

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
September 4, 2019

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, September 4, 2019 at 7:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room. Present were: Reed Cutting, Rebecca English, Vijay Joyce, Milo Martinez, Stacey Norkun, Erin Schaeffer. Not present: David Hart, Mark Pattison

20 Beckford Street - CONTINUATION

Paul and Kirsten Bunker submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for rear door hood

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/20/19
- Photographs

Paul Bunker was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Bunker stated that he submitted revised drawings based on the feedback from the Commission. The hood that he wanted to rebuild rather than repair, is over the back step of the addition that has limited visibility. Mr. Joyce asked if the hood would be hipped not just sloped in one direction and the brackets will be at a 45-degree-angle. Mr. Bunker replied yes, in keeping with submitted examples and the brackets will match the existing. He provided a photo of the proposed trim. They are pulling detail from the closest roofline. A metal roof is preferable to copper due to the minimal slope.

Public comment:

A member of the public was present (name not known) who stated that she would prefer a copper roof.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the application as designed. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

79 Columbus Avenue - CONTINUATION

Request for Comment on new construction

Eric Cormier was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Cormier presented a window sample in wood painted black in a 6 over 1 formation with a white casing. Mr. Cormier stated that the architect asked if the lattice should be vertical/horizontal since lattice on a neighboring building was angled. Mr. Cutting and Ms. Norkun noted that squares are historically accurate lattice. Mr. Joyce stated that the posts under the porch should be 1x's instead of the turned posts as shown on drawing and he asked about the proposed garage door. Mr. Cormier replied that the garage, columns, railing and lattice will be wood, the garage doors will be a carriage style, everything on the itemized list provided by the Commission.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the roofline was changed and raised 2-feet, so the overhang at ends will go straight down. Ms. Norkun requested that the original diamond window be replicated to add to the character of the home. Mr. Cormier replied that he will find a salvaged window to install and will add an interior storm. Mr. Joyce noted that narrow vertical lites should be added at the top of the garage door, to match the orientation of the panes on the upper level windows.

Ms. Schaeffer asked if the dormers set back or flush with the house. Mr. Cormier replied that they will be setback 24-inches on both façades, and they can only go up 24-inches to create a knee wall, anything higher and it will become a 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. The dormer will be setback 6-feet from the front face of the house.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the applicant will be at the ZBA meeting on the September 13<sup>th</sup> and she would draft a comment letter to the ZBA for the Commission to approve.

### 3 Orne Square

Jeff Kabriel submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install vent pipe.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/21/19
- Photographs
- Vent pipe specifications

Jeff Kabriel, owner, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Kabriel stated that he wants to add a roof vent onto the slate roof on the North side of the building along Winthrop Street. The 2-inch PVC pipe to be painted the same color as the roof. The Orne Square Association is okay with it if they use a certified slate installer. Ms. Kelleher noted that the rear is visible from Winthrop and that part of Winthrop is within the historic district. Mr. Kabriel noted that the plumbing installer told him it will extend 24-inches max from the top of the roof. Ms. Kelleher stated that the Commission has approved them at the rear of structures in the past. Mr. Kabriel replied that the slate is multicolored, and they will use a dark color.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE:** Ms. Schaeffer made a motion to approve the vent pipe. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

### 122 Derby Street

Robert Burkinshaw submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for window replacement.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/30/19
- Photographs

Robert Burkinshaw and Jacqueline Russel were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Burkinshaw presented his application for new windows. The current windows are aluminum and they want to replace them in wood. The 1<sup>st</sup> story façade windows will be three separate windows. He noted that his store needs the ability to open the windows for ventilation, particularly in the kitchen. He asked if the windows would require mullions or muntins. Mr. Joyce replied muntins. Mr. Burkinshaw suggested the middle window be fixed and the two end windows be operable, and he would use true divided lite Brosco windows and they would be double glazed, so they don't need storm windows. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission hasn't reviewed a double-glazed Brosco, only single glaze. Mr. Cutting stated that he would shy away for this type of window in this location since it's at street level. Ms. Schaeffer noted that the Commission recently approved a single pane Brosco in this area.

Public comment:

Jessica Herbert, 70 Webb Street, asked why whether the center window should be kept if it is not operable, when all of the windows could be operable. She questioned the details of the proposed window.

