

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
December 18, 2019

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, December 18, 2019 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1st Floor Conference Room. Present were: Milo Martinez, Mark Pattison, Erin Schaeffer, Rebecca English, David Hart, Vijay Joyce, Stacey Norkun. Not present: Reed Cutting

319 Essex Street - CONTINUATION

Myra Ameigh submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint colors.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/22/19
- Photographs

Myrica Ameigh and Morris Schopf were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Ameigh stated that the home has been renovated and they want to replace the roof in kind using the same color, as well as replace the loose and wet clapboards at the sides and rear only, and the trim will remain. They want to change the façade color too and submitted three colors that have been approved by the Commission in the past, but possibly not in this combination. Windows – Easter Lily (Cream), Doors – Forest Green (glossy greenish-black), and the Body – Duxbury Grey. They are requesting approval to repaint in the spring of 2020.

Ms. Norkun suggested they use a semi-gloss on the door. Mr. Spang asked if the window sash will match the trim. Mr. Martinez asked for the window trim color. Ms. Ameigh replied that the window sash and trim color will be cream.

Mr. Spang stated that the door surround is approximately 2-feet deep. Ms. Ameigh replied that the door surround will all be the trim color. Ms. Kelleher noted that the inventory form indicates the door surround was done after 1976.

Ms. Ameigh noted that the plywood will be painted grey to highlight the door and exterior frame, but you will see cream trim at the exterior. The door will be Forest Green with Duxbury Grey for the returns. The original entrance was at the side courtyard gate, it was built in 1823, the back area were additions.

Ms. Norkun stated that high gloss finishes are more modern, clapboard and siding can be an eggshell or satin, and the front door shouldn't be glossier than a semi-gloss.

Mr. Martinez asked if the storm windows were white. Ms. Ameigh replied yes. Mr. Martinez asked if the sashes will be painted the same color, because that would make the window pop. The doors could match the window shutters, with all moving parts of the window in the same color and the Commission could approve both color options

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

VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to approve the following paint colors; Duxbury Grey for body and recessed entry panels, Easter Lily for trim and window sashes not to exceed semi-gloss, and door in Forest Green in a finish no higher than a semi-gloss with the option to paint the window sashes Forest Green. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Joe and Kathy Archambault submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate rear entry porch and paint colors

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/25/19
- Photographs

Joe Archambault was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Archambault stated that the home was built in 1780, he's owned the home for 65 years and wanted to add a new rear porch and new paint colors. He will replace some fascia boards on multiple sides of the house and some shingles will be replaced in kind. Mr. Spang requested clarification on the red at the foundation. Mr. Archambault replied that the foundation is brick and they are considering painting it grey. Mr. Joyce asked if the foundation has been cemented or painted over. Mr. Archambault replied that his father cemented it years ago, some bricks will be replaced, but it will be painted over too. "Sandlot Gray" will be used for the entire façade, the shutters will be black and the trim will remain the current white.

Ms. Norkun asked if the front door was recessed. Mr. Archambault replied yes, the door is black with lites on both sides and the exterior storm door has been in place for 30 years. It was enclosed after several car accidents resulted in drivers hitting their house and to keep unwanted visitors from loitering in the area.

Ms. Schaeffer asked if the color has been previously approved. Mr. Archambault replied that his neighbor has a similar color but he had no preselected colors to choose from. Ms. Kelleher noted that the neighbor wanted to match the existing paint color that had faded. Mr. Pattison stated that two grey houses next to each other may clash color-wise.

Ms. Schaeffer suggested a dark grey foundation color. Ms. Norkun stated that the proposed color will look very similar to the neighbor's house but felt that the proposed color scheme is a modern color combination. Mr. Martinez noted that the Commission looks at the district as a whole and a color that pops and draws more visual interest would be best. Mr. Martinez suggested a site visit. Mr. Spang stated that it is difficult to say the applicants house can't be grey because someone else on the block has a grey house, paint isn't permanent and they shouldn't be picking colors based on liking or not liking the colors. Ms. Norkun suggested they think about the historic character of the building, not individual colors, and suggested a color that is a couple shades darker. Mr. Pattison noted that beige color will look washed out quickly. Mr. Martinez noted that a dark color saturation will make the house pop while the current color fades into the sky in photographs.

Mr. Joyce stated that the color contrast of dark grey with stark white trim isn't appropriate to the period this house was built. He suggested a different color white that is not so stark. Mr. Archambault replied that his neighbors have used different tones of white for their trim. Mr. Joyce suggested a cream-white, such as Benjamin Moore "Cloudy Grey" instead of a truer white such as "Putnam Ivory" with the "Sandlot Grey body color. He added that the damage to the foundation is because there is no water table, which could be added, since there is only one remaining water table on the house. Mr. Archambault replied that he is not trying to repair the bricks at this time.

Porch

Mr. Archambault stated that he would like to remove the boxed-in porch from the 1960's-70's, that was added to protect the rear entrance, which gets the most use and its roof accumulates snow. He would want to return to railings on the sides but to use metal. Mr. Joyce replied that wood railings are preferred. Mr. Spang noted that there would be an open porch with columns, a small roof, railings on two sides, and steps on the third side. He asked if lattice would be added to conceal the base or the brick steps rebuilt. The columns would be wood, round and tapered, bottom and top would have two square layers of trim pieces. He stated that more formal designs would need to be submitted for review because the Commission would want them to look historic rather than modern. Mr. Hart questioned whether the columns had an entasis or slight bulge. Mr. Pattison noted that entasis columns should

have a slight bulge towards the middle and not be evenly tapered or conical. Mr. Schaeffer requested column photos and details. Mr. Archambault replied that the columns will be wood and the railings 1½” square balusters.

Mr. Hart noted that the plan indicated that the old porch is 16-feet long and the new appears to be 12-feet long. Mr. Joyce requested that the plans be labeled and materials indicated. Mr. Spang requested a scaled drawing of the front elevation so the railing is drawn to scale and to provide photos of similar back porches. He noted that the roof extensions are concerning because they don’t feel historic. He suggested that if the desire was to have more coverage to protect the stairs, the columns should be separated more so the roof extends over the stairs. Mr. Archambault replied that he wants to protect the stairs for the winter and keep the same 16-foot length of the porch. Mr. Pattison suggested a closed carriage stair to conceal the end of the steps while also creating a platform to set the porch column on to or add a third column. Mr. Spang noted that the new railings must meet current code. Mr. Joyce added that the plans also need to indicate the space between the bottom of the railing and the deck surface, to make sure the height of the handrail off the deck is accurate. Mr. Joyce suggested he match the existing overhang dimensions to make the new roof marry into the existing structure.

Mr. Pattison stated that square top capital blocks usually stick out further than the edge of the top of the column and the framing goes on top of that creating the roof overhang, but the dimensions should be minimal. Mr. Spang noted that the framing should be hidden, and if they close the bottom of the porch with lattice, it should be in wood and either square or slats and not diamond. Ms. Kelleher suggested the applicant refer to the Historic Commission Guidelines for railing details.

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

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue the porch discussion to the next meeting on January 15th. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to approve clapboard in Sandlot Gray in an eggshell finish; trim and window casings, sashes and muntins in either Cloudy Gray, Pale Oak, or Balboa Mist with the option to paint the sashes and muntins black to match the front door. Front door to be satin or semi-glass, foundation to be Dior Grey. Ms. Schaeffer seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Pattison asked if the front and rear white storm door would remain. Mr. Archambault replied that the door is glass except for the bottom 2-feet and the trim is Powder Blue.

VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to allow the front and rear storm doors to be painted black. Ms. Schaeffer suggested the door surround match the trim color with a black door. Ms. Norkun amended motion by Norkun to allow the door surround to match. Ms. Schaeffer seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve in-kind replacement of damaged shingles and trim. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

12 Mall Street - CONTINUATION

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

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/27/19
- Photographs

The applicant was not present.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the application clock started on September 27th and there is nothing the Commission needs to do procedurally. If the Commission votes to impose the 6-month delay, the delay period would expire on March

27th. The Commission could also decide to continue the application to the next meeting. Ms. Schaeffer suggested they vote to deny the waiver request at the next meeting.

