

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
April 19, 2017

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, April 19, 2017 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, David Hart, Joanne McCrea, Larry Spang and Jane Turiel.

287-291 Lafayette Essex Street - continuation

In a continuation of the previous meeting, the Commission heard the request from Renewal Ventures LLC for an application for a Certificate of Hardship to approve the rooftop HVAC unit.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: January 30, 2017
- Photographs
- Drawings by Seger Architects dated January 24, 2017 and March 15, 2017
- Memorandum from BLW Engineers dated March 14, 2017

The applicant David Pabich and Dan Ricciarelli of Seger Architects were also present.

Ms. Bellin recused herself and left the table to sit in the audience.

Mr. Pabich presented a photograph of the 5' tall mock-up screen that was placed on the roof last week. He clarified that there would be a total of two screens placed on the roof - one large screen placed around the sound attenuation unit and one approximately 4'-8" tall screen along the roof edge to screen the venting ductwork. The lower screen would appear as a fence, not as a screen panel. He noted that the project engineer may ask that fence have slats similar to a shadow box detail.

Ms. Herbert asked if the concern about snow load was eliminated.

Mr. Pabich replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Ms. Polly Wilbert stated her concerns about the height of the sound attenuation unit and its prominent visibility from Lafayette Street. She asked the Commission to revisit their earlier request to construct a gable on the breezeway addition.

Ms. Herbert replied that the Commission had discussed the gable at the previous meeting and determined that the gable roof would not eliminate all views of the attenuation unit.

Ms. Herbert asked for the proposed material of screening fence.

Mr. Pabich replied that the fence would be a PVC vinyl painted gray to match to screen panels.

Ms. Teasie Goggin asked if there would be additional vibration noise from the addition of the screening panels.

Mr. Pabich replied that he did not anticipate any vibration caused by the panels.

Abutters in the audience agreed that they were able to hear the unit today.

Councillor Josh Turiel stated that he felt the proposal of two screens did a good job covering the ductwork, screening most from view. He noted that the screen did not entirely eliminate the view of the attenuation unit, which was installed to eliminate the sound. He reported his understanding that the neighbors were more concerned about eliminating the sound and not the visual impact. The proposal does eliminate some of the view of the unit.

Ms. Liz Vargo asked if the fencing could be angled in some fashion to mimic the style of the building and not appear as such a big block on roof. She did note that the matte finish would help to diminish its appearance.

Mr. Pabich indicated on the presentation photographs that the screening would continue along the sides and front of the attenuation unit. He suggested that lowering the screen along the roofline slightly would help to minimize the blockiness of that screen. The screen could be angled toward the attenuation unit from the side.

Ms. Herbert agreed that lowering the screen to the edge of the gable roof return would be preferred.

Mr. Spang asked if the gap between the screen and the roof as presently shown would be eliminated.

Mr. Pabich replied in the affirmative. He presented small samples of the material to be used for the roof screen, noting that the material would be painted.

Ms. Herbert discussed the general issues with HVAC units on buildings.

Mr. Hart discussed the verticality of attenuation unit and asked if small horizontal strips could be placed over the attenuator's vertical slats to eliminate the vertical appearance.

Mr. Pabich noted that the proposed screen around the attenuation unit would eliminate most of the view of the unit but adding 1 or 2 slats could help.

Mr. Spang noted that it will be important to make sure that any additional appendages will not cause vibration or noise.

Ms. Goggin asked if the Historical Commission had reviewed the project before it was constructed, would this be the resulting design.

Ms. Herbert replied that it appears that after reviewing three options presented by the applicant, this design as presented would have been the resulting design.

Ms. McCrea asked if the sound will be more pronounced in the summer.

Mr. Pabich replied that the unit runs during warm weather and will be audible during the summer.

Mr. Spang asked for clarification on the City's sound ordinance. He noted that sound emanating from the unit would be enforced by the Building Inspector. If the neighbors have concerns, they can alert the Building Inspector after the Commission has finished its review.

Councillor Turiel agreed with Mr. Spang.

Mr. Pabich suggested that the addition of screening will help to lessen the sound.

Ms. Wilbert asked for clarification on the design of the two screens.

Mr. Pabich reviewed the presentation drawings and photographs.

**VOTE:** Mr. Spang made a motion to approve the unit and screening as drawn and mocked-up with the understanding that the roof edge fencing will be a shadow box design with matte gray paint. Height to be approximately 4'-8".

Mr. Hart submitted an amendment that the applicant make his best efforts to minimize the verticality of the attenuators.

Mr. Cutting seconded the amended motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried (Ms. Bellin and Ms. McCrea abstained).

### 31 Juniper Avenue

In a continuation from the previous meeting, the Commission heard the request from Jasper Property Services LLC to Waive the Demolition Delay Ordinance.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: March 22, 2016.
- Photographs
- Simple sketch

Ms. Herbert reported that Mr. Cutting, Mr. Hart and herself met with the owner on site to discuss the proposed new construction on the site once the building is demolished.

Ms. Kelleher distributed a rudimentary sketch provided by the applicant at the site visit on the proposed new construction.

Ms. Herbert noted that ZBA review and approval will be required for new construction on the lot. She suggested that Commission continue the discussion until the next meeting.

Mr. Hart noted that the owner has stated that he has not considered rehabilitation. Mr. Hart agreed with continuing discussion to encourage owner to explore rehabilitation.

Ms. McCrea and Ms. Bellin asked if the building could be rehabilitated.

Mr. Hart stated that while property has been neglected, other similar properties have been rehabbed.

The Commission agreed that applicant should attend a Commission meeting to discuss the waiver request.

Ms. Bellin asked if the Commission could have the 60 day review period be extended.

Ms. Herbert replied that the applicant could request an extension, which would benefit him. She will work with Ms. Kelleher to determine the likelihood of ZBA approval of variances or special permits.

Mr. Spang asked for clarification that architect stamps are required for construction.

Mr. Ricciarelli confirmed.

Mr. Spang suggested that the applicant be notified that he is in within flood zone, which may limit that ability to construct a non-permeable foundation.

**MOTION:** Mr. Cutting made a motion to continue. Mr. Spang seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

162 Federal Street

Dan Botwinick submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for building renovations.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 3/30/17
- Drawings by Seger Architects dated 11/28/16

Mr. Ricciarelli reported that the applicant Dan Botwinick requests a continuation to the May 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

**VOTE: Ms. Turiel made a motion to continue the hearing until May 3<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

13 Chestnut Street

Nicholas Kiefer and Jennifer Rousseau Kiefer submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate rear entry porch, side fence and planting area and to install new driveway gates.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/3/17
- Photographs
- Drawings by Cristina Campa dated 4/3/17

Matt Keifer and his architect Cristina Campa were present.

Ms. Campa presented the proposal to install a drive and pedestrian gates on Cambridge Street. The fence will be solid wood fence constructed by Mark Patterson. Fence color to match Navajo White of trim color.

Ms. Herbert asked Mr. Keifer if he had considered replacing flat board fence with a picket fence similar to gate.

Mr. Keifer replied that flat board fence hides the barrel.

Ms. Campa noted that flat board fence is on the rental unit and is a mirror of the abutting property's fence. She noted that a new gate will be added to the flat board fence.

Mr. Spang suggested that the fences be switched and the flat board fence extend across the driveway and the delicate picket fence be located at the rental unit entrance.

Ms. Campa replied that the owners prefer the open feel of the delicate fence, which provides a garden-like appearance. She noted that the owner has considered changing the board fence to an open picket fence in the future. The picket fence along the side property boundary will be replaced with a picket fence similar to driveway gate and will be placed on the existing granite wall. The current side yard fence is 3'-2" above the existing garden bed and the owner would like to increase the height to 3'-6". New fence will be 4" to 5" shorter than the driveway gate height.

Ms. Bellin asked how the design of the fence will be affected when the height is reduced.

Ms. Campa replied that the fence will be shortened proportionally.

Mr. Keifer noted that the fence will mimic the same construction technique of the existing side fence with steel rods placed into the concrete wall to provide support for fence.

Ms. Herbert asked if neighbors were in support of the fence change.

Mr. Keifer replied in the affirmative noting that fence is deteriorated.

Ms. Bellin questioned whether side fence should be similar to the front fence and whether it was appropriate to have such a decorative fence for a side yard fence.

Mr. Keifer noted that this is their main view from their small yard. They considered different styles and preferred a more decorative fence to encircle their yard.

Ms. Herbert suggested the Commission consider the portions of the application for which designs have been submitted and consider design of side fence at the following meeting.

Mr. Spang stated that he was supportive of the fence to be continued along the side yard but needed to see how the fence will be designed.

Ms. Campa presented plans for a new enlarged rear deck. Deck will be constructed of ipe and stained. Lattice will be flat board. Only a small portion of newel post and bottom step will be visible from a public way.

Ms. Campa noted that applicant has submitted an application to repair an existing rear fence and wall and received a Certificate of Non-Applicability. He would also like to add a gate at the rear of the yard to replicate the rear fence. The gate will be 4' tall and will abut a 6' tall fence.

Ms. Turiel asked if the gate should be 6' tall to match fence.

Ms. Campa and Mr. Keifer both stated that 4' tall would be preferred.

Ms. Campa presented plans to reduce length of planting bed slightly. Granite cobbles will be reused. Also brick edging on Chestnut Street bed will be replaced with Belgium block.

Mr. Spang asked about supports for driveway gates.

Mr. Keifer replied that carpenter will be fabricating metal support for interior of gates.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve fence on Cambridge Street, gate on flat board fence, 4' fence next to garage, enlargement of rear porch deck, reduction of planting bed on driveway and replacement of brick border with Belgium block. Mr. Spang seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue discussion of side fence design will be continued to May 3<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

*Reed Cutting left at this portion of the meeting.*

#### Other business

##### 14-16 Hodges Court

Mr. Becker was in the audience and asked for a modification of the approved drawings for his property to allow the installation of a vent pipe on the roof.

Ms. Bellin questioned whether the request was on the agenda for consideration.

Ms. Herbert asked if the vent has to be in specific location.

Mr. Becker replied that could be in another location but the selected location is the least conspicuous.

Ms. Herbert suggested that it be heard at the next meeting as an amendment to approved plans.

Ms. Bellin recommended that it be considered at a public hearing.

The Commission members agreed.

Mr. Becker asked for clarification on the driveway windows, which were not approved in the fence changes.

Ms. Kelleher asked for clarification that windows along driveway will be as presented in original application.

Mr. Becker replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Becker agreed to submit his request for windows and vent pipe to be heard at a public hearing.

#### Other Business

There was no correspondence.

Mr. Hart reported that the Traditional Building Conference will be held at the Hawthorne Hotel for two days in July.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Community Development Planner