

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
April 17, 2019

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, April 17, 2019 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1st Floor Conference Room. Present were Chair Herbert, Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, Rebecca English, David Hart, JoAnne McCrea, Mark Pattison, Larry Spang.

21 Washington Square

Renewal Ventures LLC submitted a Certificate of Hardship for removal of snow fence.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/21/19
- Photographs

David Pabich (Owner) was present to discuss the project.

Chair Herbert stated that she conducted a site visit to observe the badly deteriorated snow fence.

Mr. Pabich requested a continuance so that he may seek more information from the foundry. There were 15 brackets and 14 sections of cast iron snow guard fence, the brackets have failed and are being held together with tar and copper wire. The fence was removed when the building was reroofed and were brought to Cassidy Brothers in Rowley to determine if they can be repaired. Mr. Pabich stated that he wants the new condition to be safe, but the cost of the repair work is also a concern. He hasn't found a suitable substitute product yet. Mr. Hart suggested DeAngelis Brothers be consulted. Ms. Kelleher noted that DeAngelis is working on the Salem Common Fence where they are recreating missing fence pieces with an alloy.

There was no public comment.

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

95 Federal Street

Laurie La Chapelle and David Leach submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace stained glass windows on rear elevation.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/18/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Helen Sides, LLC

Mr. Hart recused himself abutter to an abutter.

Helen Sides (Architect of Helen Sides, LLC) and Laurie La Chapelle (Owner) were present to discuss the project.

Chair Herbert stated that the windows may be in bad shape and she suggested they consider a larger opening than what exists. She noted that the windows were designed to work with the existing stained-glass window which compliments the opening because of its height. A larger opening will also make the window look more planned. Ms. Sides replied that they didn't consider enlarging the opening, they want to do as little exterior work as possible, and the high windows provide privacy. Chair Herbert noted that the stained-glass should be retained at the property in case a future owner decided to replace it.

Ms. Sides stated that there is a door to a deck being removed due to a rearrangement interior. Chair Herbert noted that there is minimal visibility of this area. Ms. Sides stated that the exterior has rotted, they want to maintain the same opening size and these three windows will be Marvin, simulated divided lite with wood interior and aluminum exterior. The center window will be stained-glass with applied muntins to divide them, but they will act as a single awning style window that will match what exists.

Chair Herbert stated that they need a letter from the association/other owners acknowledging their approval since they all share the exterior of the building.

Mr. Bellin asked where the stained-glass window was located previously. Chair Herbert replied on an interior wall. Ms. Sides stated that the window will be stored downstairs with other stained-glass panels. Its placement in a new wall is not historic although the window is historic.

Chair Herbert stated that none of the windows are historic, but they came from a convent. With all the exterior items they didn't want to set a precedent because they aren't original to the building; however, they are period appropriate. Many parts of this building have been lost over time.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve, subject to approval from the other owners. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Hart returned.

0 North Pine Street

Jamie and David Graham submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter carriage house doors

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/25/19
- Photographs

Ms. Bellin recused herself as an abutter.

Jamie Graham and Dan Graham (Owners) was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Graham stated that the doors aren't original to the property and were possibly added in the 1980's when the barn became a residential use. They want to take top 2 sections of the door, cut openings and insert lites. The room on the opposite side of the door is a small bedroom that will become a living and kitchen space. Mr. Cutting asked if the door were operable. Ms. Graham replied that it is nailed to front, want to create some transparency and to preserve what they can from in the building. Mr. Pattison noted that the windows were oriented vertically not horizontally. Chair Herbert noted that the applicant is picking up on design of 384 Essex Street, with 8 lites on each half of the door, the verticals look more transitional. Ms. Graham replied that they can install them vertically and they will check the other windows too. Mr. Pattison noted that considering the width of the door, there should be 4 lites not 3. Ms. Graham added that the they will be true divided lites.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve with vertical window orientation. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Bellin returned.

4 Hamilton Street

Alexis Dwyer submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to expand rear addition

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/2/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Seger Architects dated 3/25/19

John Seger (Architect of Seger Architects) and Alexis Dwyer (Owner) were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher stated that Nina Cohen and the owners of 3 Hamilton Street submitted letters of support.

