

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
July 17, 2019

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, July 17, 2019 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1st Floor Conference Room. Present were: Interim Chair Larry Spang, Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce, Stacey Norkun, Mark Pattison, Erin Schaeffer, Milo Martinez. Absent: Reed Cutting and David Hart.

31 Flint Street

Johnathan Felt submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint color

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/24/19
- Photographs
- Paint color chips

Johnathan Felt was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Felt stated that they want to install new storm windows in black, to match the door color. Ms. Kelleher stated that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over storm windows or storm doors, but they do have control over the color. Mr. Felt noted that they will be matching the storm windows to the color of the window sash, which will provide a better look than aluminum. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission's Design Guidelines state that storm windows should match the color of window trim but within the past year the Commission has been approving black storms. She suggested that the Guidelines should be updated.

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

VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to install new storm windows in black. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

117-119 Federal Street

Fred and Linda Lipton, Steve Duguay and Kathleen Riley submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint color.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/26/19
- Photographs
- Paint color chips

Linda and Fred Lipton were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Lipton stated that the house color will remain the same and they are only proposing to change the trim color. The existing trim color "Brilliant White" is too bright and creates too much of a contrast. She researched white paint and felt that "White Dove" added some warmth and a touch of grey to work with the house color. She feels the entrance is dark and uninviting and many homes on Chestnut Street paint their entryways white. Their entrance is removable, and it will be reattached when the weather gets cold.

Mr. Joyce asked if the inner door will be white. Mr. Lipton replied yes. Ms. Kelleher stated that the applicant submitted the outer storm as White Dove, the main entry door will remain black, and the door surround in the inner vestibule will be black. Mr. Spang asked if the adjoining neighbor at 117 will do the same. Mr. Lipton replied yes but they couldn't attend this meeting. Mr. Pattison asked when the framework was built. Ms. Lipton replied 1846.

Mr. Lipton added that someone replaced the glass with plexiglass. Ms. Norkun agreed that White Dove would be a good and neutral color choice.

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

VOTE: Mr. Norkun made a motion to approve the painting of all trim including entry storm door surround and door, window trim and muntins in “White Dove”, all clapboards to be painted in existing Charcoal color. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Six were in favor, one opposed (Mr. Martinez), and the motion so carried. (Mr. Martinez stated that the guidelines indicate that there should be 3 colors and the door should be black.)

57 Summer Street

Dionisio and Jessica Alves submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint colors

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/20/19
- Photographs
- Paint color chips

Ms. Norkun recused herself as an abutter.

Dennis Alves was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Alves stated that the house needs to be painted and they are proposing to keep the trim “white”, change the body color from teal to a warmer green “Clearspring Green”, and change the shutters and front door to a “Hale Navy”. Ms. Kelleher asked if the two sunbursts will be a different color. Mr. Alves replied that they will be white “Chantilly Lace.”

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

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to accept the proposed paint colors as submitted. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Norkun returned.

1 Brown Street (Daniel Bray House)

Peabody Essex Museum submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for paint color

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/25/19
- Photographs
- Historic paint color analysis by Sutherland Conservation and Consulting

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

Mr. Mallory presented the application for exterior paint colors on the restored Daniel Bray House. He stated that PEM had a lab analysis conducted on the building’s original exterior paint and presented the final report to the Commission. The report details the color of the building’s historic elements. The body was a deep chocolate brown made of pine tar, which is an unusual paint for the period and made the façade appear darker. The owner at that time was in the maritime trade and pine tar was used on boats, so it makes sense that it would be used on the house. The window trim, door trim, and main cornice was a pumpkin color mixed with red ochre and iron oxide to make it even more orange. The clapboards, corner boards, rake boards, and water table matched the body’s deep brown.

Unfortunately, there is no evidence of the front door color since the door was lost prior to 1903. Sutherland Conservation and Consulting and others that have analyzing experience determined that the door would have been dark, possibly a black or dark green, but PEM was concerned about the final colors appearing to much like Halloween colors. The PEM is proposing to finish the door in a faux grain to resemble mahogany. An analysis completed at the Gardner Pingree House determined that grain painted furniture from this period was common in lower income households like the Bray House so a mahogany door would be historically appropriate. They will use Benjamin Moore color to match the archival colors instead of historical paints, but they will be mixed to what the measurements were originally using reverse aging to match the original color as closely as possible. If this were bare wood, they may have suggested a pine tar finish which would be grimy and sticky. The structure was painted in 1806, then 35 years later after paint loss and grime, a light grey color was painted in 1840, and the base went from lead to zinc. The analysis found that the air quality at the time was horrific; the air contained sulfur dioxide, which is an air quality similar to an industrial setting. In 1890 the house was painted an emerald green with bright red trim. They've decided to return the structure to the 1805-1829 period because it always looked the same between that period. Mr. Spang asked if the pine tar was based on boat paint. Mr. Mallory replied possibly, it's only been used in marine settings.

Ms. Norkun asked for the door composition. Mr. Mallory replied that it will have paneling and construction to match an interior door but will be enlarged to fit the exterior opening. It will be made to historic preservation standards along with hand forged iron box locks with soldered knobs fabricated in Williamsburg, VA.

Ms. Norkun asked about the window sashes and muntins. Mr. Mallory replied that the window details will be the tan, and the finish trim Lead White. Construction will behind on Monday.

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

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the proposed paint colors as submitted. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

316 Essex Street

First Church of Salem submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install replace fence

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/19/19
- Photographs

Nick Lewis and Paul Marquee of the First Church of Salem were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Lewis stated that they want to replace the eastern side fence. Its age is unknown, but it is badly damaged which has raised safety concerns. Ms. Kelleher noted that the applicant had replaced the rear fence with wrought iron and this proposed fence is adjacent to the Witch House and Bowditch House. It would also be visible from North Street and from down the driveway of the Bowditch House. Mr. Marquee presented a rendering of the view from the street; straight 1x4 pickets at a spacing of 2½", and 8" between top cross rail and cap rail. The top rail will be flat not beveled and will be painted "White 7245" (super white with no tint) in an eggshell finish. Mr. Lewis noted that they will paint the fence to help preserve the wood. He asked their residential neighbor for their paint color so they can match its bright white color. Mr. Spang asked if the fence will be pressure treated. Mr. Lewis replied yes except for posts and cap rail for longevity. Cedar will not work with their budget for a fence just under 80-feet-long. Mr. Marquee added that they will apply one coat of primer and two coats of paint. Mr. Martinez requested the existing fence height. Mr. Lewis replied approximately 54 – 56" high, but the height varies.

Public comment:

Dawn Steward, 17 North Street. The proposed fence is next to the Bowditch House and will come around the corner onto Eaton Place, where 3-4 different kinds of fencing will meet. Ms. Kelleher noted that there is a taller board fence in this location. Mr. Marquee replied that the new fence will stop at the end and will not turn the corner. Mr. Lewis added that he is on the property committee and this is being done as their budget permits. A major renovation was done 10 years ago, and they want to get the next phase in place by the 400-year anniversary. They will look at the historical appropriateness of everything.

Christina Sacondi, 17 North Street. Asked if the existing height will be replicated. Mr. Lewis replied 60-inches high to increase their privacy and create a uniform height. It will not be at the same height at the southern privacy fence.

Ms. Norkun asked if the existing fence is wrought iron. Mr. Lewis replied that the iron fence is next to the Ropes Garden. Ms. Norkun stated that there are so many viewpoints to this property and multiple fences. She questioned how all the fences will work together because there shouldn't be a hodgepodge which would be inappropriate given the neighboring structures. Mr. Lewis replied that the propose fence is only within public view from North Street, not Eaton Place.

Mr. Spang stated that he is not in favor of using pressure treated wood, despite its longevity, because it tends to warp and shrink as it dries out. It will fight against the finished look they hope to have. Mr. Lewis replied that it depends on how the wood is sourced. It will come from a lumber supplier, and he's never needed to wait 6 months to paint pressure treated wood, he's only waited 2-4 weeks maximum. It may be as expensive as something else, but it will be dried before they install it, and they will seal the end grains, etc. to eliminate any defects.

Mr. Joyce asked for the Commission's history on pressure treated wood. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Commission has approved it in non-visible areas only. Mr. Marquee asked if pine could be used. Mr. Pattison replied that pine will rot out, but red or white cedar could be used. He asked how they will set the posts. Mr. Marquee replied that they will drill down and sink the pressure treated posts 24-inches into the ground. Mr. Pattison suggested a site visit to see existing posts and how best to make the proposed blend with neighboring properties. Mr. Marquee noted the existing galvanized posts. Ms. Schaffer noted her concern with the white fence against the Witch House. Mr. Lewis noted a neighboring fence is also white and abuts the Witch House. The Commission agreed to schedule a site visit for August 3rd at 10AM.

Ms. Sacondi stated that Eaton Place is a private driveway.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

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

33 Carlton Street – CONTINUATION

Erika Harris submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 5/28/19
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher stated that Ms. Erika Harris has revised her proposal to use a true-divided wood Brosco window to replicate the existing windows. She recommended that the proposal now qualified for a Certificate of Non-applicability.

The Commission confirmed that proposed work qualified for approval under a Certificate of Non-Applicability.

42 Broad Street, Unit 6 - CONTINUATION

Cynthia Spang submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/25/19
- Photographs
- Harvey Majesty brochure

Ed Burge was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Burge stated that he is representing the owners of Units 2, 3 & 6. He presented interior photographs to respond to concerns raised at the last meeting regarding the installation method. The Commission stated at the last meeting that the windows should be recessed instead of projecting past the casing. The red line on the photos indicated the approximate location of where the window will be set back, the new window will not go past that point. They will add a pre-finished board / interior stops to bring the window back and the boards will be ripped down to allow for a sunken window to get the maximum look at the exterior. Unit 6 on the 3rd floor has vinyl windows to be removed and replaced with a new aluminum clad window that will be finished in white to match the trim color. The simulated divided lites will be affixed to the exterior glass with a metal spacer and ponderosa pine on the interior. Ms. Kelleher asked if the spacers come in bronzer rather than aluminum. The Commission's guidelines state that bronze spaces should be used. Mr. Burge replied that the spacer is tin.

Mr. Spang requested the setback distance. Mr. Burge replied that the window will sit back 7/8" from the face of the board. The flanges and gap at the window groove will be covered with a finished piece of wood. Mr. Pattison noted that if the sash is only an inch that leaves 1 1/4" gap around the perimeter.

Ms. Norkun asked if the applicant explored other windows with exterior wood rather than the proposed aluminum clad exterior. Mr. Burge replied yes but using a Marvin window would require all the exterior trim and the original wood moulding to be completely removed and he wouldn't want to lose that detail because it's old growth wood that can't be replaced. He also stated that Pella wood windows only last 10 years and can fall apart. The proposed Harvey Majesty window would last 30 years and be more efficient. There are 6 different types of windows. Ms. Schaeffer noted that the Harvey Majesty has been approved by the Commission and suggested that the Marvin might be a happy medium that's affordable for the owners. Ms. Norkun noted that there is a noticeable difference between the wood and the aluminum clad. She stated that this will dilute the integrity of the historic districts should the Commission go down this road. Mr. Barge replied that he could put in a Brosco wood window with an aluminum storm, but felt that this wouldn't look as good. He stated that this is what his customers can afford and Brosco windows will become more expensive for the owner.

Ms. Kelleher stated that Harvey Majesty was approved at 100 Derby Street, where existing windows were vinyl windows from the 1980's. At 81 Derby Street, they used a different type of Harvey Majesty, and the glass expanse was narrower, and the trim was wider. Ms. Norkun noted that some aluminum clad windows can be painted and recommended that this be considered since the aluminum finish is very noticeable unless it's painted because of its glossy finish. Ms. English noted that the Carlton Street applicant also wanted this type of window but the Commission was concerned about visually consistency since only 3 windows would be replaced. She expressed her opinion that this house is different since the majority of windows visible from the street will be replaced with the same window model. Ms. Kelleher noted that currently there is a mix of vinyl and wood windows with configurations of 1x1 and 6x1 sash. Ms. Schaeffer stated that he would prefer to see a wood replacement.

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

Mr. Martinez asked how the aluminum clad window will look in comparison. Mr. Pattison replied that the muntin profile and dimensions were close to an historic window and the shadow lines are good, despite the aluminum finish.

Ms. Norkun asked if 1" will be lost around the entire pane size. Mr. Barge replied yes with a total loss of 2" of glazing, but windows are already 46-inches wide. Mr. Martinez noted that there will be a small light loss by comparison. Ms. Norkun noted that some windows have larger middle windows and narrower sidelites.

Mr. Spang stated that he is torn on the exterior cladding but felt that painting aluminum would help to make it blend. He asked how long the paint will last over an aluminum finish. Mr. Barge replied that latex paints adhere well to the aluminum finish, it does fade but there is no peeling. Mr. Joyce asked if the sash color was factory applied. Mr. Barge replied yes, and there will be painted brush strokes when finished. Mr. Pattison noted that this building is brick and not wood, so he is more comfortable with the material change. He noted that the building is also on the edge of the district and the house across the street isn't in the district. Mr. Barge stated that the owners would be okay with painting the aluminum window. Mr. Spang noted the trim around the brick moulding should be kept. Ms. English stated that the house dates from the early 20th century and is one of the more recent buildings in the district. Ms. Norkun and Mr. Martinez agreed with Ms. English on setting precedent in the McIntire District. The paint finish should be brushed on and not sprayed on to get the texture. Ms. Schaeffer stated that the setback distance of the window and the lights shouldn't get too narrow. Mr. Barge replied that three are on first floor and the remaining are on the second and third floors and aren't highly visible.

Ms. Norkun stated that the exterior applied muntin grid should fit tightly into the aluminum clad sash with no gaps. Mr. Barge replied that it would be a tight fit. Mr. Pattison suggested they stipulate that any gaps be filled.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the applications for Units 6 and 3 are continuations so only Mr. Martinez, Ms. English, Mr. Pattison and Mr. Spang are eligible to vote. For Units 4 and 2, all members are eligible to vote since these applications are new submittals and not continuations.

Ms. Kelleher stated that painting was not included in the application, but it should to match the trim.

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve the application as presented with the following conditions: exterior aluminum cladding be brush painted; trim around brick moulding to be retained; gaps in muntins to be filled prior to painting; and installation to be completed as presented by Contractor with units set behind the face casing as indicated on detail on page 7 of the application documentation. This decision is based on the age of the building, its location in the district and the materials of the existing windows. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

42 Broad Street, Unit 3 - CONTINUATION

Isabel Leinster submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/17/19
- Photographs
- Harvey Majesty brochure

Ed Barge, representing the owner Isabel Leinster, was present to discuss the project.

(See discussion from Unit 6 above.)

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve the application as presented with the following conditions: exterior aluminum cladding be brush painted; trim around brick moulding to be retained; gaps in muntins to be filled prior to painting; and installation to be completed as presented by Contractor with units set behind the face casing as indicated on detail on page 7 of the application documentation. This decision is based on the age of the building, its location in the district and the materials of the existing windows. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. Ms. Norkun opposed. Five were in favor and two were opposed (Ms. Norkun and Ms. Schaeffer) and the motion so carried.

Unit 3 - Sliding Door

Mr. Spang stated that it is difficult to see and barely visible from Warren Street. Mr. Barge noted that the door opening size will remain the same. Mr. Spang noted that a sample was brought to their site visit, and band moulding will be provided to create a shadow effect. Painting the aluminum will give it a wood-like look. The paint color will be the same softer white by Sherwin Williams. Mr. Pattison agreed that the sliding doors are hardly visible, but a painted finish will provide a realistic look.

There were no public comments.

VOTE: Mr. Pattison made a motion to accept application as presented. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

42 Broad Street, Unit 2

Wolfgang Koch submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 6/17/19
- Photographs
- Harvey Majesty brochure

Ed Barge, representing the owner Wolfgang Koch, was present to discuss the project.

(See discussion from Unit 6 above.)

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

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve the application as presented with the following conditions: exterior aluminum cladding be brush painted; trim around brick moulding to be retained; gaps in muntins to be filled prior to painting; and installation to be completed as presented by Contractor with units set behind the face casing as indicated on detail on page 7 of the application documentation. This decision is based on the age of the building, its location in the district and the materials of the existing windows. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Five were in favor and two were opposed (Ms. Norkun and Ms. Schaeffer) and the motion so carried.

42 Broad Street, Unit 4

Pajo Vujkovic-Cvijin submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows in his unit

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/3/19
- Photographs
- Harvey Majesty brochure

Pajo Vujkovic-Cvijin was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Vujkovic-Cvijin stated that he wants to replace the windows in his unit with Harvey Majesty aluminum clad windows as previously discussed for units 2,3 and 6. The company he is using, C&D Windows, has been in business since the 1970's and will follow the same installation method as discussed with the other units, keeping the trim. However, the Harvey Majesty windows aren't the best energy efficiency so he is proposing that the four windows that aren't facing the street to be Harvey Tribute which have a higher efficiency. Mr. Joyce stated that the Tribute model is a triple pane window with an .17 efficiency where Majesty is .30, almost twice as efficient. They

would have the same details only a different fabrication. Ms. Kelleher noted that she is unsure of visibility of those windows from Broad Street. Mr. Spang noted that window #5 is visible from the street but behind tree branches; window #7 is possibly hard to see; window #8 is not visible; window #9 is possibly hard to see, and window #10 is visible. Mr. Pattison requested a sample of the Harvey Tribute because it looks like a vinyl replacement window. Mr. Spang noted that the sill is thin and its fit within the opening may look too different and not match the rest of the building. He was also unsure if an energy calculation was done to see if there is any heat loss through the wall and not just the window. There are U-value differences may not be noticeable. Mr. Vujkovic-Cvijin stated that even half of the more energy efficiency would make a difference to him.

Mr. Vujkovic-Cvijin stated that the second floor windows are less visible. Mr. Martinez suggested that windows #1-7 are visible from a public way, window #8 is not visible, and window #9 is partially visible.

Ms. English stated that a lot of custom installation would be done with the previous approved windows in units 2, 3 and 6 and the same detail should be used in this unit. Mr. Vujkovic-Cvijin replied that C&D Window provided a quote for that work. Ms. Kelleher suggested a stipulation that the Contractor reach out to the Commission to make sure the requirements are met. Mr. Vujkovic-Cvijin replied that he can forgo the higher efficiency window and his Contractor will follow the same customization. Ms. Schaeffer suggested they attach photos and drawings to the certificate, so everyone has the same information to work from. She also requested a window sample. Mr. Pattison noted that the windows won't be the same as below. Mr. Joyce suggested to the applicant that the cost difference for the higher priced windows would take too long to get that savings back in reduced heating costs.

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

VOTE: Ms. English made a motion to approve windows #1-9 to be replaced with Harvey Majesty windows with the following conditions: exterior aluminum cladding be brush painted; trim around brick moulding to be retained; gaps in muntins to be filled prior to painting; and installation to comply with approvals for units 2, 3 and 6 with drawing attached to certificate. This decision is based on the age of the building, its location in the district and the materials of the existing windows. Window #10 is not within the purview of the SHC due to its not being visible from a public way. Mr. Pattison seconded the motion. Five were in favor and two were opposed (Ms. Norkun and Ms. Schaeffer) and the motion so carried.

Other Business

11 Orne Fence: Mr. Pattison stated that the fence has been painted and he gave her options for how to fix it. He suggested the Commission send the applicant a letter stating that proposed solution was not appropriate. Ms. Kelleher stated that she would draft a response letter for the Commission to review.

384 Essex Street: Ms. Kelleher stated that the Owner hired a contractor to redo the portico and requested that someone from the Commission make a site visit to observe the water damage and details that will be lost. He has a quote to replace rotted detail, add a new copper roof, however; a drawing should be submitted. Ms. Schaeffer noted that this is too much hand holding for a small portico and a contractor should create the plan. Mr. Pattison replied that he will conduct a site visit. Mr. Spang suggested the applicant provide a drawing or marked-up photographs.

Ms. Kelleher noted the existing aluminum windows that will be replaced with Marvin windows in a matching color and that the storm window that will match the window trim. This item can be on the agenda for the next meeting. The Commission agreed to a site visit rather than having a public hearing. All monochrome paint would be okay.

13 Chestnut Street: David Hart submitted a photo of the copper roof replacement that was not done in kind - they added scuppers with an approximate 5" overhang. Mr. Spang noted that this will allow rainwater to cascade onto the sidewalk and create slippery conditions. Ms. Kelleher replied that she will draft a letter asking the applicant to submit an application for the roof change noting the Commission concerns about public safety.

159 Federal Street: Ms. Kelleher presented the applicant's proposal for a lattice fence and placement of associated pads for the AC units. The applicant will add 2-3 bushes in front to help conceal the units. The Commission can ask for a better depiction from the applicant who was already asked to submit a plan. Mr. Pattison noted that at a minimum the posts should be 4x4 not 2x3. Mr. Spang requested the applicant provide examples.

79 Columbus Avenue: Ms. Kelleher noted that this project also needs review by the ZBA, Conservation Commission and possibly Planning Board.

1 Derby Square: Ms. Kelleher stated that the owner of this building installed vinyl windows on the second floor without approval from the Redevelopment Authority. will be replaced.

VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Pattison 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