

**DRAFT**  
**SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES**  
June 3, 2020

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held virtually on Wednesday, June 3, 2020 at 7:00 pm via Zoom meeting platform. Present: Reed Cutting, Laurence Spang (Chair), Milo Martinez, David Hart (Vice Chair), Mark Pattison, Stacey Norkun, Vijay Joyce. Not present: Erin Schaeffer, Rebecca English

7 Carpenter Street

7 Carpenter Street Condominium Trust submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a downspout.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/3/20
- Photographs

Harry Fraser was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Fraser reported that he had met with Mr. Pattison on site to discuss the issue. Mr. Pattison suggested enlarging the hole from the gutter to the downspout, which would likely solve the overflow problem.

Mr. Spang described how the inlet pipe would be enlarged from 1 1/2" wide to 4 3/4". Mr. Fraser commented that if there is still a problem then he will come back to discuss alternative methods. Ms. Norkun was in support of this.

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to accept the application. Mr. Joyce sectioned the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

111 Federal Street

Amanda Ray submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a new fence.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/3/20
- Photographs

Amanda Ray and neighboring property owner Dick Lindemann were present to discuss the project.

The property currently has a 6' tall flat board fence in the rear and a side short picket fence. The applicant expressed the desire to install a taller fence to ensure better privacy.

Mr. Joyce asked the applicant for further clarification. In response, Ms. Ray described how the fence would start at the corner of the porch and extend to the rear fence.

Mr. Spang questioned how the new fence would relate to the porch. Ms. Ray described how there is an existing small fence at that location that would run diagonal. Mr. Spang asked whether it would connect with a fence post at the rear fence. Ms. Ray responded that it would hit further to the right.

Ms. Norkun questioned if this change would create a narrow strip of fenced land between the new fence and an existing picket fence. Ms. Ray clarified that this would be the case but she would be willing to take down the picket

fence in question. Ms. Norkun raised the issue of the picket fence not fulfilling the need and the applicant responded by describing how the neighbor's door is directly next to the existing picket fence.

Mr. Spang questioned the property line and whether or not it correctly follows the fence. Ms. Norkun believed that it did. Ms. Norkun suggested the use of planting evergreen dense shrubs next to the existing picket fence. The applicant described how the planting may not suffice with her three large dogs. She had more confidence in the fence protecting the neighbors from the pets. It was suggested by Mr. Spang that she extend the existing fence at the porch pergola then work with the neighbors to raise their low fence at the intersection.

Dick Lindemann (abutting property) described how the existing fence was installed thirty years ago as a signifier of the property line by the owners of 111 Federal St. The existing pathway between the two houses is very narrow. Ms. Ray is trying to mitigate this narrow pathway by pushing the higher fence off the property line toward her property. Then the low picket fence could be removed.

Mr. Spang offered the suggestion of a solid bottom section with lattice detailing above. Mr. Lindemann was not in favor of the suggestion, describing how it would be claustrophobic if it accurately followed the property line. Mr. Pattison asked how far the fence will come forward and Mr. Lindemann voiced his desire to protect the existing tree in the area.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to accept the 6' tall solid board fence from the corner of the porch balcony to the rear property fence to match the existing rear fence in color and style. The current picket fence would be removed. Mr. Joyce sectioned the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

### 35 Flint Street

Bowditch Condominiums submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a new stair railing.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/3//20
- Images of similar style handrails proposed

Inga Milner (representative of Bowditch Condominiums) was present to discuss the application.

The original side handrails are still in place but the center handrail has been removed. The application describes the plan to add railings on the sides next to the side handrails and not in the center of the front stairway. The staining on the granite steps shows where a center railing was once placed, however, it was not original to the building. The desire for side rails was expressed since a center rail would be in the way.

Mr. Spang inquired about the width between the side handrails and believed that even with the new additional side handrails there would still be a safety code for egress railings. Mr. Joyce also questioned whether the existing handrails will be removed. Ms. Milner responded that no additional rails will be added and it is set in 1'.

Mr. Pattison suggested the duplication of the existing with pickets. Mr. Joyce questioned whether the new railings will be taller and the applicant informed the committee that they will not as the new ones need to be 42'. Mr. Spang and Mr. Pattison disagreed with the statement that the existing are 42'. Images of similar style to proposed rails were presented by the applicant but explained how the proposed railings were thicker.

Mr. Spang noted that the original rail has had a secondary rail added above pickets. It was common to have a center rail to allow the rail to be readily available to users on either side. He suggested replacing this and starting at the step below. Ms. Norkun voiced concern that multiple rails could add unwanted visual clutter. She proposed that it be replaced with a flat top to mimic the original.

The applicant questioned whether it would need to be 42'. Mr. Pattison and Mr. Spang did not believe so, more likely 34' but suggested checking with the Building Inspector for accuracy. Mr. Spang explained how the center intermediary rail was likely added when the building was converted to condos. The applicant will talk with the condominium association. Mr. Hart reiterated the suggestion to confer with the Building Inspector.

Mr. Spang advocated for the single rail with no picket and just a loop - suggesting that stainless steel would be best but a more expensive material choice. The applicant agreed.

Public Comment:

Alan Hanscomb questioned whether this was run by the Disability Commission.

Helen Sides requested a drawing to ensure that it would properly meet code.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue the application the next meeting on June 17, 2020. Mr. Joyce seconded this motion. Seven out of the seven members were in favor and so the motion carried.**

### 13 Cambridge Street

Michael Sherriff submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new dormer.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/3//20
- Drawings by Helen Sides Architect
- Photographs

Helen Sides was present to discuss the application.

The building's dormer is planned to be 6' wide to provide headroom for the bathroom. This design is similar to a shed roof dormer incorporated into the design plan of the neighboring home. The plan includes the use of a skylight in place of a window.

Mr. Spang questioned how far the setback would be from the street edge of building and the applicant responded that it would be 13' back. Ms. Norkun noted that it would have very limited visibility. Ms. Sides described how the materials would match the existing. The abutting property owner has been contacted and is in approval. The project will also be going to a ZBA for a special permit to alter an existing non-conforming building. The soffit will be kept and slightly setback from the wall plane.

Ms. Norkun inquired about whether the skylight in the drawing was to scale. Ms. Sides responded that it was not. Mr. Joyce agreed with Ms. Norkun's earlier point about limited visibility. Mr. Hart reported that he had visited the house and found the design to be appropriate but would have very limited visibility. Mr. Pattison suggested setting it back further from the sidewall but the applicant described how there would not be enough space to do so. Ms. Norkun echoed Mr. Pattison's comment but understood the size limitations and limited visibility.

**VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to approve the dormer as submitted with condition to match existing soffits, trim, clapboard, and paint. Mr. Martinez seconded this motion. Six out of the seven members were in favor and so the motion carried.**

### 102 Derby Street

George and Jodi Bradbury submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a new fence.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/3//20
- Photographs

George Bradbury was present to discuss the application.

The plan includes the removal of the existing chainlink and wood picket fence. A 6' tall solid board fence with gates at both corners would be added. This addition would allow 104 Derby to enter through the property.

Mr. Joyce noted that the fence would be visible from Carlton. The applicant described how 106 Derby has a similar fence and the new fence will be installed by the same company. Mr. Martinez inquired whether they would continue using the retaining wall and Mr. Bradbury responded that this was preferred by the fence company. Mr. Spang asked if the fence would sit on the retaining wall. Mr. Bradbury confirmed this and said that adjustments will be made to both the fence and grade.

Mr. Joyce asked if they could review the retaining wall. Mr. Spang responded by saying that it was in their jurisdiction if it already existed but could be considered if it was being extended. Mr. Bradbury expressed that it would look better to have the retaining wall the entire length. Mr. Spang suggested regrading instead and removing the retaining wall. Mr. Bradbury asked about the use of railroad ties. Mr. Spang stated that the Commission typically prefers the use of brick and the applicant responded by saying that cedar railroad ties would tie in effectively with the fence. Mr. Joyce recommended the use of stacked block to mimic the house's foundation. Mr. Bradbury noted that he would review all of the possible options.

Mr. Martinez suggested that the new retaining wall addition will be obscured by the driveway and Mr. Spang noted that installation of a board fence would help to screen bins and would be better than chainlink. Mr. Pattison suggested grading to the concrete walk.

Public Comment:

Rebecca Babbitt Chafe, 24 Carlton Street, expressed concern with the 6' height but was in favor of the overall proposal.

Mr. Spang recommended the applicant explore all of the options and return to the next meeting. The applicant asked if the committee was in approval of the fence and Mr. Spang expressed his personal support. Mr. Joyce expressed support but wondered if the wood would be kept natural. Ms. Norkun made the suggestion that the rear could be either be stained or natural but set farther back. Mr. Bradbury said he would okay with painting the fence white to match the existing trim. Mr. Spang asked if it was all white cedar. Mr. Pattison recommended that the boards have a straight run over posts and the applicant agreed.

The color of the second story deck was also discussed and Mr. Joyce expressed that if the fence was white then the porch should be painted white to match. Mr. Spang said that the applicant would need to come back to explore the deck color in further detail.

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

388-390 Essex Street

Steven A. Sass submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for solar panels.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/18/20
- Photographs

- Solar panel specifications

Steven Sass and John Moore were present to discuss the application for flush mounted panels.

Mr. Spang asked how many panels would be installed. Mr. Moore responded that five 4 x 8' panels for hot water would be used. They would be larger than traditional solar panels and would likely cover upper portion of the roof. Ms. Norkun expressed her concern for the incorporation of the panels in a historic district as they may not be appropriate. Mr. Sass responded that SHC Guidelines allow panels.

Mr. Moore described the measurements with 12' for the length, 3' off lower roofline and 1' off the top roof edge. Mr. Spang questioned if the lineset would be visible. Both Ms. Kelleher and Mr. Joyce confirmed that it did not appear to be. Mr. Joyce asked how far off the roof the panels would extend. Mr. Moore explained that they would be 2" off the roof and the panels are thicker - 4". Mr. Joyce mentioned how 8" height would raise its visibility and wondered how far they extend back from the front edge of the building. Mr. Moore responded by saying a couple of feet.

Ms. Kelleher discussed previous requests for solar. She asked about possible installation on the rear ell and the applicants responded that it was shaded by a large tree.

Public Comment:

Alan Hanscomb, 82 Washington Square, discussed the continuing issue of climate change and how sea level rise will impact historic resources. He said that the use of solar will help to mitigate this.

Mr. Joyce agreed with this public comment and due to the conditions, the upper slope of the gambrel has limited visibility. Mr. Pattison and Mr. Cutting voiced support as well, noting the space at the street edge.

Mr. Martinez expressed his support for the application due to the 3' lead at the gambrel edge. Mr. Joyce agreed noting the gambrel roof slope and location of panels. Mr. Spang also expressed support but asked Ms. Kelleher to contact City Solicitor on State policy and/or requirements regarding solar panels in historic districts.

**VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to approve the application as proposed with a 2' set back from the street edge and to paint the support structures to match the roof color at the street edge. Mr. Joyce seconded this motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 92 Federal Street

Steven A Sass submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for solar panels.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/3/20
- Photographs
- Solar panel specifications

Steven Sass and John Moore were present to discuss the application.

Mr. Moore explained that solar hot water panels need winter sun and energy year round, which differs from solar electric panels that can store energy for off season. He described that angle of the subject panels would be 20 degrees to 40 degrees and be on the front dormer. If placed on the rear dormer - the corner would be visible. The application proposes adding new solar heated tanks to add to existing gas hot water tanks. Moving forward there are questions on whether to choose solar thermal or solar panel.

Mr. Joyce suggested moving the panels to the side Beverly Jog and Mr. Moore confirmed this as a possible option. Mr. Sass asked if it would be possible to change the angle. Mr. Moore described how a reduction could be made from 45 degrees to 30 degrees to reduce visibility. Mr. Spang offered the option to put in solar electric panels and on-demand hot water tanks. Mr. Moore responded that this option would be very difficult with a multi-tenant building.

Mr. Joyce expressed support if the angle was decreased. Mr. Spang agreed as 45 degrees seems too conspicuous. Mr. Pattison also was okay with this plan as it wouldn't be visible from the flow of traffic/travel.

Ms. Norkun had concerns with the appearance and Mr. Hart asked the applicants if they could construct a physical mockup. Mr. Moore said this was possible and could also look into using five collectors/panels instead of six, as this may reduce the view entirely.

After a motion was made to continue the application to the next meeting, Mr. Moore asked if it would be approved if not visible from the street. Mr. Spang explained that if it wasn't visible, then there is no jurisdiction. He would personally prefer the front dormer flush panels. Mr. Moore said he would look into this option.

**VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting with a mockup to be installed for the Commission to view. Mr. Joyce seconded this motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 1 - 3 North Pine Street

Blue Sky Properties submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for new fence.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/3/20
- Photographs

Greg Spanos was present to discuss the application.

The proposal details how the fences would be set back approximately 35' from the street and would be located approximately one foot in front of the rear corner of the building.

Mr. Spang asked if the new fence would force tandem-parked cars to overhang the sidewalk. Ms. Norkun expressed concern with the use of vinyl material and inquired if Mr. Spanos explored composite as an alternative option. Mr. Spanos said he would consider this but has already purchased the fence and prefers a low maintenance option/easiest to install. Mr. Pattison recommended using white cedar with Northeast Fence as a possible company for purchasing affordable fencing. The applicant responded that he would look into it further but expressed hesitation with using wood. Mr. Spang also voiced an issue with the use of vinyl but commended the applicant on his efforts to restore the property. Mr. Martinez also expressed concern with proposed material.

*Mr. Cutting left the meeting at this time.*

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting. Ms. Norkun seconded this motion. Six out of the six members were in favor and so the motion carried.**

*Mr. Hart left the meeting at this time.*

#### 350 - 352 Essex Street

Blue Sky Properties submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint colors.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/3/20
- Photographs

Greg Spanos was present to discuss the application.

Commissioners Joyce and Norkun reported that they had met with the applicant to discuss possible paint color schemes for the building. The applicant is amendable to option 1 - Secret Path (body in satin finish), Baize (trim in semi-gloss finish), Saywood Pine (door in high-gloss finish). Ms. Norkun offered to help with painters to delineate trim vs. body. Mr. Spanos thanked the committee members for their guidance. Mr. Spang suggested calling out the details.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to accept paint color scheme Option 1 and for Commissioner Norkun to work with the painters and for in-kind exterior trim repairs and replacements as necessary. Ms. Norkun seconded this motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### Other Business

#### Commission review of staff approval for certain categories of Non-Applicability

The Commission discussed allowing staff to issue approval of in-kind repainting requests.

**VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to allow staff approval of inkind paint color requests. Mr. Joyce seconded this motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### Request to extend Certificate of Appropriateness for 9 Warren Street

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to extend Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Norkun seconded this motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### Meeting Minutes

**VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of December 18, 2019 and March 4, 2020 with changes noted. Mr. Joyce seconded this motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Preservation Planner