

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board – Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, June 28, 2023 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	Remote Participation via Zoom
DRB Members Present:	Chair Paul Durand, Glenn Kennedy, Catherine Miller, Marc Perras, J. Michael Sullivan, Sarah Tarbet
DRB Members Absent:	David Jaquith
Others Present:	Kate Newhall-Smith
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

Chair Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:02PM. Roll call was taken.

Signs in the Urban Renewal Area

There are no sign proposals to review.

Projects in the Urban Renewal Area

- 1. 23 Summer Street:** Modification of Approved Design – Request to remove slate roof and replace it with GAF Slateline fiberglass/asphalt shingle, continued from May 10, 2023, request to add skylights to the east side of the roof, and request to change from Hardie siding to LP Smart Siding.

Michael Becker (owner) was present to discuss the project.

Becker stated that the east side of the roof is the bigger concern and has many chipped, cracked, and broken slate, along with cave-in areas and the south side is buckling. His slate company provided a statement about the condition of the roof. Black Jack has been used to patch multiple roof penetrations and slate of varying colors were used for more recent patches. He proposed the east side was unsalvageable and should be replaced. He noted that the west façade is in better condition, but the chimney needs to be repointed and the flashing needs to be repaired. The ridge is in the worst shape, and he proposed constructing a cricket to solve future water penetration patterns.

Perras asked if the sheathing was in good condition. Becker replied that some areas are in better shape than others, but he believed it can be salvaged.

Miller raised concerns with the south elevation. Becker replied that the contrast of the condition is very apparent and only one small piece of copper ridge is in place, while the remaining is break metal. He noted that the south side also has cracks, holes, and missing slate.

Perras asked if they can they remove and reinstall the existing slate. Becker replied that the black slate tends to spall, and it is 130 years old. Perras noted that it is sustainable, and they would advocate for salvaging and reusing it, and supplementing it as necessary. Becker noted that the east elevation has a rougher texture and splitting slate. His proposed was to salvage the Summer Street façade and install GAF Slateline, which resembles slate. Miller noted that the Slateline has straight edges and not the

angled edges like other shingles. Sullivan asked if the Slateline roof shingles were the same thickness. Becker assumed it would be thicker since Slateline is not as heavy as slate. He noted that to use slate, the structure would need to be reinforced to meet the current insulation requirements, and adding weight means bringing it up to code. Snow load is also a concern, and they will install foam insulation from the interior.

Miller asked if at the hip ridge line on the original building, if the old trim would be maintained. Becker replied that he could maintain the hip trim if the DRB would prefer it.

Miller asked what color was proposed and noted that it looked beige. Becker replied that they would install a mixed grey at the new construction which has a grain. Tarbet noted that she didn't like the look and suggested it wouldn't do it justice. Chair Durand stated that the asphalt shingle doesn't really resemble slate. Sullivan raised concerns with only one section of the roof remaining slate. Kennedy agreed and suggested alternative materials that resemble slate, like IGF. Chair Durand agreed. Miller suggested the DaVinci product line.

Perras stated that this approval could set a precedent, and as a developer project, the Board should push for maintaining slate. There is no better candidate for this roof, which is highly visible from two major streets, to preface the history of Salem in material form. Imitation slate in opposition to reinforcing the existing roof is what he needs to approve it. It's important and worth digging deeper to preserve or replace the slate. Becker stated that the Commission has previously approved imitation slate within historic districts, and he questioned if he and this project was being held to a higher standard because he's a developer.

Newhall-Smith stated that the SRA members appreciated the slate but didn't vote to keep the slate or remove it, they wanted the DRB to weigh-in. Sullivan questioned the letter from HSI wanting to replace it in kind which referenced Ms. Kelleher's letter and the Commission's Design Guidelines. Sullivan believed HSI was suggesting it in-kind with slate. Becker believed simulated slate would be an appropriate alternative. Sullivan suggested a product that substitutes slate but also closely resembles slate. Perras stated that the applicant would need to strip the slate to install new sheathing and he questioned whether there is enough slate to salvage from the north and east to fully replace the highly visible west and south sides. Becker noted the roof's eastern slope would face 38 Norman Street would not be highly visible once the new construction was completed, and once again encouraged the approval of asphalt shingles. Sullivan and Chair Durand were not in favor. Perras stated that it's precedent setting and suggested imitation slate.

Chair Durand questioned the difference in cost. Becker replied that simulated slate can cost about the same, but the section of roof is not visible from a public way, and only visible from roof decks of the new construction at 38 Norman Street. Sullivan agreed that it would set a bad precedent to use an alternative material anywhere on the building. Chair Durand agreed. Becker noted that the precedent has been set with other approval in historic districts.

Perras asked if the low roof salvageable. Becker replied that there wasn't much to salvage at the time, and they did not consider saving any of the slate at the time. Perras stated that it didn't make sense to do three sides of the roof and not the entire thing. Becker noted that hundreds of slates that are still on the roof and significant weight that could cost \$20,000 more to replace in-kind. Sullivan requested synthetic slate costs. Becker replied that while comparable the difference is the weight.

Chair Durand stated that he didn't want to create a mishmash of materials. Becker replied that the GAF Slateline is already on the addition of the roof 10-feet away and he reiterated that this area is minimally visible. Perras noted that the DRB is charged with maintaining historical buildings in Salem and questioned whether the structure was pre-Salem fire because it's a slate roof, which would add to the reinforcement for preservation. Tarbet wished they would have pushed for new slate on the addition. Becker stated that he would contact Patti Kelleher about the existing precedent of approving a combination of asphalt and slate shingle on a historic structure within the historic districts.

Skylights

Becker stated that two Velux skylights were proposed on the east façade, both would be flat and located on the vaulted ceiling to provide light to the living room which doesn't get sun until later in the day. Tarbet requested the skylight frame color. Becker replied dark brown. Tarbet and Perras were in favor of adding the two skylights.

Miller noted that the window on west elevation, second floor, at the right corner is a different size and may have been placed in the wrong location. Becker agreed to investigate the varied window sizes.

Newhall-Smith asked whether there was any concern with installing skylights on slate roofs. The Board had no concern.

Kennedy noted that a pattern will be required to blend the various slate colors, with consideration for the result and weathering. Perras suggested researching the source of the original slate to determine if more can be obtained. Becker noted that the current colors are green were from the hidden areas of the slate and the charcoal-colored areas were weathered by the sun. Perras had no concern with patches and color variation, which will blend eventually.

Public Comment:

Andy Lippman, 28 Chestnut Street. Stated that the review of the Commission is often different than that of the DRB. There is a difference between a homeowner encountering a problem with their building, such as a leaking roof and having to replace it, and the Commission having to balance the livability and historic nature of the building. Therefore, it's not fair to equate a comment by Patti Kelleher with a building renovation. He asked whether the roof needing to be reinforced and potentially replaced was known at the time of purchase. If so, then the applicant bought himself into a hardship and is now asking for an accommodation to save money or what this hardship imposed upon

him that he did not anticipate or know about. Becker replied no, he was not aware of the substantial rot and excessive water damage within the walls and framing until they opened the walls and roof. He noted that three different roofs were added over the course of the history of the building, as the building increased in height.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Sullivan: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting.

Kennedy questioned whether the purpose was to strip and salvage the roof shingles. Becker replied that they can only guess at the time. He would need to find a slate source and salvage existing slate. Sullivan noted that the Board would need to know what would be proposed on the east side and what synthetic material would be suggested. Miller suggested that it may be hard to convince the DRB of approving a synthetic material. Newhall-Smith clarified that they would remove and salvage as much slate as they can to use on three sides, and the fourth side could be a mix of salvaged and new slate. Kennedy stated that all alternate material information and samples must be provided, solutions for the east or all four sides, costs, and whether there is enough slate to salvage, and information on the structural component for the potential added weight. Becker agreed.

Kennedy reiterated that both salvaged and reclaimed slate should be considered. Becker noted his desire to add snow guards to the slate roof because of the sidewalk on Summer, the driveways below the north and south roofs. Perras suggested roof rails like at Old Town Hall. He noted that it would be hard to convince him to use simulated slate.

Becker noted that the structural beams are historical and he's like to preserve them, the ceilings would be spray foamed between the beams, so they remain visible. He noted that he underestimated the burden of proof needed for the SRA. Newhall-Smith requested additional roof photos and a roof sample for the Board to review prior to the meeting. Perras also requested an existing slate sample.

VOTE: Perras: Motion to approve skylights as presented. Seconded by: Tarbet
Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sullivan, Tarbet and Durand were in favor. Passes 6-0.

VOTE: Kennedy: Motion to approve the removal of the existing slate and to continue the review the roof shingles. Seconded by: Perras.

Tarbert amended to motion to include salvaging as much of the existing slate as possible.

Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sullivan, Tarbet and Durand were in favor. Passes 6-0.

Newhall-Smith stated that the applicant will need to return to the SRA with the DRB recommendation, prior to returning to the DRB. Removal of the slate will show the condition of the sheathing, which would be good to show both boards. Kennedy

suggested receiving an earlier approval from the SRA. Newhall-Smith noted that the SRA would not have a special meeting and she will speak with the Executive Director regarding whether it could be an administrative change. Kennedy noted that the replacement material will have a big impact on the structure.

Siding

Becker stated that proposed siding is LP Smart Siding rather than the already approved the Hardie Siding. LP has a 50-year warranty, is safer to install, and has a texture. Kennedy was in favor of the LP, 440 is cedar texture and 550 is the smooth texture. The Board agreed that product literature, colors, and samples would be required.

Miller raised concern with the use of cedar texture and suggested the smooth finish.

Sullivan asked if the windows were being replaced. Becker replied one casement window only. Sullivan asked if the corner boards would remain. Becker replied that the clapboard butted up against each other, however, the existing trim will be kept, and he will not re-side the front of the building.

Kennedy requested an assembly of the proposed package rather than verbal descriptions.

VOTE: Tarbet: Motion to continue the review of siding. Seconded by: Sullivan.
Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sullivan, Tarbet and Durand were in favor. Passes 6-0.

Kennedy requested smooth and textured samples. The Board discussed whether product lines had been discontinued. Miller suggested options be proposed since she is not in favor of textured finish. Sullivan requested a clear indication of which facades would be resided on a revised set of plans. Tarbet reiterated the need for a cohesive package.

Projects Outside the Urban Renewal Area

There are no projects outside the Urban Renewal area to review.

New / Old Business

1. Approval of Minutes:

May 24, 2023

VOTE: Perras: Motion to approve the May 24, 2023, meeting minutes with Miller's edits to include two conditions. Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sullivan, Tarbet, and Durand. Passes 6-0.

2. Staff Updates, if any:

Newhall-Smith stated an upcoming internal staff meeting, on Thursday June 29th, to discuss outdoor dining in 2024, which may return to what it was. There is legislation to amend and allow sidewalk obstructions with SRA and DRB review and they want to get restaurants through the process early. They will discuss restroom accommodations that will be determined by the Building Inspector, although they are unsure of how the Acting Building Inspector will interpret the requirements and what currently exists in the downtown might be scaled back to meet plumbing code requirements. Miller raised concerns with not taking a logical approach to the code. Newhall-Smith replied that this is a state code that the city must abide by.

Newhall-Smith noted the recent staffing change at City Hall and Planning Department.

Miller requested the windows that don't match at the Summer Street façade of 23 Summer Street be followed up on by city staff.

Adjournment

Miller: Motion to adjourn. Seconded by: Perras.

Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sullivan, Tarbet, and Durand. Passes 6-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 7:50PM.

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City Ordinance Sections 2-028 through 2-203