

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
January 21, 2021

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, January 21, 2021 at 6:00 pm **Zoom Virtual Meeting** Present were; Reed Cutting, Rebecca English, Stacey Norkun , Milo Martinez, Mark Meche, Mark Pattison, Erin Schaeffer and Larry Spang. Not present: Vijay Joyce.

140 Derby Street

Derby Properties LLC submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for architectural roof shingles

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/4/21
- Photographs

Patrick Shea, applicant and roofer at Professional Roofing Contractors, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Shea stated that he recently purchased the building and would like to replace the roof because the shingles are in such poor condition that roof boards are visible, and GAF Timberline are proposed. The existing aluminum flashing at the eaves will be removed and new copper drip edge flashing would be installed at the rakes and eaves. The existing gutters and downspouts will remain but the antenna at the ridgeline would also be removed.

Ms. Norkun stated that the Commission doesn't favor Timberline because the angular cuts create a trapezoid shape whereas the Slateline has straight vertical cuts. Mr. Meche asked why the applicant selected Timberline over Slateline. Mr. Shea replied that 6-10 times a year he's fixing Slateline shingles because their shingles are independent tabs connected to one shingle; each tab is individual so there's less integrity in each shingle making them fragile and prone to uplift in high winds. A standard 3tab is also individual tabs and susceptible to wind and uplift. The architectural shingle is one shingle that gives the look of multiple shingles. Chair Spang noted the additional color variation in the Timberline that the Commission believes creates a busy looking roof. Ms. Kelleher noted the Commission has approved Owens-Corning in the district. Ms. Norkun added that the Commission has only approved some as a beta test. Mr. Cutting stated that he would vote to approve it in a dark color since the roof is minimally visible.

Public Comment:

Joyce Kenney. Likes the Owen-Corning which is better quality and has been installed at various roofs about the City.

Jessica Murdock, 10 Smith Street, Salem. Roof is in poor condition now, if they went with Slateline it looks like imitation slate, but it would be inappropriate if it never had slate on it. The proposed color is muted. Timberline shingles should be appropriate and as a roofer, Mr. Shea's opinion should be considered valuable.

Mr. Martinez requested the applicant's preference. Mr. Shea replied GAF Slateline over Owens-Corning. Many sellers try to enhance their colors when the actual layering and color contrast is more subtle. The roof shingle replacement will be done soon.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve Timberline GAF shingles in Charcoal Grey with copper flashing. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Schaeffer, Cutting, English, Meche and Spang were in favor. Martinez and Norkun were not in favor. Six members were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she would compile a list of roofs for the Commission to review where these products were installed.

142-148 Derby Street

Patrick Shea submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement (request to withdrawal) and approval of HVAC unit (after the fact)

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/4/21
- Photographs

Mr. Shea stated that he is renovating a second-floor apartment and was planning to replace windows. However, he has since learned that because these windows are visible from Derby Street, they require review by the Commission. To replace the windows with a window appropriate in the district would increase the cost of the project. Therefore, he is eliminating them from the project scope due to budget constraints and the existing windows will be restored instead.

VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to accept the request to withdraw without prejudice. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Schaeffer, Cutting, Norkun, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

HVAC Unit

Mr. Shea stated that when he submitted his application, staff noticed that extra HVAC units were placed on top of the roof of Mercy Tavern that were approved by the Commission. Mercy Tavern installed ductless air and two condensers were moved elsewhere on the roof resulting in a total of 4 units on the roof. The two extra units have since been removed. However, the white duct cover going down the side elevation is still in place. Mr. Shea noted that these are electrical and not refrigerant lines. Ms. Norkun suggested concealing the rooftop condensers similar to the screening used on the VFW exhaust fans. Mr. Meche replied that there was a fan at the edge of the VFW roof but no refrigerant lines. Mr. Pattison suggested relocating the refrigerant lines to the rear of the building. Mr. Meche suggested connecting through the roof with flashing rather than down the face of the building side of the building. Chair Spang noted that in photos from 2018 the lines were present but were less noticeable since they were not covered by white vinyl covers.

Public Comment:

Mike Hardy, Bentley Street. Suggested painting the refrigerant line cover so it blends with the brick or go directly through the roof. Mr. Meche noted that if this came as a package it could have been adjusted, but the white lines alone should be adjusted and painting it may not be the best solution.

Ms. Norkun suggested square lattice to conceal the rooftop condenser. Chair Spang replied that the lines should not be visible, lattice will provide the necessary airflow, and the applicant should consider all his options. Ms. Kelleher recommended a site visit and noted that lattice may draw more attention to the rooftop unit. The applicant should discuss the matter with the tenant and see what is involved with relocating the units and the refrigerant lines.

Mike Hardy. Suggested moving the units to the middle of the roof where they will be less visible and closer to the disconnect on the neighboring second-floor wall. Mr. Shea replied that there is one roof drain, kitchen exhaust and skylight on the roof. The units were placed on the roof to avoid seeing them from the neighboring windows.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the permit for the installation of the unit went through the plumbing department and not the building department, which did not trigger a review by the Historic Commission. Mr. Meche added that trade permits don't always get flagged for review.

Ms. Schaffer agreed that lattice at the condensers would be overkill since this is commercial space and not residential. There are also no other clear alternatives as an option other than removal. Refrigerant lines are part of commercial space and there may be no other practical place for them.

VOTE: Schaffer made a motion to approve condensers as is. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Schaffer, Cutting, Norkun, English, Meche, Spang in favor and the motion so carried.

Chair Spang suggested they ask that the vertical piping be moved, hidden, or relocated.

VOTE: Schaeffer made a motion to continue the refrigerant line discussion to see if they could be move inside or painted. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Schaffer, Cutting, Norkun, English, Meche, Spang in favor and the motion so carried.

175 Federal Street

Adam Krauth and Nicole Bergman submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/4/21
- Photographs

Ms. Bergman stated that they want to make the two unit building lead safe. At the rear of the house on the lower floor, they will replace five 2/2 windows that aren't original with Marvin Ultimate windows. Window #6 on the second floor, which is original, will be repaired by The Window Woman. Three windows in the corner of the ell are visible from the street and the others are visible from Fowler Street.

Ms. Norkun asked about the proposed coil aluminum covering described in the contractor's proposal. Ms. Bergman stated that the sill, jamb, and window well would remain, but the impact areas would be covered with white aluminum to cover the lead paint. It will resemble white paint. Mr. Meche noted that it resembles a jamb liner. Chair Spang stated that the liner would only be visible when the window is open but may not be noticeable. Ms. Bergman added that it has no sheen or texture and is thin enough to fit between the sash and the jamb. Window #6 at the second-floor will have the jamb liner to protect

tenants from lead dust. It's meant to be a child guard for mouthable surfaces where a small child could chew on it.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

VOTE: Ms. Schaeffer made a motion to approve as submitted. Mr. Meche seconded the motion.

Amendment: Martinez suggested an amendment to stipulate that the aluminum will go inside the storm window and not beyond the exterior sills. Meche seconded the amendment. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Schaffer, Cutting, Norkun, English, Meche, Spang in favor and the motion so carried.

Request for determination of historic significance for Bertram Field.

The Commission agreed to continue the discussion to the next meeting.

Review of completed projects to determine compliance for Certificates of Appropriateness: 7 Carpenter Street and 49 Summer Street.

49 Summer Street

Philip Marchand was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the retaining wall was approved with a block of a different size and coloration. Mr. Marchand stated that he asked his mason to use what the Commission requested but his mason said it wouldn't be sufficient to hold the mount of earth that needed to be held back. He asked the mason to find something that was close. He noted that Gedney Street is outside of the McIntyre District. Ms. Kelleher replied that the wall is visible from Summer Street, so the Commission has jurisdiction.

Chair Spang stated that their initial approval had some degree of an historic nature with concrete blocks in a smaller pattern. The 8-inch x 16-inch block used is more modern and not consistent with the district. The mason could have used a fabric that reaches into the soil to provide more stability. Mr. Martinez noted that the approval was for a maximum 30-inch high wall making what was installed already out of compliance and the cap increases the height. The Commission knew that due to the slope, one side would be taller, but they also wanted to match the three different masonry surfaces and that's why they selected the pummeled stone. The Commission should have had an opportunity to review the changes.

