# SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION MINUTES January 6, 2021

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, January 6, 2021 at 6:00 pm **Zoom Virtual Meeting** Present were; Reed Cutting, Rebecca English, Stacey Norkun, Milo Martinez, Mark Meche, Mark Pattison, Erin Schaeffer, Vijay Joyce and Larry Spang (Chair).

#### 360 Essex Street

Emily Stuart submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to restore a rooftop balustrade.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/4/20
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher reported that the owner requested to withdraw the application without prejudice.

**VOTE:** Mr. Martinez made a motion to accept the withdrawal without prejudice. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

#### 125 Derby Street - continuation

Christian Haselgrove submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a fence

#### **Documents & Exhibits**

- Application: 10/13/20
- Photographs

The applicant Christian Haselgrove was present.

Mr. Haselgrove stated that he had worked with Mr. Joyce on a design drawing for the new fence based on a fence on Herbert Street. The Commission reviewed the design. Mr. Haselgrove expressed concern about the post and noted that the condominium association would like it removed. Mr. Joyce stated that retaining the post would provide a cleaner look.

Mr. Meche asked for clarification on the drawing. Chair Spang stated that he thought the fence turned the corner of the property, but it does not. The Commission agreed that posts should be hidden behind pickets like the Herbert Street fence example, which has a straight run of pickets to the gate.

Ms. Norkun asked about hardware. She asked if it would be located behind gate and, if so, how would it function from the street. Mr. Haselgrove replied that the fence company did not provide details on the hardware.

Chair Spang asked for fence height and paint color. Mr. Haselgrove replied that fence height would match height of the Herbert Street example and would be stained or painted to match trim color. Mr. Joyce and Ms. Norkun agreed that fence should be painted.

**VOTE:** Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the fence design as specified in the example with the fence to wrap the corner with corner post to be hidden. Ms. Norkun made a motion to add condition that gate hardware to be place on interior. Mr. Joyce accepted amendment. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

### 123 Federal Street - continuation

Marisa Lindholm submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for fence replacement after the fact.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/7/20
- Photographs

Marisa Lindhom and Einer Lindholm were present to discuss their project.

Ms. Kelleher presented the history of the project, noting that she had email correspondence with the applicant in March 2020 that Commission review was required for fence replacement.

Mr. Joyce presented a recap of previous discussion on the project.

Mr. Meche asked for clarification on the process for review.

**Public Comment:** 

Joyce Kenney spoke in support of the proposal.

Ron and Mary Hartfelder, 5 Monroe Street, noted that at the last meeting, the Commission did not approve the fence as designed and constructed and that they agreed with that assessment.

Susan Weldon, 106 Federal Street, expressed concern that the fence as designed and constructed was not appropriate and was built without necessary approvals.

Ms. Schaeffer asked for clarification on violation and if the Commission could place a lien on a property if work was completed without approval. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Commission has utilized this process in the past. Ms. Schaeffer clarified that if the Commission determined that the fence does not meet design criteria and is not appropriate, the Commission could require the fence to be removed and the property be restored to its previous condition with previous fencing within a specified timeframe. Mr. Meche agreed.

The Commission expressed frustration that they had tried to work with the applicant on solutions and design alternatives to address the fact that the fence as built was not appropriate in the historic district, but the applicant has been unwilling to accept these changes.

**VOTE:** Ms. Schaeffer made a motion to deny the request to approve the fence as constructed. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Schaeffer recommended that a timeframe of 90 days be set for applicant to provide a different fence design or restore the fence to its previous condition.

**VOTE:** Mr. Martinez made a motion that applicant provide a new design within 30 days or restore previous condition within 90 days. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

### 7 Carpenter Street - Violation

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting and she recommended that discussion be continued to the next meeting.

**VOTE:** Ms. Norkun made a motion to continue discussion to meeting on January 20, 2021. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

### 33 Carlton Street – Consultation on door hood design

Wendy Walsh was present to discuss potential design alternatives for a new door hood at the property. She presented her research of other door hoods in Salem, noting her preference for the door hood design at 6 Federal Court, which was constructed in 1804. She stated the safety concerns about steps without a protective overhang. She asked for direction on design, size, color, etc.

Ms. Norkun agreed that the previous door hood on the building was not appropriate and that the door hood at 6 Federal Court was a good design to replicate. She asked if the paneling could be incorporated to fit with 33 Carlton Street. Mr. Meche noted that the first item to decide was how far the hood could project over the sidewalk based on zoning requirement. Ms. Walsh stated that the hood would not go beyond the depth of the existing stairs. Ms. Norkun suggested that hood match depth of main landing. Ms. Walsh asked if it should coordinate with 3<sup>rd</sup> step up or project to 2<sup>nd</sup> step for safety and shelter. Other members agreed with matching 2<sup>nd</sup> step.

Mr. Meche noted that the arches over the doors at 6 Federal Court and 33 Carlton are different and more space will be needed between the hood and top of arch at 33 Carlton Street. Also, design will need to consider how the hood interacts with the building's string course and how it relates to windows. Ms. Norkun suggested that overhang coincide with sandstone string course to keep horizontal view. Mr. Meche suggested that hood match color of sandstone. Mr. Pattison recommended that hood replicate thickness and depth of the recessed panels at 6 Federal Court. Ms. Norkun suggested that existing railing and new brackets work together. Mr. Pattison recommended considering roof material and how rain will shed off hood, which may necessitate installation of gutters and downspouts or scuppers on each side.

Ms. Walsh asked if Commission has jurisdiction over light fixtures. Ms. Kelleher noted that Commission only reviews free-standing lights; attached lights are exempt from review. Mr. Pattison and Mr. Joyce both agreed that they prefer an historic appearing light fixture. Ms. Norkun suggested 360 Essex Street as a good example of overhang with hanging lantern.

#### 6 Federal Court – Request to modify Certificate of Appropriateness

Ms. Kelleher presented the request to leave new roof hatch in natural finish and not paint black as condition by the Certificate of Appropriateness.

**VOTE:** Ms. Norkun made a motion to approve leaving roof hatch as is without painting black. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

## Other

## Roofing approvals

Ms. Norkun asked about applications for architectural roof shingles. Ms. Kelleher agreed to put together a list of previously approved shingles by address and distribute to the Commission.

**VOTE:** Mr. Martinez made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00PM

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher Community Development Planner