

DRAFT
SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
March 20, 2024

A regular meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, March 20, 2024, at 6:00 pm. **VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING**. Present were: Rebecca English, Mark Meche, Milo Martinez, Larry Spang (Chair). Staff: Patti Kelleher. Not present: Vijay Joyce, Mark Pattison, Kelly Tyler-Lewis, Margarida Raka-Gonvalves.

14 Kosciusko Street

Michael Martin submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the third story window

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 1/16/24
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher noted that this application was considered under the minor change category and since no objection was received, the certificate was issued.

30 Northey Street- continuation

Flora Tonthat submitted a waiver of the Demolition Delay Ordinance for the demolish more than 50% of garage roof

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 2/15/24
- Photographs

Flora Tonthat (owner) and Claudia Paraschiv (architect) were present to discuss the project.

Chair Spang noted that he reviewed the plan but did not attend the site visit. Mr. Meche noted that he, Mr. Joyce, and Ms. Kelleher were present at the site visit. Noting that the photos clearly state the existing conditions, the garage is in pretty good shape, although the roof is leaking, and the rear of the garage is the same material and close to the rear property line. He noted the crowded site due to proximity of the neighboring units and the rear of a triple decker being visible behind the garage. He learned that the garage is on the National Register district and this address is listed as a contributing property.

Ms. Paraschiv stated that revised drawings were provided. Chair Spang noted that the drawings from the previous meeting were more for ZBA and not Historical Commission which would target design issues, given that this is a new approach to the garage. Ms. Paraschiv stated that they proposed to keep 3 decorative concrete block walls, they factored in symmetry on the right-hand side with a continuation of the wall. The openings above are fixed glass panels to capture light and both spaces are double height with an art studio space with a metal interior ceiling. The right side will be a double-height space residential space with exterior access. The treatment will resemble the existing pergola porch which has different character and is the inspiration for the form and material of the ADU. The wood siding would be sustainable in a natural finish, the double door will have fixed members with divided lites, and the transoms above the double doors will act as a bresaola. There are raised planting beds between the two

doors to act as a small courtyard for privacy. They have located condensers for the mini split at both the ground level and on the balcony behind the screen wall. The balcony acts as a roof and has a glorified setback to provide some outdoor space and to back away from the neighboring wall and chimney.

Chair Spang requested the front elevation. Ms. Paraschiv replied that the front façade would continue the siding as shown in the shaded image. Chair Spang requested a rear elevation. Ms. Tonthat replied that the concrete block wall would remain below, with new siding above, and there are no windows at the rear of the building. Chair Spang raised concern with the proximity to neighboring property. Ms. Tonthat replied that there would be no visibility into the rear yards of her neighbors.

Public Comment:

Jeff Cohen, 12 Hancock Street, Ward 5 City Councillor, married to the applicant. This is a \$30,000 issue. Last year Flora won a restoration award from HSI and informs her guests on the history of the house. She took remarkable care of the housing during demolition and is an example of how to restore and maintain historic properties. She received funds through ARPA for the ADU and this is a naturally affordable housing unit. She is fulfilling several missions for the city by creating an affordable unit and elevating the street. He added that she has also worked at the park at the end of the street and where they also maintain the trees.

Cyndi Geller, 42 Northey Street. She has spoken to the applicant many times and believes this would be a benefit to the neighborhood, so she is in favor of it.

Andy Varela, 23 Cedarcrest Avenue, Ward 7 City Councillor. In favor of the project, noting that this would be transformative to the neighborhood. He appreciates Flora's ability to create a naturally affordable project which helps the neighborhood.

Ms. Kelleher stated that she received letters from the following:

1. An e-mail from Councillor Caroline Watson-Felt. In support of the ADU project.
2. An e-mail from Linda Stark, 11 Church Street. In support of the ADU project.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Ms. Tonthat requested the precedent and comparable Mr. Joyce requested she compile for reference be reviewed. Ms. Tonthat read her statement. She stated that most other garages also listed on the National Registry have since been demolished and the ones that do exist look nothing like the main house and have no historical aesthetics.

Mr. Meche noted the existence of a bare quorum and the need for all members present to vote in favor. In his opinion, the existing garage wasn't very special although he believed the concrete blocks should remain. The garage is contributing within the district and to get to a good place the new design it shouldn't look two centuries old. He added that the pergola is a good design, he is not completely satisfied that the design presented is best, but it's going in a good direction. It is historic and what comes next needs to be comfortable fit in this location, as well as differentiate from the older part of the building.

He would be inclined to agree to take the roof off but suggested it be done carefully. He noted the close proximity of the windows to the property lines.

Chair Spang reiterated that two votes are under the demo delay waiver, whether the structure is historically significant and whether it's preferably preserved. With a bare quorum, every Commission member must agree. He offered a continuation so that more members could be present to vote.

Ms. English noted that he is not sure she would vote any differently, due to the current design, when the only change seems to be the windows.

Mr. Matinez stated that the task of the Commission is to decide if the roof can be removed not whether an ADU can go there. The Commission is not here to stop an ADU, they are here to protect a historic resource. Parasitic architecture: differentiating one style of architecture with the use of another style is subjective and he doesn't follow the parasitic architectural design method. He noted that the signatures collected were for ZBA not the waiver of demo delay.

Chair Spang agreed that there are many ways to accomplish an ADU on site, and the demolition of the roof is Commission's purview. He questioned the concerns of the Commission, whether there was skepticism with adding height to the building or the proposal to use a different composition or treatment at the façade. Mr. Martinez had concerns with the design as presented. The garage was built approximately 100 years after the house, but from the street you'd know they belong together, and the language between houses and their carriage houses is important, as is the treatment of the facade. Ms. English agreed with Mr. Martinez. Mr. Martinez noted that the Commission recently allowed the total demolition of a garage to allow for the construction of additional living space.

Chair Spang noted that at the Winter Street ADU precedent provided, the façade is like what is proposed with garage bays, windows and decorative historic treatment and a porch. He asked if the garages were windows, if that was a direction the Commission would support, noting that there was also some dialog with the historic property. Mr. Meche replied that if the pergola is the precedent, it has notched beams like brackets, and at the Winter Street ADU, if it's new it's not historic even if detailed similarly to the garage. He suggested other complimentary details be added. Chair Spang noted that the applicant is attempting to match how the newer pergola speaks to the old and she wants the garage to do the same thing. He doesn't see a new way to do that with the garage.

Ms. Tonthat stated that if the garage were a carriage house, you'd still have to deal with the pergola porch, which they want to connect to. They want to make the garden larger to help connect with the house. It breaks the dialog and she would rather see it absorbed and woven into the gardenscape. Mr. Martinez replied that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over the pergola, if it went before the Commission, it would have turned out very differently. Ms. Paraschiv noted that the Commission wasn't present for the design of the main house either.

Chair Spang stated that the Commission has jurisdiction over the removal of the roof but not the design. The design is close in some ways and far away in other ways. He questioned how to find the middle ground, noting that they don't have the votes tonight and would need to continue.

VOTE: Meche made a motion to continue. English seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

5 North Pine Street

Michael Greengart submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove siding and restore building exterior

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 2/29/24
- Photographs

Michael Greengart (owner of unit #2) was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Greengart stated that he is proposing to remove the deteriorated shakes on three sides to expose the clapboard, replace deteriorated clapboards in kind as needed, remove mold, and paint in the same color. He noted that there are soffit issues and rot at windows that would also be replaced in-kind.

Chair Spang stated that the removal of shakes is a change. Mr. Greengart agreed and noted that they will paint the window frames and soffits white to match the existing color.

Ms. Kelleher asked if the composite material would be placed at the soffits or windows. Mr. Greengart replied that his contractor, Preserve Services, suggested AZEK which has been used on other historic homes. Chair Spang questioned whether the product would be used as a board, shaped to match, and painted. Mr. Greengart was unsure how the product would be used.

Fred Smith, owner of Unit #1, stated that when the shingles were added nothing was done to the window frames, there is no reveal and the water washes down the face of the building, which is the reason for the rot.

Chair Spang asked if a test area of shakes were removed. Mr. Greengart replied yes, and the area clapboards below was in good shape.

Mr. Meche clarified that the window frame mentioned is the jamb, head and sill.

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

Chair Spang asked if the downspouts and electric weather head would be detached and reattached. Mr. Smith replied yes.

Ms. English asked if the composite trim would blend well with the wood. Mr. Smith replied yes, adding that the building was remodeled 25-years ago. The composite material would be used at the soffits and the window frames won't be composite. Chair Spang asked if the trim profiles will be replicated using synthetic material. Mr. Smith replied yes.

Mr. Meche noted that the inventory form includes a photo, possibly from the 1950's, when there was no gutter and the current gutter is an aluminum K style gutter. He also noted that the presence of some ornamental detail and cove moulding at the cornice that he wouldn't want to see removed.

Ms. Kelleher stated that this house would have had corner boards and a waterboard that could be under the siding. She requested they work with the Commission if any details emerge and encouraged the reinstallation of those elements.

Mr. Meche stated that if they choose to replace the asphalt shingles on the entry door roof overhang it must be reviewed by the Commission. Ms. Kelleher noted that an in-kind replacement would be an administrative review.

VOTE: Meche made a motion to approve as submitted with the following conditions: any features and prior details revealed to be addressed by the Commission and/or Ms. Kelleher, no visible details to be eliminated in pursuit of replacing the soffit, with a preference for the same material vs. composite. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Martinez, Meche, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

3 Smith Street

Megan Valentine requested a waiver of the demolition delay to demolish more than 50% of roof on house older than 100 years.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/5/24
- Photographs

Elpidio Santos was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Kelleher stated that Mr. Meche visited the property and the application is to remove the shallow roof and replace an existing dormer with a larger dormer to add headroom in the attic half-story. This structure is a contributing resource in the Bridge Street Neck Historic District and she didn't believe the shallow dormer was original. Chair Spang noted that only the front dormer is being adjusted. Ms. Kelleher noted that a floor plan was provided, the new dormer would go up to the ridgeline, and there is no setback proposed from the side or front walls.

Mr. Martinez noted the existing structure is a gable with a rear lean-to roof and asked if the front dormer removal was actually 50% of the roof. Ms. Kelleher replied that the ordinance stated that it can be either 50% of the roof visible from the public way or 50% of the roof, and the same applies to the walls.

Mr. Santos stated that they are proposing to replace the windows and front dormer using the same pitch. The existing vinyl siding would remain, they would match it below the new dormer.

Ms. Kelleher stated that this structure is not in a local district, however; it is a contributing resource in the Bridge Street Neck Historic District. Mr. Meche added that the fact that it is in a National Register district makes it historically significant.

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

Chair Spang questioned why there was such a large space above the first-floor windows and entry door, and whether the eave was tight to the windows. He suggested the contractor may find something underneath the siding. Mr. Martinez suggested the roof was raised to accommodate a second floor. Ms. Kelleher noted that there is no reason given as to why the eave was raised with a shallow return. Chair Spang suggested a redesign of the dormer to fit the character of the house that also suits the needs of the occupants. He noted that the side window has the sill well below the existing eave and the new front slider windows would be clerestory and well above head height. He suggested the windows be installed at a height where someone can look out of them and closer to the second-floor line.

Mr. Meche stated that the door surround suggests it's a Greek Revival, but the drawings are missing that detail. Mr. Santos replied that the first-floor entry will not be changed, and he was unsure of the interior height of the second-floor windows at the front façade.

Mr. Martinez suggested orienting the second-floor windows like the cornice dormers at 92 Federal Street, since the fenestration matches, and it could work well. He noted that 34 Collins Street also has a high roofline and windows that cut through the roofline to break up the block style roof. Mr. Meche replied that it would make the façade the height of the addition and would introduce other compositional challenges. Chair Spang agreed and noted that the sills of the window may want to match those of the side windows.

Ms. Kelleher agreed to provide examples to the applicant. Mr. Santos agreed to work with the architect on a redesign. Chair Spang noted that it should look more like it contributes to the district.

VOTE: English made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting on April 3, 2024. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, English, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

4 Broad Street

Michael Salah submitted a Certificate of Appropriateness to relocate electric meter

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/4/24
- Photographs

No one was present to discuss the project.

Chair Spang stated that there are new standards for electric meter shut offs and it's good to relocate it from the front façade to the side of the house. Ms. Kelleher noted that this application only applies to the left meter and the right meter will remain in place in the interior. Only the new meter will be exterior mounted. The applicant proposed to locate the meter between the left corner window and the fence and the lower it can be placed so it can be screen by the post and fence the better. She questioned where to place the connection to the house and conduit line, centered or closer to the corner board. Mr. Martinez suggested not higher than the meeting rail on the window. Mr. Meche suggested not higher than the window sill. Chair Spang suggested toward the rear rather than closer to the street. Ms. Kelleher noted the existence of a rear stair and porch that would place the conduit in the middle of the façade. Mr. Meche suggested 4 feet above the grade. Ms. English suggested providing a minimum and a maximum height. Chair Spang suggested including painting it as a condition. Chair Spang noted the box, meter and conduit location indicated 3 knockouts. The Commission agreed to center all three between the window and corner board.

