

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
September 21, 2016

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, September 21, 2016 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Kathryn Harper (Vice Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, David Hart, Susan Keenan, Joanne McCrea, and Larry Spang.

380 Essex Street - continuation

Jay Famico submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a shingle roof and install solar panels.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: August 23, 2016
- Photographs
- Solar panel specifications

Colleen Bowdren represented the applicant.

Chris Miller from Sunbug Solar was also present.

Ms. Bowdren presented samples of roofing shingles of GAF Slateline asphalt shingle. She reported that she and the owner have not selected a specific color and are open to suggestions. She presented photographs of 53 Summer Street and 4 Federal Court as examples. Also the roof at 330 Essex Street was discussed.

Mr. Hart asked for clarification that the Slateline shingles would be straight cut since the example on the sample board had an angled cut.

The Commission discussed whether the Slateline has an angled edge. They agreed that they are slightly more angled than the previous Grandslate design. The company no longer makes the Grandslate shingle.

Mr. Hart stated his opposition to the Slateline design since it is not straight cut.

Mr. Cutting stated that he believed shingles would not be visible underneath solar panel.

Ms. Bellin noted that roof is not highly visible and she is amenable to design.

Ms. Harper stated that the height of roof and the pitch of roof would make the roof less prominent.

The Commission discussed appropriate color for shingles.

Ms. Harper recommended English Gray slate as the best color.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve GAF Slateline asphalt shingles in English Gray color. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Six members voted in favor and one opposed (Mr. Hart). The motion so carried.

The Commission then discussed the request to install solar panels on the façade (south) slope of the roof.

Mr. Miller presented a sample solar panel and examples of mounting for flat roof and sloped roof. He noted that installation on the flat roof would allow only 9 panels, making project financially infeasible. Installation on the sloped roof allows for 20 panels, which generates a full payout.

Ms. Harper asked if it was possible to do a combination of panels on the flat and sloped portions of the roof.

Mr. Miller responded that a dual design would require different materials and result in different efficiency. The flat roof array would provide approximately 75%, while an array on the sloped portion of the roof would provide 100%.

The Commission discussed whether solar shingles will be available in near future.

Mr. Miller reported that he did not envision solar shingles to be available within close timeframe.

Ms. Keenan asked how high the panels would project off the roof.

Mr. Miller replied that panels would have a 1" frame, would project approximately 4" off the roof and would be 2" from edge of roof.

There was no public comment

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor, and the motion so carried.

Ms. Bellin expressed concern about the balustrade. The Commission cannot require owner to reinstall the lower balustrade since it was not present when the current owner acquired the property. She recommended that the Commission not approve any changes that would prohibit a railing from being installed in the future. It appears that the double balustrade was original and should be on the house. Placement of solar panels at the roof edge would prohibit reinstallation. Therefore she cannot support prohibiting their reinstallation in the future. She also noted that the Commission's guidelines state that panels should not be installed on the façade of the building.

Mr. Cutting asked if it was possible to have both panels and balustrade.

Mr. Miller replied that he was not sure whether it was possible.

Mr. Spang suggested that panels could be turned to allow the balustrade.

Mr. Miller replied that turning panels would still require loss of panels.

Ms. Bowdren stated that panels would not be a permanent structure and could be removed in the future in order to install a balustrade. They are seeking to keep house as a single family and seeking opportunities to make it affordable to maintain as a single family house.

Ms. Bellin suggested that panels would be a long term investment and a long term structure.

Mr. Hart and Ms. McCrea agreed.

Mr. Cutting stated that he regretfully agreed with the concern that the installation of the panels would conflict with a future railing.

Ms. Bellin stated that she is not opposed to solar panels and would be amenable to a different array solution.

Mr. Hart stated that the property is an important house and is significant for its association with Samuel McIntire.

Ms. Keenan asked if there was a lien on the house for the previous owner's violation for removing the balustrade.

Ms. Bellin replied in the negative, which is why Commission cannot require new owner to reinstall.

Mr. Spang asked if solar company and owner would consider reducing return from 113% to 100% by moving panels to another slope of the roof.

Ms. Bowdren noted that large trees on the property would impact panels placed on side slope.

The Commission questioned whether a couple of panels could be moved to another section of roof or on back roof of ell.

Mr. Miller replied that he did not take a shade reading because of the evident shading on other roof slopes. He noted that adding panels to different sections of the roof would decrease return in value and the wiring would be visible. As proposed, the wires would be hidden in a single conduit.

Ms. Harper asked about reported shading from the balustrade and whether it would be all day or portions of the day.

Mr. Miller replied that roof efficiency is stated more broadly than specific time of day. 20% in shading would result in 20% decrease of efficiency.

Ms. Bowdren stated that solar would allow greater savings in heating and cooling costs by reducing energy footprint, not necessarily oil use.

Mr. Cutting asked how much space would be needed for the balustrade.

Mr. Spang projected that 2½' to 3' would be required to install the balustrade.

Mr. Hart asked if goal is to be 100%.

Mr. Miller replied that panels do not need to be at 100% but it is the owner's goal.

Ms. Bowdren presented an aerial view of roof on her phone.

Ms. McCrea asked how many types of solar panels were researched.

Mr. Miller replied that there are hundreds of types of panels. He selected Sunpower as the most efficient and high powered.

Mr. Spang stated that it appears that Commission is not amenable to approval as presented.

Ms. Bellin suggested that the Commission could approve the panels conditionally with the requirement that the panels do not prohibit future reinstallation of the balustrade.

Mr. Miller expressed concern that removing panels would make project financially infeasible for owner.

Ms. Bellin stated that owner could consider a redesign of the solar panels. She is just opposed to the proposed array design.

Mr. Miller questioned whether the Commission is following State guidelines for encouraging solar energy.

The Commission agreed that the State guidelines are not the same as the Commission's design guidelines.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue the application to allow the applicant to explore other design alternatives to allow balustrades to be re-installed in the future. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 12 Chestnut Street

Peter and Martha Pitman submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install AC condenser units and landscape screen.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: August 31, 2016
- Photographs

Peter Pitman was present.

Mr. Pitman presented his application. He stated that he previously received approval to relocate fence forward to screen the condenser units. However, his immediate neighbor decided that a

landscape screening would be preferable and asked Mr. Pitman to install landscaping to see if it would work. Mr. Pitman agreed with the caveat that the Commission could require the fence to be moved forward to serve as screening.

Ms. Bellin asked for clarification on whether existing fence in photograph would be moved.

Mr. Pitman replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Spang asked what type of shrubbery

Mr. Pitman replied that bushes are yews, which are evergreen.

Ms. Bellin asked if they are drought resistant.

Mr. Pitman replied that he is not sure of tolerance.

Ms. Harper asked what unit was installed.

Mr. Pitman stated that he is not sure.

Ms. Bellin asked for information on design of units.

Mr. Pitman stated that he will provide manufacturing specifications.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Ms. Hart made a motion the application as presented with the proviso that the landscape screen be permanent and that condenser unit specifications be provided.**

**VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to amend Mr. Hart's motion to include the proviso that landscape be in perpetuity and permanent. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried**

#### FY17 Community Preservation Plan – Request for Comment

Ms. McCrea asked to continue the discussion on the Community Preservation Plan to the next meeting.

**VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue discussion to next meeting. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### Other Business

##### *81 Derby Street*

Ms. Kelleher reported that Commission-approved drawings indicated asphalt roof but did not specify asphalt style or type.

Mr. Spang asked if Commission has approved paint colors.

Ms. Kelleher will confirm.

*Seawall at Juniper Point*

Ms. Kelleher reported that she has contacted City Engineer on possible funding sources to repair the seawall. She will follow up engineer.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

**VOTE:** *Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the minutes of August 3, 2016. Ms. Keenan seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.*

**VOTE:** *Ms. Bellin made a motion to approve the minutes of September 7, 2016 with changes noted. Ms. Keenan seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.*

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

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Community Development Planner