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

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

374 Essex Street

Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application – Request for a Letter of Support

Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant has requested a letter of support for historic tax credits to restore the property's historic carriage house. She noted that the Commission approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for this project at their last meeting. She explained that in order to qualify for tax credits the property must be income producing for 5 years and the carriage house will be a rental unit. The tax credit process adds additional layers of review by the Massachusetts Historical Commission and the National Park Service. Ms. Schaeffer stated that she would always want to support applications for historic tax credits. Mr. Spang noted that it is possible that MHC may require design changes that the Commission may not approve of.

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve a letter of support. Mr. Pattison second the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

Design Guidelines

Ms. Kelleher reported that the City submitted a grant pre-application to update the Historical Commission Design Guidelines. MHC has approved the request to go to the next round and a full application will be submitted in February with a funding decision by April. She noted that if approved, the project would not start until summer 2020. The Commission agreed that they should not wait until the project commences to determine which architectural shingles are appropriate for the historic districts. Mr. Spang asked if they should request proformas and identify houses in the districts with certain types of shingles to determine what should be the standard approved shingles. Ms. Kelleher replied that she will organize a list of homes that have installed the previously approved shingles and a list of other communities with approved architectural shingles.

Mr. Spang added that he also wants to review double-muntin windows, but noted that owners will still need to determine their performance and do their due diligence. Ms. Schaeffer suggested they also incorporate an approved list of windows and their price points.

Court Houses

Mr. Spang reported that the City issued an RFQ to redevelop the historic courthouse complex and has narrowed the potential development teams to four. Proposals are expected to be due in March, when the City will select their preferred developer for the Superior Court, County Commissioners Building and crescent lot. As part of this project, a preservation restriction held by MHC will be placed on the historic buildings. Ms. Kelleher noted that the buildings are owned by DCAMM, the state will transfer it to the City and then to the developer. Ms. Schaeffer noted that this will make the property less of a local burden when handled this way. She asked if MHC has specified the boundaries of the restriction, particularly regarding the retaining wall. On a similar project, there were restrictions on the site and not just the building. Mr. Spang stated that a preservation consultant has been hired to put together a list of architectural elements that are required to be preserved as part of the preservation restriction. Mr. Martinez noted that the SRA will conduct interviews with the development teams and he hopes they allow public comment.

Mr. Spang noted that the selection criteria should include historic preservation too. Ms. Kelleher replied that the criteria will include preference for projects that preserve more of the buildings than required under the PR. The development teams will also be required to provide proformas and financial capacity. The SRA hired a consultant to review initial RFP and financials. They could apply for an HDIP or other program, and if historic tax credits are sought it's only good for 5 years. Under the tax credit program, the Park Service could say they need to retain the volumes of space which a developer may not want to do. The Commission will be asked to weigh in on the preservation restrictions. Ms. Schaeffer asked if the Commission should hire their own consultant. Mr. Spang noted that the preservation consultant will include a list of items to be preserved and a list of items will be included in the RFP. If the developer is willing to preserve them, they will be considered highly advantageous. Both buildings count as one structure but the Superior Court has more details to salvage. Mr. Spang noted that the County Commissioners Building was redone in the 1970's. Mr. Spang noted that accessibility and building systems upgrade is a concern.

8 Chestnut Street

Several months ago, the owner of the property came to the Commission to rebuild the rear ell after a tree fell on the roof. The Commission discussed whether the owner adjusted the window heights after saying that everything was to be kept the same. Mr. Pattison stated that it appears the applicant lifted one side of the roof edge 8-inches to make it even, but then changed the structure by raising the entire extension and raised the roof of the barn structure approximately 2-feet. Ms. Kelleher added that instead of taking the lintel to the cornice line, it appears there is a 2-foot difference. The applicant only received a certificate to rebuild in kind. Ms. Schaeffer noted that the applicant kept adding on changes after their last meeting with him. Mr. Pattison suggested the Commission tell the applicant that what's he's done is unacceptable. Mr. Spang suggested the applicant return to explain the changes because the work completed hasn't been approved. Ms. Schaeffer suggested the new work be removed because he lied to the Commission.

Vacancy

Ms. Schaeffer reported that she will soon resign since she purchased a home in Beverly and will be moving.

Climate Change

Mr. Hart reported that he went to the Climate Leadership Conference in Miami, which was about the effect of climate change on historic preservation. Ms. Kelleher added that the preservation partners are discussing focusing on climate change in 2020 and has reached out to the group Keeping History Above Water about holding a conference in Salem in 2020.

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:20PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner