

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
October 16, 2019

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, October 16, 2019 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room. Present were: Reed Cutting, Rebecca English, David Hart, Vijay Joyce, Milo Martinez, Stacey Norkun, Mark Pattison, Erin Schaeffer. Not present: Stacey Norkun

8 Lynn Street

Patricia Murtagh submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint colors

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/20/19
- Photographs
- Paint chips

Patricia Murtagh was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Murtagh wanted to return to the original or slightly similar paint colors: Benjamin Moore flat “White” trim around the windows and door, “Spanish Moss” clapboard, and “Cranberry Bog” door to match the existing. Mr. Hart suggested a semi-gloss rather than a flat white. Mr. Pattison added that the flat paint is textured and gets dirty easily. Ms. Murtagh agreed to use a semi-gloss. Ms. Schaeffer noted that Navajo White is written in the report as the trim color. Ms. English agreed and noted that the trim in the photo provided looks Navajo White.

Public comment:

Laurie Hart, 112-114 Federal Street, stated that she had no issue with the proposed colors.

The owner of 13 Lynn Street (name not known) stated that she had no issue with the proposed color.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Martinez requested that the “White” color be determined. Ms. Murtagh replied that she will submit samples of the “White” and “Red” colors.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that she is comfortable with an in-kind match that matches the colors in the photo, particularly the “Navajo White.”

**VOTE:** Ms. Schaeffer made a motion to approve the following paint colors to match the 1993 photos: “Spanish Moss” body color, “Navajo White” trim color, “Cranberry Bog” door color. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Mr. Hart amended the motion to include the “Navajo White” in a semi-gloss paint. Mr. Pattison seconded the amended motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

1 Brown Street

Peabody Essex Museum submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install new granite post

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/25/19
- Photographs

Stephen Mallory, Manager of Historic Structures at PEM, was present to discuss the project.

The Commission agreed that the Daniel Bray House looks great. Mr. Mallory stated that the exterior is completed except for door hardware, which is being made in Colonial Williamsburg. The new issue is that the house juts out into the sidewalk by 2-feet and this corner of the building has been hit twice by industrial snow blowers. Snow removal is mostly done at night when the corner of the house is harder to see. Several houses in the area have a granite pier to protect the corner of the house from similar damage, and they want to install one on this corner. They proposed installing historic salvaged Cape Ann granite and have already identified the stone. It would have an 8-inch x 8-inch with a rock face not a smooth finish. They want to install it before the winter, so it can be both a visual and physical barrier to protect the house.

Mr. Joyce asked if the proposed height would be 4-feet. Mr. Mallory replied that the height would be like others in town, at a handrail height, which could still get buried in a Nor'easter.

Public comment:

Jessica Herbert, 70 Webb Street, asked if the granite pier can be incorporated into the new fence. Mr. Mallory replied no since it does not align due to a 30-inch difference between the corner of the house and the fence.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Cutting asked how much of the granite pier would be below ground. Mr. Mallory replied 3-feet below grade, 7-feet total length.

Mr. Mallory added that there was once a line of brick townhouses next to the Bray House that once protected this corner, that have since been removed.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve 4-foot-high salvaged rock faced, 8-inch x 8-inch granite post. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 4 Hamilton Street

Alexis and Greg Dwyer submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint colors.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/25/19
- Photographs
- Paint chips

Alexis Dwyer, owner, and Jessica Herbert were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Herbert stated that the trim will be a "Medium Green", the body "Katsura," the shutters "James Brown," and the front door and window sashes "Wicked."

Public comment: No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Pattison stated that the trim should be semi-gloss not flat. Ms. Herbert noted that the primer will be tinted, the body and trim satin, and the front door and shutters semi-gloss. Ms. Kelleher noted that other than for doors, the Commission recommends gloss or semi-gloss.

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the colors as submitted with the option to use gloss or semi-gloss on the shutters and door. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 4 Hamilton Street

Alexis and Greg Dwyer submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove entry vestibule.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/27/19
- Photographs

Alexis Dwyer, owner, and Jessica Herbert were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Herbert stated that the Architect was going to replace the plywood and modern door vestibule. They now want to remove it for winter, document any original details, and they will decide if it should be rebuilt next year. She discovered that the partition is truncated but underneath there may be preserved parts of a former partition. The door also opens onto the sidewalk so a double shutter door is proposed although the final design details need to be resolved. It is unknown when the vestibule was installed, possibly in the 1940's or 50's. This is a gardener's cottage so many details are minimal to a typical Greek Revival. Want to remove what is there now and they will return with a proposed design.

Public comment: No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to accept as submitted. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

0 North Pine Street - CONTINUATION

Jamie and Dan Graham submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter window.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/16/19
- Photographs
- Shop drawings by Parrett Windows & Doors dated 10-9-19

Jamie and Dan Graham were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher stated this application is continued from the previous meeting where only Mr. Joyce, Ms. Schaeffer, Mr. Martinez, and Mr. Cutting were present. The applicant was asked to return with specifications for the new window. Ms. Graham stated that the new window is for safety and egress. It's the only window on that level and the Building Inspector told them it needs to be operable for egress and no half-moon type windows large enough to be considered an egress exists. Of their three option, the option they preferred was a double-hung window with an arch top window above. Mr. Joyce noted that the dormers were originally arch top so the proposed windows will match those. He recommended installing a half screen not a full screen. Mr. Pattison asked for the egress opening size. Ms. Graham replied 3.3 square-feet in Massachusetts.

Mr. Spang asked if the trim around the window will match the other window. Ms. Graham replied yes, it will match the existing as much as possible, but this building was originally a barn so it has less detail and flat trim. Ms. English asked if the small windows were operable. Ms. Graham replied yes.

Ms. Spang requested the proposed paint colors. Ms. Graham replied that the paint colors will match the existing colors.

Public comment: No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to accept as presented. Mr. Joyce amended the motion to include a half screen not full screen at the egress window. Ms. Schaeffer seconded the motion. All four members present were in favor and the motion so carried.**

122 Derby Street - CONTINUATION

Robert Burkinshaw submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness a window replacement.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/30/19
- Photographs

Robert Burkinshaw and Jacqueline Russell, owners, were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Burkinshaw stated that they are seeking window approval and provided a plan of what the contractor wants to install. Ms. Kelleher stated that a rough sketch was sent, there will be three separate windows set into the existing framing between existing studs, not a single unit. Mr. Burkinshaw noted that the existing condition is three separate vinyl windows. The new will be Brosco true-divided lite windows. Mr. Joyce noted that alternates were in the submittal and the new windows should be wood, as well as a half screen not a full screen. Mr. Burkinshaw replied that the new windows will be wood.

Mr. Spang asked if the wood goes over the stud. Mr. Burkinshaw replied that there is one stud between each window and the window casings will butt up against one another. All new end windows will be operable but the center window is not operable. They also use the windows to fit equipment that can't fit through the doors. The side windows will also be replaced with wood, not vinyl.

Mr. Spang asked if the window sills will also butt up against one another or be one continuous sill. Mr. Joyce noted that the trim could come separate and new continuous trim gets added after so it won't look disjointed or the windows will need to be wider apart. Mr. Pattison noted that the contractor will need to verify dimensions first.

Public comment:

Jessica Herbert, 70 Webb Street, asked if the window sill will have extension ears so there is more of a reveal to the window. Mr. Pattison replied that there are no ears on any of the existing windows, which is an antique detail that would look good on the building. It would also look good as a stand-alone detail on just these windows. Mr. Joyce noted that a separate longer sill could be ordered.

Mr. Spang requested a drawing from the carpenter in addition to the drawing submitted by the Contractor, to ensure that all trim details are followed; sill thickness, ears, etc. Ms. Kelleher suggested it be made into a condition. Mr. Burkinshaw noted that it will add character since there will no longer be any shutters. Mr. Pattison agreed to meet with the Carpenter.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the application as submitted, with the carpenter providing a trim detail to be coordinated Mr. Pattison. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

110 Federal Street #2 - CONTINUATION

Linda A. Clifford and Patricia Barry submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install an HVAC mini-split system.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/5/19
- Photographs

Linda A. Clifford and Patricia Barry were present to discuss the project.

*Mr. Hart recused himself as an abutter.*

Ms. Clifford stated that she owns the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor unit. Ms. Kelleher noted that the applicant originally wanted to install the HVAC unit on the roof but that would be visible. The condenser will now be located at the rear of the building next to a rear ell. This house is visible from three sides. Ms. Clifford stated that from Andover Street, the garage blocks most of the rear and the piping would be 12" from the corner board and painted to match the corner board. Mr. Spang asked if the piping will touch the eave. Ms. Clifford replied no, it will enter the house, a couple inches below the ceiling of the bedroom, and will be painted to match the color of the house. It will be located in a common area for the other condominium owners. She wants to add plantings around it for sound screening. From Andover Street it would only be seen at the area of the third-floor unit.

Mr. Pattison asked if the 1<sup>st</sup> floor unit owner had any concerns with the proposed location. Ms. Clifford replied that her condominium mates are on board with it and she will do her best to disguise it. The first-floor window in this area is the bathroom, and all the bathrooms are stacked. Mr. Joyce asked for the shape of the proposed pipe. Ms. Clifford replied round. Mr. Spang asked if there will be a housing and a cover where it enters the building. Ms. Kelleher noted that the specifications state that the pipe will be 4½-inch diameter. Ms. Schaeffer noted that she would want to see the conduit as close to the downspout as possible and away from other obstructions to simplify its path. Mr. Spang suggested it be pushed against the corner board and painted white to resemble a downspout. Ms. Schaeffer agreed.

Public comment:

Laurie Hart, 104 Federal Street, stated that she had no issue with the proposed work. The units have bedroom windows that look down on this area. She spoke with the applicant about adding shrubs or a sound screen as future remediation.

Jessica Herbert, 70 Webb Street, asked for unit dimensions and recommended requesting a letter from the other condominium owners stating their support for the project. Ms. Clifford replied that the unit will be 32 11/16" L x 35-inches W and the unit will be elevated. Ms. Herbert suggested screening the unit with lattice and asked if the one pipe be enough for this unit. Ms. Clifford replied yes.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Joyce stated that he preferred the pipe to be located against the corner board. Mr. Pattison added that it could be visible from the street if it is installed next to the corner board and gutter. Mr. Spang suggested installing it behind the downspout on the side, or pushed into the corner, or the interior corner. Several options could be approved. Mr. Joyce suggested the interior corner over the siding/trim or on the corner board; however, painting it to match the body color means you eliminate the shadow lines of the clapboards. Mr. Spang noted that abutting the corner board could make it look bigger and several joints would be required for that location.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to accept the HVAC mini split system with three options; Option 1– piping to be placed at the interior corner painted the same color as the side body, Option 2 – piping to be installed against the corner board painted the same color as the trim, or Option 3 – piping to be installed against the corner board painted the trim color. Mr. Martinez suggested installing the piping at the interior side elevation vertically and then running it horizontally along the clapboard.**

Mr. Joyce amended the motion to accept Option 1 – Installing the vent against the side of the larger window and painted to match the siding or Option 2 – Installing the piping against the corner board and painting it the same color as the trim. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Hart asked who she needs to be contacted if sound becomes problematic. Ms. Kelleher replied that sounds are the jurisdiction of the Building Inspector and the installation of screening falls upon the applicant.

### 337 Essex Street

Proprietors of the Salem Athenaeum submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace sign.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/1/19
- Photographs

*Mr. Hart recused himself as a recent Salem Athenaeum Board of Trustee member*

Jean Marie Prociuous was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Prociuous stated that they want to replace the existing front sign and add a smaller sign that includes their hours. Most of the activity happens at the rear of the building so it's hard to see if they are open or that the lights are. They will move the sign just inside the fence but closer to the street. They will not add lights, it will be visible by the street lights. The sign would be white, metal, and the words will be printed onto the sign and the letters will not be raised. The post and cross arm style post will be wood painted black.

Ms. Schaeffer requested the sign size. Ms. Prociuous replied 3' W x 4' H. The current sign is 3' W x 2' H. The hours sign will be approximately 1' H and attached to the bottom of the larger sign.

#### Public comment:

Christian Bleidt asked for the PEM or Ropes Mansion sign sizes for comparison. Ms. Kelleher replied that she did not have those dimensions at this time.

Sue Formica, stated that she thought the proposed signs are a good idea.

Tracey Ware, stated that she thought the proposed signs are too big and too modern.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Prociuous stated that they can compromise on the size of the sign.

Mr. Cutting stated that the proposed post resembles a real estate sign. Mr. Martinez agreed with the public, it resembles a commercial sign. This a big departure from the existing sign. Ms. Prociuous noted that people complain that they can't identify their building, so they made the sign larger.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that signage is only one piece of marketing, websites can have the additional information may not be appropriate on this sign and location. She stated that she didn't like the existing style sign. Mr. Pattison agreed that the cross-beam post looks like real estate sign. Ms. Prociuous noted that their building is one flight up and difficult to see. Ms. English suggested they reduce the hours portion of the sign. Ms. Schaeffer suggested a small plaque on the building with the hours. Ms. Kelleher noted that it's difficult to see the front from the street. Mr. Spang agreed with Ms. Schaeffer and noted that the sign feels as if they are trying to get the vehicles and not the pedestrians with the proposed sign size. He suggested placing the hours on fence and a small sign on cross beam sign. Ms. Prociuous noted that a second fence would need to be on the fence. Ms. Schaeffer noted that a

framed sign for events does capture people's attention. Mr. Spang noted his concerns with size of the sign and its resemblance of a realtor sign. Ms. Prociouso stated that the Phillips House Museum is part of their logo. Mr. Joyce stated that the bracket should speak to the house it's trying to represent and that can be changed by using a Colonial Revival style bracket. People will Google them to get additional information. They should have the name only and reduce the size of the sign.

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting on November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2019. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Ms. Kelleher stated that she will verify the dimensions of the other signs on the street.

#### 6 Federal Court - CONTINUATION

Federal Court Realty, LLC submitted an application for a Certificate of Hardship to demolish carriage house.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/5/19
- Photographs

*Mr. Hart recused himself as an abutter.*

Mary Richard of Trustee of Federal Court Realty Trust and Attorney John Fitzpatrick were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Fitzpatrick stated that the discussion was continued to see what progress they could make in resolving their Application for Hardship. He presented the stamped engineers report from H&O Engineers stating "It is our professional opinion that this structure is unstable and unrepairable. The structure shall be demolished in its entirety." The Commission raised concerns and a statement from 15 neighbors in support of demolishing the barn. There was some discussion at the last hearing regarding the viability of someone dismantling the barn and removing it from the site. He sent multiple communications to historic preservation contractors offering them the barn but there has been no response to date. Local real estate agents were also solicited offering the barn for \$1 but there was no response. Neighbors are concerned and they want it removed. He suggested the City of Salem could relocate the barn with CPA funds since it could be an appropriate use for CPA funding. He believes they have done their due diligence in terms of follow-up. They have had initial conversations with the North Bennet Street School. A meeting is scheduled for Oct 24<sup>th</sup>; however, the dismantling of this building as a school project must be reviewed for the safety for the students and viability. He added that the owner has received offer from developers but they were seeking to buy the land for redevelopment not the carriage barn to relocate.

Mr. Spang requested the list of contacts that were approached and asked if they preserved the barn in place could they use the land. Ms. Richard replied no, there is no access to it. Atty. Fitzpatrick added that the owner wants to use it as open space as a buffer for the neighbors. This has been an obvious hardship to the Owner, the residence has historic significance and some preservation work has been completed. The residence is the Owner's main focus for this property. Ms. Richard stated that her family purchased the land with the barn in 1962 due to the threat of redevelopment next door. The Commission had the opportunity to vote in favor of renovating the carriage barn in 2003 but it ultimately ended in a court case and a criminal lawsuit against her father for not maintaining the barn. The Fire Department placed a red 'X' on the building indicating that it was unsafe for emergency personnel.

Mr. Martinez stated that he reviewed the 2003 application and believes that people would be excited about the proposal if it were made today. The application was 'Denied without prejudice' in 2003 because no one came to the meeting. Ms. Richard replied that the Peabody's attorney didn't attend the meeting without notifying her family. Atty. Fitzpatrick added that Mr. Peabody was arraigned in court, they went into civil litigation, and there were numerous continuations of meetings. The City settled but wanted their own engineer to evaluate the property.

The Peabody's did what they were told to do with the building, but the building has continued to decline, and it prevented the restoration of the house.

Ms. Richard noted that in 2003 people didn't want another carriage house as a residential unit because the neighborhood was dense. Mr. Spang recalled the Peabody family wanting to save the face of the barn and build a more modern structure behind it; however, the building hasn't been maintained in all these years.

Mr. Pattison asked if at the 2003 meetings, people were more concerned with the condition of the house. Atty. Fitzpatrick replied that the barn was the focus and the owners had to prioritize, but there was no benign neglect as suggested, because they complied with the City's request. Mr. Pattison noted that the repairs made at the request of the city were intended to be temporary fixes not meant to be permanent. Ms. Richard noted that the barn protected 6 Federal Court because nothing can go beside it, because there was no access. Atty. Fitzpatrick noted that a neighbor at the previous meeting mentioned that the barn was significantly deteriorated when the Peabody family acquired it.

Mr. Pattison asked if restoration work on the house was required by the City. Mr. Richard replied no. Atty. Fitzpatrick replied that the Peabody family has limited funds, want to address the alternate options.

Mr. Cutting stated that North Bennet Street School making a site visit is a good sign of progress. Ms. Kelleher stated that she can help with the dialog on the private property if the owner is comfortable with it. Ms. Richard replied yes, the department heads name is Stephen O'Shaughnessy. Atty. Fitzpatrick noted that it's good to see this positive dynamic.

Ms. Kelleher stated that because this property is in a local historic district the Commission can deny a request for demolition. The Commission can also approve relocation, but it may never have been done before. Mr. Pattison noted that there are many examples of properties being placed into receivership. Ms. Kelleher replied that Salem has done that with other properties.

Public comment:

Jessica Herbert. Since the last meeting she spoke with someone who could move the building. If someone wants to move it, the lot needs to be discussed in terms of redevelopment.

Mike Becker, 2 School Street Court. Interested in purchasing the structure or the structure with the land. It would not be easy to move, but he will survey it. Atty. Fitzpatrick replied that his client's interest would be to sell the structure only.

Maria Delareas, 95 Federal Street, Unit 4. Her roof deck overlooks the barn and she is concerned with the various animals it harbors. It has continued to deteriorate, and the roof started to collapse last winter. Bolts are holding it together, the structure is starting to bow, and pieces of it continue to fall off. There is not much room between it, the utility fence, and parking lot. Elements of the building could be worth some money but the structure is a hazard and eye sore that should be professionally removed.

Jane Arlander, 93 Federal Street & abutter. Everyone should put themselves in the applicant's shoes, her parents may not have done everything they should with the property, but all the blame shouldn't be on the current applicant. Some neighbors complain and call it an eye sore while others ask about safety vs. preservation. The structure is unsafe, and the police have been there since the last meeting to check the property. The applicant's resources should be put towards the residence. How long should this be dragged out? She's for preservation but rebuilding but this structure is too far gone. Even in 2003 the building was so unstable 3 sides were proposed to come down and new facades with fake windows. She questioned how long this will be dragged out because neighbors are waiting.



Jim Glynn, 103 Federal Street. This structure is 30-40 yards away from his property. People smoke in there which could lead to a fire. He doesn't want it there and it's crazy to keep everyone waiting.

Jamie Graham, 0 North Pine. He noted that he is new resident to Salem and if this building was available as a new residence, he would have wanted to buy it; selling it with the land would be a win-win. He asked if an easement had ever been studied for this structure or a shared path open to the public. Mike Becker replied that the 6 Federal Court would need to authorize that. Ms. Schaeffer added that a sub-division of property is done through the Zoning Board of Appeals. 'A public way' is also a sub-division that goes before the Planning Board and Zoning Board. An act by the board would be necessary with an agreement with the property owner.

Christian Bliedt, 4 Federal Court. Lives at the neighboring property and is against redevelopment since there is no access on this dead-end street. He is in favor of it being demolished, but perhaps there could be an agreement not to make it into condominiums, which he is against. He would like to see the 6 Federal Court renovated, but stated that he would not want community funds to be use since the owner does not live in the community.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the City has carriage house regulations regarding the conversion of an out-building to a residential use for the restoration of a historic residence.

Jennifer Luct, 103 Federal Street. Stated that the current conversation is inappropriate.

Connie Arlander, 91 Federal Street. Asked if the Commission can force an owner to sell their land. Mr. Spang replied no.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Mr. Martinez stated that someone asked them to put themselves in the position of the applicant and if he didn't have the money what would he do? At 30-feet x 40-feet each floor is approximately 12,00SF per floor, he would subdivide the land, implement an easement, and use the funds to rehabilitate the residence.

Ms. Kelleher stated that there are preservation avenues to advertise and see if there is any interest. Mr. Spang noted that the application for a demolition delay is meant to pursue other avenues, but the Commission must do their due diligence to see what can be done. In concern of the neighbors, the owner can close-up any holes in the building and add plywood. Atty. Fitzpatrick replied that the previous Peabody family owners were told to go down a similar path, while the Engineers report call for it to be demolished.

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

*Mr. Hart returned.*

#### 12 Mall Street

North Ventures, Inc. submitted an application for a Waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish a house.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/27/19
- Photographs

Dave Potter, owner, and Jessica Herbert were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Potter bought the structure with the hopes of restoring it, was issued a permit, and went to the ZBA with the hopes of restoring it. After beginning the project, he discovered that the house has never been taken care of and the

sills and walls are rotted, the roof rafters are undersized, and the floor joists are bowed. A structural engineer has deemed the structure unrepairable. He contacted Jessica Herbert and Seger Architects, who suggested replicating it. He constructed a similar structure in 2005, the Thomas Witt House in Lynn, MA, which he purchased from the local housing authority, restored, and constructed three townhouses at the rear. It's an award-winning house. Replicating is the best solution, he will salvage what he can, and make some modernizations. He will add a dormer, remove the lean-to additions to eliminate the neighbor encroachment concerns and provide more open space.

Ms. Herbert stated that she read the engineering report and spoke to someone who does preservation work who agreed with the level of deterioration of the structure. Many changes and modernizations were done in the 1960's and 70's. What was left has rotted and it's a candidate for demolition. The Commission has no jurisdiction over the new plans but the owner can request review by the Historic Commission and HSI. Ms. Herbert would eliminate the Nantucket dormer but recreate the single dormer on the roof. Mr. Potter noted that the Planning Board was okay with the reinstallation of a front dormer. Ms. English asked if there was a rear dormer. Mr. Potter replied that there had been a rear dormer but it has been removed.

Ms. Cutting requested a site visit. Mr. Spang noted that the Commission has 6 months to do their due diligence, as they have done in the past. Mr. Potter added that he believes there is nothing more to be done, due to the existing construction methods. Mr. Hart stated that he walked by the building and believes the structural engineer was leaning toward demolition. He wasn't able to see the interior but he stated that the exterior wasn't in terrible condition. Mr. Potter replied that the foundation and soil has shrunk and the foundation is missing mortar.

Mr. Spang noted the difference with the draft from Seger Architects is that the dormer in question would be eliminated. He asked if the two chimneys would be removed. Mr. Potter believed the dormer was needed due to the 5 over 12 roof pitch and he wanted to replicate the chimneys with applied brick and make them faux chimneys.

#### Public Comment:

Kerry Murphy, 10 ½ Mall Street. This structure has been a problematic property since 2013. Vermin occupy it, there are cracks in the foundation, and pieces are falling off. The architect said the rear addition would be removed, it's very narrow and odd.

Ed Murley, 7 Mall Street. Wants to know if a single family or multiple units is proposed. Ms. Herbert replied that the 3-unit count would be replicated but with sprinklers.

Sue Formica, 13 Mall Street. The structure has been in this condition for a year and she wants to see it finished. She agrees with not having a rear addition so there is more parking, but she is interested in how it would be demolished. Mr. Potter replied that the demolition would be done professionally.

Mike Becker, 2 School Street Court. Saw it when it was dilapidated, owner went through a lot to get the approval he received, as he was generally trying to save the building he has purchased. It's just not economically viable or physically possible to save this home with all of its deterioration and neglect.

Tracy Ware, 7 Mall Street. Spoke with the owner after he purchased the house, who said the finished product would be high quality like his other projects. She would appreciate the oversight of what would be built because it's been 10-months since the siding was removed. The Commission should go inside the building too, since some developers are just looking for profits. It's also become a safety issue because people would congregate on the porch.

Ed Murley. Asked if off-street parking will be available instead of the current situation where parking is only available on the opposite side of the street. Mr. Potter replied 4 spaces were approved but he will try for 5.

The Commission asked Ms. Kelleher to schedule a site visit.

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue to the November 6<sup>th</sup> 2019. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Vote for officers: Chair and Vice Chair

Mr. Spang (Interim Chair) and Mr. Hart (Interim Vice-Chair) stated that they were amenable to continuing in their positions. Mr. Hart noted that his term expires March 1, 2020 and he will continue until then.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to vote Larry Spang as Chair. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

**VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to vote David Hart as Vice-Chair. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Other Business

20 Beckford Street. Ms. Kelleher stated that this property was left off the agenda. There are aluminum gutters on 3/4 of the house and the applicant wants to install new gutters on the fourth side (rear) with downspouts in kind to match what is already installed. She asked the Commission whether they consider it a minor change that is not detrimental to the building. She noted that the rear elevation is visible from the street because the house is sideways on its lot. Mr. Pattison noted his dislike of aluminum gutters and downspouts that aren't appropriate. Ms. Kelleher stated that she would schedule the request under a public hearing as a Certificate of Appropriateness.

79 Columbus. Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant has returned to the ZBA. She noted that this was the house that was partially demolished and the Commission provided preliminary comments.

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Community Development Planner