Mr. Joyce questioned whether three windows can be mulled together and what that detail would look like and requested a detailed drawing. Ms. English asked why keep the middle window fixed. Mr. Burkinshaw replied that having only the end windows operable was sufficient. The original configuration was installed in the 1970's. Ms. Schaeffer noted that this new configuration would not match the old detail. Mr. Joyce asked if the applicant would be open to the middle window being operable both for practicality and for aesthetics. Mr. Burkinshaw replied that people kept breaking the larger windows, so they switched them out for smaller windows since it cost too much money to replace them so frequently.

The Commission agreed that three windows on each side is okay. Mr. Joyce requested a window cut sheet from the manufacturer with details of how the windows will fit together. He noted that there should also be no vinyl jamb liners, wood only. Mr. Burkinshaw replied that he already told the Contractor that the window will not be vinyl.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting to get a detail of the window of single pane wood Brosco windows. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 28 Chestnut Street

Andrew Lippman and Annie C. Harris, Trustees, submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for Architectural roof shingles.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/16/19
- Photographs
- Roofing sample

Annie Harris was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Harris stated that they need a new roof, the existing is a 3-tab grey asphalt roof and she could submit a Certificate of Non-Applicability if they replaced it with new 3-tab shingles. The roofer said architectural singles last longer and perform better in strong wind condition. The roof isn't very visible, and the new shingles would match the existing grey-black color as much as possible. There could be 3-4 layers of roofs up there now. Ms. Norkun stated that the Commission doesn't typically approve architectural shingles but has approved Slateline. Ms. Harris stated that Slateline has a more mottled slate look and the Commission had approved other architectural shingles on streets like Chestnut. She reviewed other samples and looked at Slateline but they aren't trying to match a slate roof and she believes what they are proposing is more subdued with no color variations. Ms. Norkun noted that the architectural style shingle has a diagonal cut that isn't historic but the Slateline has a perpendicularly cut and comes in nine colors. Ms. Harris stated that they won't be able to see the variation on the roof that high up on the main roof since most of the roof isn't very visible. There is a nearly flat tar roof at the rear that was completed 15-years ago. Ms. Kelleher noted that further away the less you see of the shingle and the more you see of the roof slope. Ms. Norkun asked if what minimal views of the roof could Slateline be used in a darker color. Ms. Harris replied that Slateline is also more expensive.

Ms. Norkun stated that approving this type of roof on Chestnut Street in an architectural profile sets a precedent that could snowball. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Commission has approved GAF Slateline. Mr. Cutting noted his concern with the diagonal cut because the angle mimics nothing historic. Ms. Harris noted that the proposed shingle doesn't have the 3-dimension look and she didn't know the diagonal cuts were the Commission's concern. Mr. Cutting replied that the roof has enough visibility from a distance so it's important to get it right. Ms. Schaeffer stated that with the straight cut being an important concern of the Commission, straight line products should be explored. Ms. Kelleher noted that Slateline is used more often, as well as CertainTeed Hatteras.

Public comment:

Jane Arlander, 93 Federal Street, noted that her neighbor asked for architectural shingles in 2014 since these shingles are easy to install but she was denied. She used Slateline on her hip roof in dark grey. It's as durable as the architectural shingle but does take more skill to install. The material is more expensive but it's worth it for its durability. 3M also has dark color shingles that should be investigated. She also wants the Commission to be consistent with its decisions.

Ms. Kelleher stated that there are different levels of architectural shingles. Ms. Harris noted that it seems the Commission isn't against the architectural shingle but not at this slope. She can install the 3-tab shingle with the 20-year guarantee and not the shingle with the 40-year guarantee she wanted. Mr. Joyce noted that alternative shingles the Commission aren't familiar with and haven't approved before can be explored.

David Pabich stated that he has used the Hatteras which looks like a 3-tab with a shadow line that has the dimension of a flat slate shingle. It has some variation and colors but with a flat look. Ms. Harris replied that she didn't want to mimic that look. Mr. Martinez noted that there is a Hatteras in a dark color.

**VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to continue to October 2, 2019. Mr. Joyce seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

1 Forrester Street

Jennifer Geraghty submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for new fencing.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 9/8/19
- Photographs

*Mr. Martinez recused himself as an abutter.*

Jeffery and Jennifer Geraghty were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Geraghty stated that they want to install a fence at their home like one depicted in an historic photo of the property. Mr. Geraghty noted that they are open to material suggestions, but they want it to be low like the original, approximately 3 ½ feet high. They are concerned with the existing hedges. Ms. Schaeffer asked if they would replicate the original fence. Ms. Kelleher noted that the original proposed was a picket fence with posts in between. Mr. Geraghty replied that they wanted to preserve the historic look of the home, that is also cost effective to keep the daughter within the confines of the property. She presented a photo of the original fence. Ms. Geraghty noted that the original fence looked sharp and she doesn't want to replicate the pointed pickets. Mr. Joyce stated that he is in favor of replication and noted that the fence pickets are slightly rounded and not dangerous. He suggested the applicants look at other Federal houses in the neighborhood or in the McIntire District and bring photos of them to a Contractor for pricing. Ms. Geraghty stated that she would also like to add a trellis at the entry way from the sidewalk, in addition to the existing one on the house. She provided one letter of support signed by three neighbors for the fence and one in support of the trellis. Ms. Geraghty noted that they have a double lot and asked whether there should be a gate at the driveway entrance and if the fence should stop there or be kept open. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Commission guidelines mentions having a straight fence, not a broken fence. Ms. Schaeffer asked why the proposed fence wouldn't enclose the entire perimeter. Mr. Geraghty replied that an existing dense hedge also acts as a barrier.

Mr. Cutting stated that the proposed material must be determined, and the final product must meet what the Commission approved. Ms. Schaeffer requested a mock-up from post to post, whether they decide to construct the fence themselves or use a contractor.

Public comment:

Unknown commenter. As a fence owner, they are high maintenance. There is a top bar that is casting a dark shadow in the photo on the pickets behind and underneath the shelf. Would the pickets of the new fence penetrate the top rail or go behind it? The bottom rail appears to be sitting in the soil which would cause the paint to fail and the wood to deteriorate. The applicants should check other fences in the neighborhood to see how they are surviving and not surviving. She just rebuilt her fence for the third time.

Architect Helen Sides. This propose custom-made fence would be very expensive. She suggested the applicants get quotes and look at other fence styles to get an idea of the cost and maintenance required.

Mr. Geraghty asked what the Commission would need to see in order to approve the fence. Ms. Schaeffer replied plans or drawings and elevations, or a completed section viewable during a site visit. She asked how it will tie into the corner. Ms. Geraghty replied that the fence would be straight across so the hedge can stay, but it would be continuous across the front of the house until it reached the fence at the adjacent property. Mr. Joyce suggested the fence be capped so if the hedges come down the fence could be continued. Mr. Cutting stated that the fence could curve and then cut off. Ms. Schaeffer noted that the property is a corner lot with two fronts, and she would prefer to see a full run of fence along both fronts. Ms. Geraghty asked how long a Commission approval lasts. Ms. Kelleher replied one year but it can be continued if need be.

Mr. Martinez stated that the fence in the photo would add curb appeal to the house and neighboring houses, but he would want to see the giant box posts replicated. In the historic photo, there appears to be a solid run of fence at the driveway and the proposed fence could enclose only the front yard and not the driveway. He asked if there was ever a house next door. Ms. Geraghty replied that she does not believe so and there is no shadow of a house in the old fence photograph. What they want most is to fence in the second lot since this is the area, they use the most.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to continue to Oct 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019 regular meeting. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

*Mr. Martinez returned.*

#### 21 Washington Square North

Salem Renewal Ventures, LLC submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install fence/gate.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/21/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Seger Architects

David Pabich, 8 Harborview Terrace, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Pabich reported that the building restoration project is almost complete except for the installation of the recreated snow fence. He stated that one of the new owners in the building would like a gate and fence installed due to the activity in front of the house, so he is proposing a wrought iron gate with posts. He stated that the gate is absolute, and the fence is secondary since vegetation at the rear helps isolate it. He noted that the gate would extend from the two short granite posts with a straight run of fence from the right side of the gate to the house and a curved wrought iron fence from the left side to the Witch House museum property line. Mr. Martinez asked if the granite curbing lies along the property line. Mr. Pabich replied yes and it's entirely on his property. Mr. Joyce asked if the

existing fence would be replicated. Mr. Pabich replied yes, a simple square 1-inch balusters with a pyramidal top, top rail, and 2-inch x 2-inch wrought iron posts. Ms. Schaeffer asked if the historic fence is taller. Mr. Pabich replied that the original fence was shorter than the Witch Museum's fence and the granite posts are newer because there is no indication that there was a fence in that granite.

Mr. Martinez asked for the height of the fence at Salem Witch Museum. Mr. Pabich replied that he believes the two fences will meet at the bottom rail but that he could also have the fence meet the lower rail of the top two rails of the Museum fence. The top rail is proposed at 2-feet 7-inches high. The Commission agreed that the railing lines and pyramidal tops should be aligned with the Museum fence for continuity.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the top and bottom rails of the new wrought iron fence meet up with the neighboring property to make it appear as a continuous run of fence. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the gate following the same fence details where the cap aligns with the lower fence post of the Witch Museum. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 6 South Pine Street

Matthew Murphy and Sarah Morrill submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for building renovations.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 7/29/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Helen Sides

Architect Helen Sides and owners Matt Murphy and Sarah Morrill were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Sides stated that the owners received a Certificate of Non-Applicability for a non-visible rear window and they will install Marvin SDL windows at this location. The gambrel roofed building faces towards the side yard with its gambrel end facing the street. The owners want to add a new shed dormer on the building's façade to match an existing shed dormer on the rear. The new dormer would be twice the size of the rear shed dormer, which provides light and headroom for a small bathroom. The Commission asked if the single shed dormer could be changed to three small dormers instead. Ms. Sides responded that the building is old, and they need to review the building's structure to determine whether dormers can be added. At the side and rear elevations, they are proposing to add two new double hung windows. There is no Brosco window available to match the opening size so they are proposing a new custom Marvin window, which will be very expensive. They would use a storm window to match existing on the building.

Mr. Joyce stated that the house has enough detail that it warrants more decorative gable dormers instead of a simpler shed dormer. Ms. Sides replied that they would prefer the new dormer to be a shed roof to match the existing dormer on the rear. She's also concerned with construction that they wouldn't get the pitch at such a short distance. They want to match the window size and beef up the sides for framing. She stated that they could consider having three sheds dormers vs. three pitched dormers. They would continue the pitch at the upper roof slope since it's an upper part of a gambrel roof. She believes this would be most appropriate and asked if three single shed dormers would be acceptable rather than three pitched. The cornice line would continue around the dormer perimeters at the upper roof. Ms. Norkun asked where the dormers would be placed since the front of the house isn't symmetrical. Ms. Sides replied centered on the far left and centered between the two on the right depending upon where it calls in the room. Ms. English asked if the dormers are original. Ms. Sides replied possibly, it is as old as the sash and the framing is very thin.

Mr. Cutting stated that the home has had no roof penetrations for 200 years and is original to the original design. Ms. Sides replied that they are seeking feedback not an approval. Ms. Morrill added that they are open to other options so they can get added light at this level. Ms. English noted that no other houses this style have dormers. Ms. Schaeffer noted that she is torn and likes the design and three dormers seems to be a better option, but she is concerned about adding new dormers on the front façade. Mr. Joyce reiterated his opinion that the dormers shouldn't be shed; the front entry has a lot of detail and the dormers should follow that same line of thinking. If the details were simpler it may be appropriate, but it's a refined house and the original intent should be followed.

Ms. Sides stated that the gable end at the rear is visible and there is a single window that they want to make two windows. The porch was added in 1938. Ms. Kelleher suggested that the Commission could conduct a site visit to see the relationship of the proposed changes.

There was no public comment.

#### 6 South Pine Street

Matthew Murphy and Sarah Morrill submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate front fence and install shed.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/19/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Helen Sides

Architect Helen Sides, owners Matt Murphy and Sarah Morrill were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Sides stated that they are seeking approval for proposed fencing and a new shed. The existing fence is a simple flat board capped fence with intermediate posts. They want to move the entire front fence back to a location in line with the rear corner of the building's vestibule. The property has an existing curb cut of 15-feet-6-inches and there is a tree on the left close to the curb cut. She noted that South Pine Street is a narrow street and the owners have the width and curb cut to park two cars on site. Leaving the fence at the edge keeps it too close to the corner when coming out of the driveway and there is nowhere for the gates to swing out of the way. They also want to continue the brick sidewalk and create a brick courtyard, with the fence behind the parked cars and not at the street line. Ms. Schaeffer asked if there was any existing parking on site. Ms. Sides replied that there was once and the former owners, two-owners ago, extended the fence to the street and parked in the parking lot of a neighboring church. It's too tight and a fence doesn't work well at the street, it's not viable in the winter since there is no place to plow snow. Also, there is not enough room for gates to open and get past them, or for two cars to get in. Mr. Joyce asked if the fence would terminate at the brick driveway. Ms. Sides replied yes and there will be enough room for some plantings. She noted that the abutter has a 6-foot-tall fence with lattice detail and the relocated fence would return to the existing fence as it already does. Mr. Cutting requested the setback of the fence. Ms. Sides replied 24-feet. Mr. Joyce asked why it doesn't continue along the lot line to the street. Ms. Sides replied that there is no way to end the fence at the street since there isn't enough room to return it and still provide enough turning space for vehicles. Mr. Joyce suggested ending it with a fence post. Ms. Sides replied that she believed that plantings were a better option to separate the properties along that edge. Mr. Joyce suggested that plantings could limit the parking. Ms. Norkun suggested a site visit to determine whether a run of fence is preferred to be at the street, to avoid an awkward placement. Mr. Murphy stated that every single house has what they are proposing, no fence at the property line. Ms. Schaeffer replied that their property is different since what is the house's front yard is in face the side yard from the street view. A fence brings together the feeling of a yard that is different than other houses with the front door that is facing the side street. She would prefer the fence to be on the zero-lot line. Mr. Martinez noted that the proposed fence would bisect their view of the front of the house despite there being an existing curb cut. The Commission wants to make decisions that are historically accurate and appropriate for the neighborhood