Mr. Pattison suggested the mason build a full brick veneer mortared to the stone dry wall to match the house with a cap, it's a dry wall which has no mortar. Ms. Schaeffer agreed with Mr. Pattison. Chair Spang suggested they use the blocks that were approved or install a new brick face and lower the height of the wall to decrease some of the pressure. Laybacks or tie it to the soil can be spaced 12-inches apart with a filter fabric to stabilize the soil. Mr. Meche noted that it would be difficult for face brick to be adhered without horizontal reinforcing. The top course could be removed so the cap is lowered, the wall painted white, and the grade beyond contoured. Mr. Martinez noted that the applicant thought a low wall would invite sitting and suggested setting back each course 1-inch to counteract the weight of the earth.

Chair Spang was not in favor of painting the wall and suggested the wall be adjusted to fit what was approved since moisture and freeze-thaw cycles could push the brick forward. Mr. Marchand asked

whether the look or height was the issue. Chair Spang replied both and suggested the concerns be discussed with the manufacturer. Ms. Schaeffer added that the material, shape and texture of what was installed isn't historic and it's also higher than what was approved.

VOTE: Mr. Meche made a motion to continue. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Schaeffer, Cutting, English, Meche, Spang in favor and the motion so carried.

7 Carpenter Street

Harry Fraser was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Pattison stated that he met the applicant on site to determine possible solutions, but the new downspout was installed instead. Ms. Kelleher noted that the applicant didn't return to the Commission for discussion of proposed modifications and added a new downspout in the middle of the side elevation.

Mr. Fraser stated that after he received the approval the job was cancelled due to Covid-19 but the company he hired installed it on their own at a time when he wasn't available to give them direction. He wanted to solve their water overflow problem and Scott Kidney, the contractor, thought that only the front façade was the issue, not the side façade. They put a rubber roof on the box bay, installed the middle downspout which eliminated their drainage issues. There is a 60-foot run with only one downspout at each end so the third downspout shouldn't be considered unreasonable. The overflow from the middle of the roof was cascading down the shiplap façade and deteriorating the boxed bay roof below. They have the same issue on the rear wing, and they installed a downspout to resolve their basement flooding. What was agreed to was enlarging the drain opening size from the gutter into the downspout but there was a miscommunication. The gutters have not been replaced.

Mr. Pattison believed they increased the size of the inlets at the same time they added the downspout

Chair Spang stated that a downspout at the middle of the façade was what they wanted to avoid, to maintain the historic quality of the property and larger downspouts may have solved the issue. Mr. Fraser noted that the proposed downspout at the front of building was eliminated.

Chair Spang suggested they ask roofer to plug hole of middle downspout to see if the larger inlets do job before they approve the additional downspout. Mr. Cutting stated that the additional downspout did solve the problem but it's not the worst resolution. Mr. Fraser replied that the downspout is copper and can be painted to help it disappear. Mr. Meche noted that it would have been better if it were placed 12-inches away from the bow window or behind the box bay. All the downspouts start at the bracket so the new one could have also aligned with one of them. Mr. Fraser stated that a condenser behind the bow lead to the placement in front of the box bay. Mr. Pattison noted that he is okay with the placement of the new downspout.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to accept the downspout as installed but to paint it to match the façade. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Schaeffer, Cutting, Norkun, English, Meche, Spang in favor and the motion so carried.

Other

Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the November 4, 2020 regular meeting minutes were reviewed.

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve the November 4, 2020 meeting minutes. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Schaeffer, Cutting, Norkun, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

The minutes of the November 18, 2020 regular meeting minutes were reviewed.

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve the November 18, 2020 meeting minutes. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Schaeffer, Cutting, Norkun, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

The minutes of the December 2, 2020 regular meeting minutes were reviewed.

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve the December 2, 2020 meeting minutes. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. Roll Call: Pattison, Martinez, Schaeffer, Cutting, Norkun, English, Meche, Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Greenlawn Cemetery

Ms. Kelleher stated that the Master Plan consultant Martha Lyon wants a roundtable discussion to speak with some Board members with an interest in the cemetery. They will be looking at historic resources: structures, fence, gravestones, bridge over a pond, stairs, monuments, cannons, and the future of the cemetery as an active burial site. A virtual public meeting will be held on February 1st from 6:30-8PM. Chair Spang suggested appointing a sub-committee. Meche, Schaeffer and English noted their interest in joining a sub-committee.

Adjournment

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:30PM

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner