvious that the chimney is not original to the building.

Ms. Bellin asked if the roof flashing will continue through the faux chimney, as shown in the plan, or be removed, as shown in the rendering.

Mr. Tsikanovsky responded that he believes the drawing is an error.

Mr. Spang asked for clarification that the flashing would be peeled back and the fiberglass extended to meet the parapet and the roof and all of the flashing would be hidden within the structure.

Mr. Tsikanovsky responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Spang stated that he is concerned that in construction the chimney will not match the existing brick and will look strange.

Ms. Herbert noted that if the chimney is moved back, then the balustrade should also be set back to meet the faux chimney.

Ms. Lovett stated that she recalled that if the chimney is set back too far the structural members will be visible.

Mr. Tsikanovsky responded that is correct. There will be about a 6" transition.

Mr. Spang stated that the drawings show that the membrane will continue along the roofline and the flashing will be visible through the chimney. If the chimney is pulled back, then it would look like it is distinctive rather than trying to be part of the original building.

Ms. Bellin asked if the chimney could be shifted back 6".

Mr. Tsikanovsky responded that he believes the chimney can be shifted back 6".

Ms. Herbert summarized that the Commission would like the chimney to look distinct from the building. However, Ms. Sides, Design Review Board member, preferred that the chimney look as though it is part of the building.

Ms. Herbert asked the Commission members for their preferences.

Mr. Cutting, Mr. Spang, Mr. Herbert, and Ms. Harper preferred the set back.

Ms. Bellin preferred the chimney being flush if it will look like a seamless part of the building.

Ms. Keenan and Ms. McCrea had no preference.

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

Other Business

Status of Preservation Project

Ms. Lovett updated the Commission on the status of the Preservation Plan. The Plan will be completed by the end of November.

Mr. Herbert discussed the possibility of extending the delay period for the demolition delay ordinance. She believes that there may be support within the City Council to extend the delay to 18 months.

Ms. Keenan asked if the cinderblock garages fell under the Demolition Delay Ordinance. Ms. Bellin responded that any structure over 50 years needs to receive a waiver.

Approval of Minutes

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve the minutes of 6/17/15 with comments. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried. Ms. McCrea abstained.

Correspondence

Ms. Lovett stated that she received a copy of the Peabody Essex Museum's expansion plans, if any members of the Commission would like to look at them they should let her know.

Ms. Lovett noted that Thursday, November 12 will be her last day working in Salem. She will let the Commission know when she has more information on who will be providing staff support to the Commission until a new Planner is hired by the Department of Planning and Community Development.

Ms. Harper updated the Commission on her roof shingle research. She stated that she found the architectural shingles the Commission has approved to date are almost twice the cost of other shingles. She believes the Commission should give applicants more guidance on what shingles they should look at.

Ms. Harper stated that the architectural shingles have a much higher wind resistance rating (120mph vs. 60mph). The 3-tab are prone to curling because of all the cut outs. She added that she talked with Paul Holtz at MHC about architectural shingles and he stated that they do not

have an issue with architectural shingles. They are more concerned with the removal of slate or shingle roofs.

With regards to the guarantee, Ms. Harper stated that Mr. Hart is correct. The guarantee is usually for 20 years and then is pro-rated. However, she continued that she does not feel that the Commission cannot deny people better coverage for their roofs.

Ms. Bellin stated that Mr. Hart is not present at this meeting, however she tends to agree with him that the architectural shingles distract from the house.

Ms. Harper responded that she is not sure the architectural roofs are distracting for everyone.

The Commission discussed which roofing materials required Certificates of Appropriateness versus Certificates of Non-Applicability.

Ms. Herbert stated that pictures of the different roofs would be helpful.

Mr. Spang discussed the application for a Certificate of Non-Applicability for 354 Essex Street which was to reroof and to install ice wires. He asked whether the Commission has approved ice wires before.

Mr. Cutting stated that it is not a structural part of the house and he sees no problem with them if an applicant feels they need them.

Ms. Lovett stated that she will issue the Non-Applicability for the reroof and ask the applicant to apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the ice wire.

Ms. Harper noted that there may be alternatives to the ice wire, such as ice shield and increased attic insulation.

VOTE: There being no further business, Mr. Cutting made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Spang seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Natalie BL Lovett
Community Development Planner