just to provide them with parking. Ms. Morrill noted that the configuration from two owners ago is what they are requesting. Mr. Kelleher stated that if continued, she can look up previous details on this property.

#### Shed Discussion

Ms. Sides stated that the owners have no place to put bikes and lawn equipment. They proposed the Chateau or Sierra model shed. Ms. Morrill added that the shed would be the cedar tongue and groove, no windows and a single door, and dual black 3-tab shingles. Ms. English requested the proposed placement of the shed. Mr. Murphy replied the far corner of the lot with a 5-foot setback. Ms. Schaeffer requested shed approvals and all associated information. Mr. Joyce suggested matching the corner boards at the shed, similar to how a carriage house would be treated if it were built at the same time. Ms. Sides replied that it would not be done at this small scale, but it could also be unpainted, so it doesn't stand out. Mr. Murphy noted that the shed size will be 6-feet x 1-feet, that could weather and fade into the background. They would prefer using cedar shingles. Mr. Cutting asked how the shed gets delivered or constructed. Ms. Morrill replied assembled on site and there is an option for the door to be wood not vinyl.

#### Fence Discussion

Ms. Sides stated that the fence extends to the street, returns a small amount with a small piece at the edge of the garden. Ms. Morrill added that there will be just a small open space to pull the cars in. Mr. Joyce replied that he is okay with that placement. Ms. Sides noted that the secondary fence off the vestibule is to contain their dog on the property.

#### Public comment:

Darlene Millis, noted that historically fences demarcate the public and private space and this situation has been handled before, at 115 Federal Street, as well as several other houses. She noted that there is an oval window in the vestibule and this detail could be installed in the shed dormer. This façade has 4 bays not 5 which alters its symmetry.

Jessica Herbert. The dormers at the front façade should be discussed with a proper depiction of what's proposed. The applicants can investigate side dormers or other solutions other than changing the façade of the building. Mr. Joyce replied that the applicants only requested the Commission's opinion, but they should have a rendering of the proposal before their site visit.

Ms. Kelleher agreed to coordinate a site visit.

**VOTE: Ms. Norkun made a motion to continue all applications for the property to the next regular meeting. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 27 Herbert Street

Nancy Corral submitted a Certificate of Hardship to install new fencing and gate (after the fact.)

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/1/19
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher noted that the application was not present as she lives out of state.

The Commission agreed to continue the request to the next meeting.



## 6 Federal Court

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

### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/5/19
- Photographs
- Engineer Report from Hayes & O'Neill

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

Ms. Richard stated that she included the report from a licensed structural engineer, Hayes & O'Neill, who evaluated the structure this past summer and determined that it was unstable, unrepairable, and should be demolished. With it deemed unsafe there is a fear of it collapsing, so safety fencing is in place to protect people from the structure. She stated that it is a hardship to keep continuing the application hoping the structure can be repurposed or rebuilt. The previous owner's applications weren't accepted, but she is now responsible for the structure and believes that it needs to be taken it down. She has an estimate and proposal from a contractor who is awaiting permission from the Commission to take it down.

Ms. Norkun asked if any other avenues were looked into. Ms. English noted that only one engineer was asked to provide a structural opinion. Atty Fitzpatrick replied that the professional opinion says it must be demolished and they didn't feel the need to reach out to multiple engineers. Ms. Richard stated that the last proposal to renovate the carriage barn was in the early 2000s and was designed by Staley McDermet. This proposal was discussed at multiple meetings and was ultimately not approved. She noted that when the barn was separated from its original property on Federal Street, the result was a structure with no setback on one side. The previous Commission requested an entrance to the structure facing the Ropes Mansion to provide the building with a usable entrance, which also wasn't acceptable. She has been in touch with a nursery in search of mature planting once the structure is removed, to fill the void and make its removal less obvious.

Ms. Schaeffer requested the future plans for the structure. Ms. Richard replied that she intends to restore the house and plant gardens at the rear. Ms. Schaeffer noted that besides the structural issues, only one structural engineer was sought who stated that the structure can't be saved. Atty. Fitzpatrick replied that a professional engineers report deemed the structure unrepairable, it's his opinion not theirs. Ms. Richard noted that this is a sensitive topic for the neighborhood, and no one wants to see it go but it's already gone. If the Commission can't come to a decision in a reasonable amount of time, she will have to take some action because it's collapsing, it's unsafe, and a fire hazard. She knows the abutting neighbors aren't happy with it, but it can't be reused. The previous owners tried to be creative in terms of solutions, but she can't undo what's been done. Atty. Fitzpatrick noted that in January 2019 the City issued an enforcement order against the owners with the threat of criminal actions. It's a catch 22 cycle because the City is also telling them they can't repair or fix it. Two facts apply; they received notices from the City with the threat of further action - to comply they hired a professional engineer who provided a report stating that the structure is not repairable and should be demolished.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that if everyone neglected their historic properties, they would all fall into a state of disrepair. Ms. English noted that this is an opportunity to explore other opportunities or other alternatives with other structural engineers. Mr. Joyce asked if they've explored the option of having someone convert the building and fix up the property. Atty. Fitzpatrick replied that they call it a barn, but the city labels it as a carriage house. They've submitted proposals that got rejected and they are given notices threatening criminal actions, foreshadowing more enforcement actions. They are trying to avoid another catch 22 situation.

Ms. Richard stated that they've applied to rebuild it, but in order to use the carriage house there must be two entrances. The proposal was put before the public in the past and it showed the clearances, but there is no easement or right-of-way. The structure would need to spin it to make it usable, and the public objected to this option 14-years ago.

Ms. Kelleher noted multiple recent examples of renovating historic carriage house for residential use, including a carriage house on North Street where the owner moved the structure wall by wall and rebuilt it on a new foundation. There have been successful renovations, but this is also a complicated site. Ms. Schaffer stated that the climate of the ZBA is the reuse the structures to generate income. Atty. Fitzpatrick added that this family's attempt to do that years ago was rejected, and so were their requests to demolish it. Ms. Schaeffer noted that if the applicant isn't willing to restore or reuse the structure, she would adamantly oppose its demolition. Atty. Fitzpatrick replied that their previous demolition and repair requests were rejected, Ms. Richard's father was prosecuted by the City, and he sees this cycle happening again. Ms. Schaeffer noted that there are consequences for neglect and there are successful examples of reuse and receivership. Atty. Fitzpatrick replied that this is not demolition by neglect. The dispute was resolved through a written settlement agreement and the family repaired and stabilized the barn. The City insisted on repairs to be done to the satisfaction of a City hired engineer. Ms. Richard added that they hired an engineer back then who also said it was in terrible condition but didn't say it needed to come down, that's when the City brought in their own engineer.

Ms. Norkun noted that the climate has changed and asked if there is an opportunity for another party to purchase it and restore it rather than demolish it. Ms. Richard replied that the property was initially purchased as a means to protect the brick house from a variance the City approved in the 1960's for 97 Federal Street. This land was purchased to act as a buffer and prevent a development there since they didn't have the proper setbacks. The City approved variances, her parents took the City to court, but the City reissued the variances. The façade facing Federal Street shows how it looked in the 1800's if someone wanted to replicate it, but the land is not for sale. Atty. Fitzpatrick noted that owner has always been open to historic preservation, if someone dismantled and reassemble it elsewhere. The owner wants to focus their resources on the residence and doesn't want further action by the City.

Public comment:

Jane Arlander, 93 Federal Street, Abutter to an abutter. History: The previous carriage house owner had a nursing home at the Victorian house and had abandoned this barn, and when the Peabody's bought it, it was already in bad condition. A trust rented out the Victorian house as a 2-family, and neither the trust or the occupants of the 2-family cared for this structure, so the carriage house has been neglected for longer than the 60-year ownership of the current owner's family. The house at 6 Federal Street Court is her main concern and she supports demolishing the structure. Wild animals seek shelter in this structure, and there are numerous police reports regarding this structure. She has a report from Kneeland Construction Co. from 2002, who said it was in a serious state of repair and suggested demolition.

Jessica Hebert, 7 Webb Street. The Commission hasn't discussed the other properties the applicant is working on. Ms. Richard should be congratulated on the work she's done so far at 6 Federal Court and the Grimshawe House on Charter Street. This carriage house is important because it belongs to the history of the Federal Street. When the house was completed in 1872, the Shreve's bought 3 lots on Federal Street to build the house but they had to maintain the street, called Loring Place, which is now the driveway. The Shreve's sold the house to Joseph Lefavor who spent 10-years trying to undo the City street down the middle of his property, which he accomplished in 1882. When that was successful, he built the carriage house in the middle of what was the street. As Ms. Richard said, the purchase of this carriage house was to prevent a new development along-side their house. With all her years on the Commission she didn't know there was an earlier application to restore it. It's important and unfortunate that it's come to this. They should discuss this privately with the owner since further legal action isn't preferable. They should also take some time to see if there are other options besides demolition. Ms. Richard is a conscientious applicant. Mr. Cutting replied that no one will speak ill of Ms. Richard and the Commission members are both sympathetic and fairly new; however, eliminating this structure at the heart of this district is significant.

Ms. English suggested the applicant see if any other opportunities come up. Atty. Fitzpatrick replied that anyone in the room can reach out to them with an offer to take it away and preserve it elsewhere, and that can also be

discussed by the Commission. Ms. Kelleher noted that the Commission received multiple letters advocating for the preservation of this building from the public.

Leann Tinkum. People want to preserve it and suggested a vocational school get involved. Ms. Richard replied that the building has been condemned so there is a liability with letting people in. Mr. Joyce suggested the word get out about the structure to determine any available opportunities. Atty. Fitzpatrick suggested the City facilitate an RFP or some discussion since many city agencies are already involved, but they don't want this to lead to more threats of criminal actions.

Ms. Schaffer hesitated to allow the Commission to stall this further without a discussion with the Building Inspector. Atty. Fitzpatrick replied that there are no time demands on them now, they fear an escalation on the City side. Ms. Kelleher stated that she will work with other staff to navigate this process and seek opportunities.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to continue to October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 393 Essex Street

Essex Street Realty, LLC submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for new signage.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/7/19
- Photographs
- Sign specifications by Lasting Designs

Leeanne Tinkham Lasting Designs was present on behalf of the applicant to discuss the project.

Ms. Tinkham stated that her client wants to install a sign similar to the one she completed on Lowell Street in Peabody but being in a historic district they didn't know which direction to go so she submitted three options. There are many different sign styles on Essex Street, they want to group names and make the slats interchangeable if a dentist were to leave the practice. The Peabody sign has slats on a stand that you unscrew and can remove it.

Mr. Cutting noted there is no freestanding sign. Ms. Kelleher stated that neighboring signs are either fixed to the building or blade signs. Ms. Tinkham noted that the bracket is existing. Ms. Norkun noted that the Athenaeum sign can be hooked into the bottom. Ms. Tinkham replied that the lower hooked-on signs get blown away in the wind and go missing. The existing sign is 20-inch wide x 32-inch high and could be a single pole-free standing sign. Mr. Joyce noted that he's seen historic houses with this level of detail and the proposal is very contemporary. Ms. Tinkham replied that her client is willing to cut back or remove the bushes to get the free-standing sign. Mr. Cutting stated that the blade sign seems tight. Ms. Tinkham replied that she thought it would be too busy by the door, so she proposed installing a new sign at the corner by the parking lot with either a single or double post, with the sign perpendicular to the street. Mr. Joyce preferred a single post sign. Ms. English noted that the existing telephone pole could be an obstruction. Mr. Cutting noted the tight space and suggested leaving three-feet of space at the corner. Mr. Joyce agreed. Mr. Martinez requested the colors. Ms. Tinkham replied a cream sign (similar to a manila envelope) with black and gold carved letters.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Mr. Joyce made a motion to approve the 20-inch x 32-inch single pole sign, replicating the Ropes Mansion sign using wood, with the sign to be black slats with gold carved lettering with a background color to**

match the body of the house, sign to be placed at the right-side corner of the house. Ms. English seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

11 Warren Street, Unit 1 & 2

Patricia Nagle; Christopher and Karen Nagle submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to install AC and HVAC systems.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant requested a continuance.

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

360 Essex Street

Emily Stuart submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness for building and site renovations.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 8/21/19
- Photographs
- Drawings by Seger Architects

Dan Ricciarelli of Seger Architects, Robert and Emily Stuart owners, were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Ricciarelli stated that the owners want to restore the building, including a driveway side addition. They will also construct a new rear porch, deck and kitchen addition that will not be visible from a public way. Ms. Kelleher confirmed that the changes to the rear can't be seen from Federal Street to the rear.

Mr. Ricciarelli noted that all new elements will be appropriate and match the building. The existing deck will wrap around the rear, they will maintain the column details, add a single top rail balustrade, and the decking material will most likely be cedar. At the driveway, a retaining wall added in the 1920's or 30's is deteriorating, so they want to remove it and expose the foundation. They will also remove the casement windows and install 6x6 double-hung windows in the master bedroom and kitchen and reinstall a widow's walk with crisscross railings. Ms. Stuart noted that widow's walk is a 9-foot x 9-foot space with an interior stair for access. Mr. Ricciarelli noted that removing the casements and replacing them with double-hung windows is being proposed for privacy. Ms. Stuart noted that the existing casements are barely operable. Mr. Ricciarelli stated that the windows will be true-divided lite to be supplied by JB Sash and the existing storms will be reinstalled.

Ms. Kelleher stated that removing the concrete wall and changes to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor window at the rear addition are all that are visible from a public way. Nothing is visible from the rear except for miscellaneous trim and clapboard repair, and the previous owner took off the rear stair.

Mr. Cutting asked for the water table detail. Mr. Ricciarelli replied that there will be a chamfered detail.

**VOTE: Mr. Martinez made a motion to approve as submitted with windows to be JB sash, the 3-tab shingles will not be replaced. Ms. Norkun seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Request for Comment under Section 106 - Salem Housing Authority – Zisson Building window replacement

Patti Kelleher presented the project on behalf of the Housing Authority.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the Salem YMCA building is jointly owned by the Salem Housing Authority and the YMCA. Most windows are 1x1 aluminum windows and the Housing Authority is seeking to replace them in kind.

The use of Federal funds means the applicant must undergo Section 106 review. The decorative wood oval and half-round windows are staying, but the proposal is to replace the existing wood true-divided four-lite transom windows above some of the single windows with aluminum simulated divided lite windows. Their use of Federal funding requires approval from MHC, who requested comments from the Historical Commission and Historic Salem, Inc. Ms. Kelleher noted that the transom windows could be restored with a new storm window or replaced in kind, rather than using the proposed aluminum clad, simulated divided lite, double glazed windows. The Housing Authority would have to paint the windows if they were restored. Ms. Kelleher reported that the Housing Authority was initially told that they didn't need SRA review, but it turns out they did, and that was after they ordered the windows. She notified them that with Federal funding they also needed MHC review. Mr. Joyce asked if they would replace the wood transom with a wood window. Ms. Kelleher replied that they were proposing aluminum. The only remaining original elements are the transoms and decorative windows with the masonry trim, which the Commission could encourage them to consider restoration. Mr. Cutting suggested a strongly worded letter encouraging window restoration.

#### FY20 Community Preservation Plan - Request for Comment

The Commission agreed to discuss the CPA Plan at the next meeting.

#### Other Business

Mike Becker, 2 School Street was present. He raised concerns about 14-16 Hodges Court where he owns the abutting property. During the public review process for his property, the owner of 14-16 Hodges Court was opposed to him putting in a driveway because headlights would shine into her windows. She then removed an existing wood fence with 2-inch pickets and 1-inch spacing (approx. 30% transparent) and installed an aluminum fence (approx. 90% transparent). He built an historically appropriate wood fence that met the guidelines, installed reclaimed brick driveway and reclaimed granite steps. He stated that he didn't believe her aluminum fence resemble wrought iron, which he wouldn't mind it if it didn't end at the sidewalk. He objected to her choice of fence when lighting getting through was one of her main concerns.

Jessica Herbert, 70 Webb Street. She stated that she shared Mr. Becker's concerns about the owner's lack of historic elements. Ms. Kelleher replied that the Commission should look at the property and continue its review to the next meeting. Ms. English noted that this fence is in clear view of the public way.

**VOTE: Ms. English motion to continue the application to the next meeting. Mr. Martinez seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### Violation Notices

Mr. Kelleher stated that there are many projects being done without permits. The regulation states that the Commission needs to vote in order to issue a violation; however, the staff can send out a letter stating that work has commenced without an application and the request to submit an application.

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Preservation Planner