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

Mr. Meche noted that the home on the corner of Flint and Essex Street has flexible conduit, but he believed painting rigid conduit is best.

VOTE: Meche made a motion to approve the relocation of the power main to the left façade, using rigid conduit, meter to be placed as low as possible above the water table and the max height at the meeting rail of the adjacent window, conduit centered, and painted to match. English seconded the motion.
Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, English, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Request for letter of support

City of Salem submitted a funding applications for Salem Willows Phase II

Ms. Kelleher presented the request. She stated that the City is moving forward with Phase II. The removal of pavement, new walkways, retention basins, concrete paths, flexible forest pavement paths, the replacement of trees, and this is all tied into the pier replacement project. This is also tied in with other funding sources. She provided a draft letter to the CPA requesting grant funds and a general letter of support to submit to other grant programs.

Mr. Meche noted that there is less plaza space and more pathways in Phase II. Chair Spang anticipated the central oval may get trampled when people want to walk a straight path rather than around. Ms. Kelleher noted that an archeologist will be on site to document anything found. She added that HATCH was involved in Phase I, but they did not design the sea wall and pier replacement.

Mr. Meche raised concern with what could occur in Phase II, noting that he can see dozens of signs in their parking lot from his home that weren't included in their proposal. Only 12 signs were originally proposed, and they are also higher than anticipated. Chair Spang raised concern with existing telephone poles obstructing new pathways creating accessibility obstructions and whether that would also occur in

Phase II. He also questioned their night lighting strategy. Ms. Kelleher will relay Commission concerns to Planning staff.

VOTE: English made a motion to provide a letter of support to the CPA and a second letter of support for other funding sources. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: English made a motion to provide a second letter of support for other funding sources. Meche seconded the motion. Roll Call: English, Meche, Martinez, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business:

a. Meeting Minutes;

VOTE: English made a motion to approve the January 17, 2024 regular meeting minutes. Martinez seconded. Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, English, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried

VOTE: English made a motion to approve the February 21, 2024 regular meeting minutes. Martinez seconded. Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, English, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried

b. Other:

Ms. Kelleher stated that this is Colleen Brewster's last meeting as the Clerk of the Historical Commission. Ms. Kelleher and the Commission thanked Ms. Brewster for her years of service.

Ms. Kelleher stated that The Bertram House is seeking a window replacement. She will reach out to determine what windows are being proposed and if the existing are original.

Mr. Meche raised concern with the old window detail at the original Captain Dusty's, where they ran clapboard beyond the frame to the window opening and trimmed it out. It didn't meet the level of detail proposed. It will get painted and could be sealed, but the end of the clap is beyond the edge of the trim.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the City received a survey and planning grant to fund half of the preservation and management plan for Fort Lee. The total project is \$62,000, they received a \$31,000 grant from MHC, and are requesting \$31,000 for CPA funds. It will include a 3D rendering of Fort Pickering and Fort Lee, there will be an archeologist involved, and robust public engagement.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the City received a CVM grant for Winter Island and Fort Pickering to study sea level rise, storm surge, and eroded walking paths. Chair Spang added that the barracks roof continues to deteriorate. Ms. Kelleher noted that unfortunately it is low on the city's priority list.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the Salem Common bandstand restoration is moving forward and there are plans to improve the entry to Salem Common. She met with the new Salem Common Board President to discuss the topic.

Mr. Martinez stated that he attended an Old House and Barn Expo in New Hampshire, which had approximately 2,000 people and 60 vendors. There were 4 or 5 window restorers, and he will pass along their information to Ms. Kelleher.

Ms. Kelleher stated that the webinar for substitute materials is tomorrow, and she will provide the recording link to the Commission.

Ms. English stated that the EMHCC webinar regarding demolition delays is also available.

Chair Spang stated that he is working with the AIA of Massachusetts to try and make changes to the Demolition Delay at the state level. There is some interest, but it is a long way away.

Adjournment

VOTE: English made a motion to adjourn. Martinez seconded the motion. Roll Call: Meche, Martinez, English, and Spang were in favor and the motion so carried.

The meeting ended at 8:45PM

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen Brewster
Clerk