Mr. Seger stated that trim detail and a stair rail have been revised. They will add a small two-story addition but only two elevations will be affected, the driveway side and the rear elevation. Chair Herbert asked if the addition can be seen from the street behind them. Ms. Graham replied no, only driveway. Chair Herbert suggested there was minimal visibility from the driveway and sidewalk. Mr. Seger noted that the existing addition extensions are visible. The rear elevation has a 1-story Family Room, post and beam structure with no foundation, and an existing side porch. The owner wants to expand the Family Room by 6-feet, so the existing addition will be demolished and rebuilt.

Mr. Seger stated that there will be a new 5-foot deep back porch with a stair to access a mudroom. They will fill-in the corner of the house to enlarge the Family Room and will duplicate the footprint and create a 2nd floor master bedroom suite with a roof to cover the new porch. The 2-story addition will match the elevation of an existing narrow addition on the other side of the house, approx. 8-feet deep. The open structure roof will protect the porch entrance to the mud room. Ms. Bellin asked if the stair will be removed. Mr. Seger replied yes and at the 2nd floor, they will mimic the gable end and will introduce a shed dormer at the master bath.

Chair Herbert asked if the shed dormer will be recessed. Mr. Seger replied yes, the side and front will expose the gable and some of the roof. It is unknown if they will carry it to the side of the house, but there could be too much redundancy. They will replicate in kind; the brick water table, 6x6 wood windows, 3-tab asphalt shingles, trim at the boards, frieze and windows that will be a composite material.

Ms. McCrear asked if they will change the color of the house. Ms. Dwyer replied that they will return to the Commission for new exterior colors and asked if she must only pick colors from a historic palette. Chair Herbert encouraged the applicant to select colors because Victorian homes typically have unique colors palettes.

Mr. Seger noted that they will need a special permit because the house is non-conforming. They need to maintain a 10-foot setback and will push the house 1-foot and will address the arborvitaes. The arborvitaes will be realigned and these that don't survive will be replaced. Ms. Dwyer added that from the street there will be more house visible and three existing arborvitaes will remain. Mr. Seger added that the trees further back on the property won't be affected.

Ms. Kelleher asked if the windows will be aluminum clad. Mr. Seger replied aluminum clad wood windows although they've haven't selected a manufacturer. Chair Herbert noted that the Commission will want to know what window will be installed and Ms. Kelleher can provide them with a list of manufacturers they've approved in the past. Chair Herbert stated that the approval is good for 1 year and she can request an extension. Ms. Dwyer asked if they only constructed the 1st floor addition would it require a separate approval. Chair Herbert replied that they can approve both and that approval could be used in the future.

Ms. Bellin suggested that the West façade may have one too many roofs. Mr. Seger replied that the lower is a wrap around roof. Ms. Bellin suggested that roof end at the corner. Mr. Seger replied that they could create a 1-foot extension. Mr. Spang asked if the four windows on what was the porch are all on the same plane. Mr. Seger

replied no, the face is stepped in 1-foot. Mr. Spang noted that the 1-foot setback gives the need for a roof-like element. He also noted that a window on West elevation addition doesn't show up in plan. Mr. Seger replied that there should be window into the shower. Ms. Dwyer added that she wants the window to match up on the elevation.

Mr. Spang suggested they add another window on the South elevation which has a lot of clapboards, but it's location would depend upon the interior layout. Mr. Seger suggested a ½ window to provide additional light in the bathroom. Ms. Dwyer agreed. Ms. Bellin noted that it's the same elevation where one window is already missing, which means there will be 2 new windows on this façade.

Mr. Cutting asked if significant excavation will be required. Mr. Seger replied that they may add a basement but will have a foundation at the very least. Chair Herbert noted that the building has an existing brick foundation all the way around. Mr. Hart noted that the proposed addition doesn't swallow the existing building and won't be as visible either.

Mr. Seger stated that they will return for façade and shutter paint colors. Chair Herbert noted that if there are any additional windows or moving of any windows, the Commission would need to be notified. Ms. Bellin requested the applicant provide an updated drawing with the missing window. Mr. Hart suggested that Sally Zimmerman from Historic New England, Inc. be consulted regarding paint colors.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion approve the application with a submission of a revised plan with the missing and new windows, and to removal of the extra roof. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Dwyer asked for approval to remove, refurbish, and reinstalled the existing shutters.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion approve refurbishing and reinstalling the existing shutters. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

221 Essex Street, The Hale Building – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application - Request for letter of support

Vu Alexander (Architect) and Doug Kelleher of Epsilon Associates were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Alexander stated that owners want to make alterations to the exterior and to replace the majority of the existing windows except for a fan detail over the entry. Elements of the façade are cast iron with some deterioration, staining, rusting, and water damage. They would also like to replace existing aluminum storefront with wood, and the aluminum cast entablature and columns will remain, although they would add wood paneling at bottom of storefront. On the alley side they will replace existing windows and keep fire escape. They will introduce some colors to the façade due to loss of detail and want to add warm grey to the cornice and between the columns, and a dark grey at the storefront. The grey will be at the cornice and columns. Mr. Kelleher added that there is too much white on the façade and the details are lost. Chair Herbert noted that the type of grey and finish will be important, the colors must be subtle.

Mr. Alexander noted that at the windows they will keep cast iron window surround, remove sashes, reuse the weight pockets, and install new aluminum windows. Chair Herbert asked if the keystones were also cast iron. Mr. Alexander replied yes, they are peeling so the cast iron is visible. The windows will be aluminum framed with aluminum muntins and the storefront will be wood. Mr. Spang suggested the windows could be replaced in kind or fixed. Ms. McCrea asked if the aluminum windows would keep out the noise. Mr. Spang replied that thermally broken are better at keeping out sound.

Chair Herbert asked if the signage will remain. Mr. Alexander replied yes, it will be cleaned. Mr. Kelleher stated that the upper floors will become residential and the first-floor will remain retail and commercial. Chair Herbert stated that they must return for paint color approval.

Mr. Spang asked if the National Park Service has reviewed the project. Mr. Kelleher replied yes, both the Massachusetts Historic Commission and Park Service have reviewed the project. They are seeking historic tax credits and would like the Commission's support.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the letter of support. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Alexander added that at the rear façade they would like to open the glass block and create a second means of egress and residential access. Ms. Kelleher asked what will happen with the clock at the front façade. Mr. Alexander replied that it is unknown at this time.

217 Essex Street, Naumkeag Trust Company Building – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application - Request for Letter of support

See discussion above.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the letter of support. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

10-12 Lynde Street, William Hunt Double House – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application - Request for Letter of Support

John Seger (Architect from Seger Architects) and Doug Kelleher (Epsilon Associates) and Greg Ahmed (owner/The Crescent Trust) were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Seger stated that Historic tax credit requires that for the first 5 years the units will be rentals and may remain rentals. The building suffered a fire in November 2018, its interior has been stripped down to the studs, and the owner has hired environmental engineers Epsilon Associates. The building was constructed in 1858 and has a two-story 1910 rear addition. It is the William Hunt Double House and it housed 12 studio units. The owner would like to create 9 units and to utilize the basement space. The site is the same, the driveway that extends beyond the rear of the building will be repaved, and a wrought iron fence will be added along the right side of the property to conceal the trash area. Utilities will be placed at the rear of the building. For egress purposes there were only two front doors, but two new rear entries and second means of egresses with small decks will be added for the rear first-floor units. They will remove the 4-foot high concrete planter and will add new landscaping surrounded by a small granite curb.

Mr. Seger added that the wood interior windows will be aluminum clad which are approvable for tax credits. Mr. Kelleher stated that the windows will have large 6x6 large panes of glass and will require shop drawing. Chair Herbert asked if there was a price difference between Pella and Andersen windows. Mr. Seger replied that he did not know the difference, but Pella's are approximately \$700 per opening and these windows will be custom. Chair Herbert noted that the sash color is important since white can look like plastic. Ms. Kelleher asked if any original windows must remain. Mr. Kelleher replied no. Chair Herbert asked if inappropriate windows could be replaced. Mr. Kelleher replied that they can't require a correction on a previous error unless the applicant touches it. They can get use profiles from the original windows to replicate for the new window. Mr. Seger added that the lower

level bedrooms window sizes will increase to meet the 44-inche egress requirement and the new windows will do down to grade for access. He added that 2x2 or 2x1 mahogany balusters and rails will be installed at the porches.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Ms. McCrea made a motion to approve the letters of support. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

131 Lafayette Street, St. Joseph Roman Catholic Church Rectory – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application - Request for Letter of Support

David Pabich and Larry Frej (Co-Owners), and Doug Kelleher of Epsilon Associates were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Pabich stated that they are purchasing 129 Lafayette and 20 Harbor Streets. The buildings are under contract and they are pursuing adaptive reuse for housing in both buildings using state and historic tax credits. They will restore the exterior of both buildings to their original condition. The Rectory is mainly unchanged with the original windows and ornamentation. The windows were previously restored and new aluminum storms were installed. The schools are 1x1 and will become 6x6 with aluminum transoms above. The masonry will also be restored, and all failed details replicated.

Chair Hebert asked the Rectory unit count and square footage. Mr. Pabich replied 13 rental units, from 600 square-foot studios to 1,200 square-foot 2-bedroom units, as well as some garden level townhouses. The school will have 21 units including some at garden level.

Mr. Cutting asked if parking will be available. Mr. Pabich replied yes, this is part of the condominium at 135 Lafayette and it was broken into 3 pieces and 41 parking spaces will be available for this building, with over a 1 to 1 ratio, which is part of the PUD. Ms. English asked if these units would be apartment. Mr. Pabich replied yes. Ms. McCrea asked what security measures will be taken. Mr. Pabich that security hasn't been decided since they don't own it yet.

Ms. McCrea asked if the interior had been preserved. Mr. Kelleher replied that the interior is in impeccable condition; however, the school has major concerns with active roof leaks and plaster loss.

Mr. Seger stated that there will be handicap access through an internal ramp. Mr. Pabich noted that the school has an exterior ramp at the south façade; however, 2/3 of the ramping would be internal. The Rectory would have a new ramp on the south façade, and the handicapped layout has been worked out with the PUD. Neither building has immediate access to grade. Ms. McCrea asked if an elevator would be installed. Mr. Pabich replied no, the access to grade occurs at a landing point in the stairs. The Rectory's entire first floor is elevated from grade and the ramp would be largely screened by the portico if Mass Historic approves it.

Chair Herbert asked if consistent window treatments will be installed at the front of the Rectory. Mr. Pabich replied yes. Ms. McCrea asked if there will be overhangs at entrance. Mr. Frej replied that the existing overhangs will remain.

Mr. Hart asked if the Fed was involvement in the approval. Mr. Pabich replied yes. Mr. Kelleher noted that the Park Service doesn't accept letters of support. Mr. Frej added that this renovation will be good for the neighborhood.

There was no public comment.

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

20 Harbor Street, St. Joseph Roman Catholic Church Street – Massachusetts Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit Application - Request for Letter of Support

See above.

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

North Shore Community Development Coalition Projects – Historic Tax Credit Application - Request for Letter of Support

Ms. Kelleher stated that the CDC has been restoring their buildings for years, and they are seeking approval on their next round of buildings. They only do state historic tax credits not federal. These buildings are all wood framed and the previous buildings were masonry.

There was no public comment.

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

Other Business

18 Peabody Street

John Seger of Seger Architects was present to discuss the request for a letter of support for historic tax credit application.

Ms. Kelleher noted that she only received this request yesterday, it was added to the agenda last minute and the Commission needs to determine whether they want to approve it or continue it to the May 8th meeting.

Mr. Seger stated that Mickey Northcutt is the owner of this property. Chair Herbert noted that in order to receive tax credit it needs to be reviewed by the Commission and the applicant has a deadline to meet on April 29th. Mr. Seger noted that the tax consultant had no issue with sending an amended letter of support after the deadline. They still have other issues to resolve involving the storefront windows seen in an old photograph. That floor will have residential units; however, the windows could be tinted. The existing condition can be left as-is unless they find evidence of a previous condition to restore. Ms. Bellin noted that reviewing this item may not be legal and it should be on the agenda so and public knowledge so the public has an opportunity to comment. Ms. McCrea asked if HSI had installed a plaque on this property. Mr. Hart replied that he did not know.

67-71 Bridge Street

Draft letter and current condition of building

Chair Herbert stated that she helped the developer revise the design and she forwarded correspondence to the Commission from City Solicitor Beth Renard. No. 71 is similar to what was proposed although some brackets weren't installed. The top floor unit went under agreement and the architect didn't installed the additional details that the Commission requested. Installing the details as indicated on the plans was also a condition of their ZBA

approval and the developer defied both agreements. Ms. Kelleher met with Building Inspector, Planning Department and other Staff and drafted a letter of her findings on this matter. The ZBA approved the project based on plans submitted to the Building Inspector which also called for wood clapboards. The Inspection determined that since vinyl siding meets code, he considers it comparable to the clapboard siding the Commission requested. Chair Herbert stated that she wants this matter to go back to the ZBA so they can determine their intent because the applicant should be tied to the drawings that were submitted and approved. This matter wouldn't be on the ZBA agenda until their next meeting. The ZBA's meeting minutes were also never completed and posted so they don't have a record of the discussion that took place at the ZBA's meeting, when they reviewed it in July of 2018. Chair Herbert read a letter she drafted.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the details of the ZBA decision has been filed but it doesn't state the approved materials; however, the ZBA issued variances and a special permit indicating that the structure should be built to the plan submitted to the Building Inspector. The Zoning Enforcement Officer's policy is that this type of change doesn't necessitate going back to the ZBA. She suggested that a future condition be applied to ZBA approvals tying it to the plans approved by the Historic Commission, to keep the applicant from making changes without approval. This also shows the limited reach of a demo delay approval. Only the ZBA has jurisdiction in the area and they need to enforce the Historic Commission's decisions. Ms. McCrea stated her disappointment with multiple commissions gave their time and their decision isn't being enforced. Ms. English added that this would have been a good example of how all the boards worked together.

Chair Herbert noted that Steve Lovely's attorney was the representative and she asked if the owner knows what will not be added to their property. Ms. Kelleher suggested a strongly worded letter be sent. Ms. McCrea added that Bob McCarthy and the ZBA representative also receive a copy. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Inspector receives a copy of Historic Commission decisions and they discuss them with her also; however, the waiver only says its delayed and it's not tied to a set of plans. Chair Herbert stated that mitigation is part of the demolition delay waiver and acceptance of it should be included in the ruling. Ms. Bellin added that decisions tied to the Commission should followed and the length of the delay also be included so the economic value is expressed in their letter.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve the letter in general with edits to be reviewed and approved by Chair Herbert. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

New Chimney Cap Policy

Ms. Kelleher asked the Commission to consider adopting a policy that would allow the approval of specific chimney cap designs as a "minor change" that would not require a public hearing. Applicants would need to demonstrate that their proposed chimney cap design met the design guidelines. She presented several examples of caps recently approved by the Commission. The Commission agreed that the lower they are the better, 8-10" in height is sufficient and it shouldn't come to the edge. Chair Herbert asked if they will be sent to the Commission members for review. Ms. Kelleher replied in the affirmative, noting that the Commission would make the determination that the cap design could be approved as a minor change, the neighbors would be notified and if no one objects within 10 days, the owner would get an approval. The Commission will receive height and setbacks for each application, each member will have 48 hours to respond, and appropriate examples can be posted to the website.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue to require applicants seeking to install chimney caps to submit an application. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Meeting Minutes Approval: Chair Herbert suggested the Commission allow the minutes to be reviewed and approved by correspondence instead of waiting for a quorum that matches who attended the meeting. Ms. Kelleher responded that she will ask City Solicitor to see if this would be allowed.

Salem Historic Commission: Resignation: Chair Herbert stated that Ms. McCrea and Ms. Turiel were resigning from the Commission. She recommended that letter of appreciation be sent to them as well as Cathy Harper. On April 25, 2019, Mayor Driscoll appointed two new Commission members, Stacey Norkun and Erin Schaeffer (Former Salem Planner.)

Approval of Meeting Minutes for February 20, 2019

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve the February 20, 2019 meeting minutes. Mr. Cutting seconded. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to adjourn. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner