

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
May 2, 2018

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, May 2, 2017 at 7:05 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, David Hart, Joanne McCrea, Larry Spang, and Jane Turiel.

105 Federal Street – continued to May 16, 2018 meeting

Whitney and Stephen van Dyke submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a dormer.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicants requested a continuation.

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

254 Lafayette Street, Unit 1R – continuation

Jaclyn White submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows at rear of house

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/2/18
- Photographs
- Renewal by Anderson specifications

Ms. Jaclyn White of 254 Lafayette Street, 1R, was present to discuss the project to replace three single sash windows with transoms above.

Ms. Herbert asked the applicant if she had investigated restoring the windows instead of replacing them.

Ms. White replied that she did some research but chose a different path.

Ms. Kelleher noted that cross sections of the Andersen by Renewal were provided to the Board.

Ms. Herbert stated that she, Ms. Bellin and Mr. Hart made a site visit to the property. She noted that the applicant is proposing that two transoms will be fixed and the one closest to the street will be operable. However, historically, they were all supposed to be operable. Ms. Herbert also noted that additional windows will be replaced but only the subject three windows are the only windows that can be seen from a public way.

Mr. Hart noted that the visibility of these three windows from the street is minimal.

Mr. Spang asked how many transom windows would be inoperable.

Ms. Herbert replied 2 of the 3 visible transom windows.

Ms. White noted that she wanted some transoms to be operable for cross ventilation. She also noted that the visible windows would be appear identical to the existing fixed windows. Mr. Spang stated that even though the discussion of fixed vs. operable has been resolved, he believed that Commission still needs to see a sample of the proposed replacement window, noting that the Commission had asked the applicant at the previous meeting to return with a sample window.

Ms. White replied that the contractor misunderstood and assumed the sample would be for future reference not for the approval, but he can provide a sample when he returns to the area.

Ms. Bellin suggested the Commission continue the hearing to the next meeting in order for the applicant to provide a window sample and can continue to research restoring the existing windows.

Ms. White replied she doesn't want to restore the windows because she has the only unit in the building that does not have storm windows. The double-glazed replacement windows will allow her to save energy. She also noted that the building and roof line have changed and the existing gutters and downspouts can no longer support the volume of water run-off. The water overflow hits the windows and has caused the deterioration. She wants a product to withstand the weather.

Ms. Bellin noted that the proposed windows are more weather resistant.

Mr. Spang stated that this window hasn't been approved in the district and he wants to see the sample. If it is appropriate it could also be used for other projects. He wanted proof that it works as this may set a precedent, and the discussion should continue until a sample is provided.

Ms. Herbert stated that if the contractor brings a sample early the can approve it before the next meeting. The photographic examples provided by the contractor only show modern examples of the window model and the Commission needs to determine whether the model will work in an antique window opening.

Ms. White noted that the windows can only be ordered when the project gets approve.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Kelleher asked if one of the bays windows on the building facade had been replaced. Ms. Herbert replied that the window has no muntins.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue to next meeting on May 16, 2018 with the proviso that a window sample be provided. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All seven (7) were in favor and the motion so carried.**

384 Essex Street – continuation

Robert Barnard submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to repair an entry portico

The applicant's son Dana Barnard was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Herbert noted that she is concerned with the condition of the left side of the building and the front section of the property where tree stumps are still in place and are unsightly.

Mr. Barnard replied that the tree stumps will be removed.

Ms. Herbert recommended that the applicant reach out to restoration carpenter Mark Pattison for guidance on the repair work on the portico.

Mr. Barnard stated that he received a proposal to redo the front entrance way and that he will keep it the same. He reported that the roof of the portico is the problem - it has rotted underneath and now needs a new metal roof.

Ms. Herbert stated that the applicant should hire a carpenter fully skilled in restoration work.

Mr. Barnard replied that he's used someone in the past that has done this type of work before.

Mr. Spang noted that the proposal includes language stating "knock-down door frame and trim" and asked if that meant the door frame and trim would be removed.

Mr. Barnard replied that they will not touch the door frame, it's just the top roof that has rotted.

Ms. Herbert noted that the contractor who installed the new replacement windows used inferior wood for the sills which have now cracked, and the contractor should have pre-primed the sills before installing.

Mr. Barnard replied that they couldn't be pre-primed since they were installed in the middle of February.

Ms. Herbert noted that this is a very important historic building and the Commission wants the restoration work to be completed correctly.

Ms. McCrea noted that the house has a McIntire entranceway and that should be stipulated on the proposal.

Mr. Barnard replied that the window repair work could be done by any apprentice carpenter who should also be able to do that roof work. Some pieces need to be removed in order to access the rotted roof and that work will be done soon.

Ms. Herbert requested that Mark Pattison look at the job and she will provide the applicant with his phone number.

Mr. Spang asked for the roof material. Mr. Barnard replied that he will be using a metal roof, which would be painted red.

Mr. Spang noted that the proposal should say "match existing" and the knock-down frame and composite trim should be clarified.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Ms. Turiel made a motion to continue to the next regular meeting on May 16, 2018. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. All (7) were in favor and the motion so carried.**

### 23 Warren Street

Nick Lewis and Kelly Lewis submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace an existing concrete flower bed with a new wood fence and repair building foundation.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/17/18
- Photographs

Nick Lewis and Kelly Tyler were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Taylor presented a photo showing an earlier fence that was once located on Warren Street in front of her 1838 Greek Revival style house. She stated that the concrete flower bed was added to the front and it is cracked and in need of repair or replacement. They are proposing a more historically appropriate wood fence with a gated return to allow maintenance and gardening. She noted that there are different homes on Warren Street with gated wooden fences at the street edge with the closest fence 6 houses down. Mr. Lewis noted that when the street was widened the fence was removed to install sidewalks. Ms. Tyler noted that 2 or 3 homes on the street have short sections of wooden fencing with or without returns. She stated that they would like the proposed new fence to match the rear fence and rear and front porch, using the same pyramid top and square/straight balusters and railings. The rear was approved for plain posts since it a less visible part of the house. The posts on the front porch have been boxed and the new fence would have boxed posts as well.

Ms. Hebert asked if the tops will be exposed and at the same height.

Ms. Tyler replied that they want to use 4-foot-high fencing so the trim will hit the bottom of the water table and be aesthetically pleasing to the eye.

Ms. Herbert asked if the same rectangular shape will be used on the other side of the driveway.

Mr. Lewis replied no. The plot plan included a trapezoid shape in front of the house and the new fence will follow the property boundary line and do that shape. They will include a 3-foot-wide gated return on the East side. There is a change in elevation where the original fence was brought to the side of the house without the stairs and they would like to bring it to the property line to eliminate an awkward transition.

Ms. Lewis noted that the cedar trim will be painted "Navajo White", the caps are flat top pyramids with spheres. She asked the Commission whether spheres would be too elaborate on the front fence.

Ms. Bellin asked if the gate is on a different side.

Ms. Lewis replied that they will discuss this with the contractor since Dig Safe has only marked the gas line, not the water line or any other utility yet. The footings will have to go down 4 feet and the post locations will have to wait for the utility markings. They are planning for two fence panels but may need to have three panels to skip over any utilities. The front fence is 22-feet long and the panels will be custom with approximately 6-foot-wide depending upon the post locations.

Ms. Herbert suggested the Commission continue the application and review a final drawing at the next meeting in two weeks.

Ms. Bellin asked if the raised bed will now be down at street level and if the fence will be at the edge of the concrete.

Ms. Taylor replied yes, it will be at the same footprint.

Ms. Bellin noted that they will also wait to approve the balls placed on top of the posts until they see a revised plan.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue to next meeting where the applicant can present a final drawing to indicate post tops selected, fence configurations, and fence color. McCrea seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### 8 Chestnut Street

Leo Kraunelis submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to building renovations including renovations to window, door, and entry steps.

#### Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 4/17/18
- Photographs

Mr. Leo Kraunelis was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Kraunelis noted on the photographs that he is requesting to replace door #3 with a neighboring window. The door is off by 2 -3/8" on one side and it has been closed for a long time. He would remove the door and infill the wall. Ms. Herbert asked where the door leads. Mr. Kraunelis replied the apartment kitchen. Mr. Spang asked if clapboard would be used. Mr. Kraunelis replied that there are 4 existing doors in place and this was done after. The door frame may have shifted as the carriage house settled. They didn't redo the windows. Mr. Hart asked if he would remove both the trim and door. Mr. Kraunelis replied yes.

Mr. Kraunelis noted that plywood is over the sill of the second floor window to conceal the unevenness of the window. Mr. Cutting asked what year this door was installed. Mr. Kraunelis replied the late 1800's.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the building was constructed in 1805, the upper floors were added to the main building in 1829, and the ell's were added in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Mr. Kraunelis noted that it was added in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Mr. Kraunelis noted that his objective with the second floor window is to save it and restore the sill. If this was not possible, he would like to replace it with an Andersen full divided light window. Ms. Kelleher noted that the proposed window would have a simulated divided light despite being called full divided light by Andersen. Mr. Kraunelis noted that he will use whatever window the Commission approves.

Mr. Kraunelis noted that door #4 has rotted and needs to be rebuilt and reinstalled, and he will use the same door with a new sill. Mr. Spang noted that that would be non-applicability since its being replaced in kind. Mr. Kraunelis stated there is also a step and railing. The original front step has granite and he wants to replace the wood step with the granite of the same dimensions, and there would be two steps. Mr. Hart asked if he would include a new railing. Mr. Kraunelis replied that the two steps would not need a railing but if he needs one he would use wrought iron. He also noted that the vent to an old wood burning stove will also be removed and covered with clapboards.

Ms. Bellin noted that the application says to remove window #2 and the drawings say to repair or replace 3 windows. Mr. Kraunelis replied that the third was taken out and window #3 will remain in place. Ms. Herbert asked if they should consider the Anderson window since this has not been approved by the Commission in the past. Mr. Cutting replied that the Commission should stick with the replacement window models already approved.

Mr. Hart noted that he is in favor of repairing the window and if the applicant can't repair the window he should return with an application to replace it.

Mr. Spang suggested that the applicant put window #4 in the location of door #3 and patch the hole of door #4 with clapboards. Mr. Kraunelis replied that he would do that and align the windows so window #1 goes above the door and window #1 becomes window #2. Mr. Spang noted that the two windows above each other would simplify the elevations and he suggested that door #3 be stored for future use.

Mr. Kraunelis noted that the bottom of the sash at window #1 was cut because it wouldn't lay flat and several window panes have moved. Ms. Herbert suggested that the window be moved to align it. Mr. Kraunelis replied that the sill will need to be rebuilt. Ms. McCrea suggested Window Woman be contacted to restore it. Mr. Kraunelis asked to replace the window with a pre-approved window type if it is beyond repair although repairing it is his goal. Ms. Herbert recommended the Commission give him both options for restoration and replacement. Ms. Kelleher noted that Pella Architect series replacement windows have been approved in the past. Mr. Kraunelis stated that this house will be featured on HGTV's House Hunters Renovation so the proposed work will be completed in mid-June.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE:** Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the following changes: door #3 be removed and replaced with window #2; windows #1, #2 & #3 will be repaired; the rotted wood steps and railing will be restored; and the clapboards used to cover the openings will be the same clapboard as the existing. If the window can't be repaired, the applicant has the option to install a 6/6 Pella Architect series replacement window. The heater vent opening will also be removed. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Documents & Exhibits

- Drawings by David Jaquith dated April 22, 2018
- Photographs

David Jaquith, Architect from David Jaquith Architects, 81 Railroad Avenue, Rowley, MA was present to discuss the project. Deirdre Pomerleau and Seth Robert, property owners, were also present.

Mr. Jaquith stated that the applicants are seeking an additional dwelling unit under the City's historic carriage house regulations and the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) required they seek design consultation with the Historical Commission. The barn was moved by a previous owner who bought a narrow parcel next to this lot and moved the barn further away from the house. The owners currently live in the 2-family Victorian at the front of the lot but will move into the barn after it's renovated. He noted that the ZBA recommended 6/6 windows although he believes 2/2 would be better.

Mr. Hart asked when the barn was constructed. Mr. Jaquith replied 1896. Ms. Herbert noted that 2/2 windows would have been used at that time.

Mr. Jaquith stated that the chimney will be retained but may not be needed. The vinyl siding will be replaced with wood clapboards and trim and a simple front door and new barn doors will be added.

Ms. Herbert asked if the flat roof will be removed. Mr. Jaquith replied that the roof has a slight pitch and it will remain. Some windows will move around to accommodate a stairway to the second floor. The right side elevation has no windows and is on the property line. Mr. Hart asked why there is one small window. Mr. Jaquith replied it is an awning window in the bathroom and an existing fence covers what would have been the bottom sash if it were a double hung window. Mr. Hart asked why the right side elevation has no windows in the living room, which is unusual. Mr. Jaquith replied that the next door neighbor has a trampoline, so the applicants will rely on the windows on the left side of the building for light. He noted that the design also has to meet fire code requirements. Mr. Spang noted that building code doesn't allow windows along the property line. Ms. Bellin questioned how they will get light and air into the space. Mr. Jaquith noted that the open concept first floor is 24' x 16'.

Ms. Herbert asked if the ZBA had any questions or problems they wanted the Historic Commission to deal with. Mr. Jaquith replied no.

Mr. Spang asked if there will be an overhang over the front door for the weather. Ms. McCrea asked if there are any entrance steps. Mr. Jaquith replied that no overhang is proposed but they can return if they feel one is necessary. He noted that there is an existing deck out front but only a skirt board will be added to it.

Mr. Jaquith asked the Commission to provide a letter to the ZBA indicating their approval of the design.

There was no public comment.

**VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to provide a letter to the ZBA stating the Commission finds the proposed renovation design appropriate for the historic barn. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.**

132 Essex Street - continuation

Peabody Essex Museum submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for renovations to Phillips Library buildings (Plummer Hall and Daland House).

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/15/17
- Photographs

- Drawings by Schwartz Silver Architects

Bob Monk of the PEM, Robert Silver and John Traficonte of Schwartz Silver Architects, and Phillip Johns of the PEM were present to discuss the project.

Mr. Monk stated that he will speak about plans for brown street lot and the block in general. What they have provided is not a comprehensive master plan but it is a list of improvements and timelines. The Daniel Bray House has broken windows at the house and a carpenter is under contract to complete that work today. There was a comprehensive development of the restoration of the house done by Brown Group Restoration Associates and they will submit a plan this summer that involved a 1908 restoration to take advantage of what's existing in the interior. The studies done are extensive and he provided a copy for the Commission. Bill Finch did them a couple years ago in 2 phases. Ms. Herbert asked what helped them determining the 1806 period to restore. Mr. Monk replied that the initial survey let them know that additional information was necessary for a phase II investigation that included the removal of modern elements. Specifications for that restoration work are being worked out now. That work will be implemented in phases. The wood siding and original windows will be restored and a short term plan will be put together for that work.

Mr. Monk stated there is a plan to remove the Brown Street fence and replace it with a landscape sidewalk and border and a local engineering firm is devising a drainage plan. The parking lot will be reduced, the grade changed where necessary to solve the drainage concerns. A plan for landscaping and replacement of the fence and a reduction of the parking lot will be determined.

Mr. Monk stated that at the Essex Block is a former Lye-Tapley Shoe Shop which has an asphalt roof and siding on the west façade. The house underwent some structural repairs a couple years ago and modern elements were installed when it became a coffee shop and exhibit material was removed and preserved. This work will be done later this summer and it will be open again as a static display. The large green metal box has contained a portico from the Peabody House for approximately 35 years, it will be placed in storage and landscape improvements will be made.

Mr. Monk stated that in conjunction with the renovation plan for the Plummer and Daland buildings, a new landscape plan will be required for Essex Street and a landscape architect will be commissioned to put together a plan and specification package for the Federal garden on the North façade of Essex Street between Plummer and Daland, and the Derby-Beebe Summer House by the elliptical walkway. Ms. Herbert asked if any historic pictures exist. Mr. Monk replied that they have the original planting plan that will be used as the basis for the new plan.

Mr. Monk stated that the engineering study relative to the Stacks Building has been completed and provided by structural engineer John Wathne, who provided a letter regarding his findings. Mr. Monk read the letter from John Wathne into the record. He added that there is an architectural treatise regarding the structure that ties into the issue of its removal.

Mr. Silver read the architectural treatise. Mr. Silver noted in terms of why the Stacks Building is not suitable for storage, the existing floor to floor height prevents a code complaint ceiling height after the installation of lighting, HVAC, and sprinklers. The existing aisle widths is currently 30" not 36" which is the ADA requirement and any books larger than 10" in depth would further reduce it aisle width. The stacks cannot be widened for wider aisle widths because they would no longer coordinate with column spacing. The current floor levels do not align with the adjoining building and are therefore not accessible and ADA complaint. The exterior wall has no insulation or vapor barrier and no cavity so moisture passes through the wall and into the building. The Stacks are attached and braced to the exterior wall and therefore impossible to prevent moisture pass through without a vapor barrier or insulation. To re-space the floors you will need to eliminate 2 floors and the floors would need floors to align with the Daland House floor levels for accessibility. It would be extraordinarily difficult to return the collections to this building. To repurpose it means it would need windows and it's currently windowless, and windows wouldn't maintain the present character of the building.

Mr. Silver stated that regarding the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for working on Historic Properties, their sense is that removing the 1960's Stacks. It's a large element that changes the massing of the Daland House to a non-residentially scaled structure and removing it would return the character and massing after the connector was added in 1913. The Stacks wing blocks views of the 1913 façades which are present but covered. Remove it will also allow views of 1851 Daland House façade Brown Street. The Stacks wing also blocks access and views into the interior of the Essex Block because the wing projects into the sightline between Daland and the Gardner-Pingree House. Removing the wing creates the possibility for future landscaping and interpretative planning.

Mr. Hart asked to clarify the required ceiling height in the Stacks Building. Mr. Silver replied 7'-6" is the code required ceiling height and 7'-0" is allowed for a bathroom.

Mr. Silver stated that the Secretary of the Interior's publishes general guidance for the changes/modification/reuse of historic structures and it divides the type of work done into 4 categories. This site has 3 structures and there is no single guideline that they feel is appropriate to apply to all structures. They've considered Plummer Hall to be a "Reconstruction" – "reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property where documenting physical evidence is available to the accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture and such reconstruction is essential to the public understanding of the property." At Plummer Hall they are proposing to recreate the balustrade around the central window on the Essex Street façade, most of which has been missing for over 50. They were able to determine with reasonable accuracy what those balustrades looked like from historic photographs.

Mr. Silver stated that at Connector they are applying "Rehabilitation" – "the property will be used as it was historically or given new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive material, features, or special relations." At the connector they are relocating the arch elements forward, and moving it to grade to allow for an ADA compliant accessible public entry, maintaining the original historic materials, and adding an appropriate porch at the rear. The rear porch as already been approved by Historic Commission.

Mr. Silver stated that at the Daland House they are applying "Restoration" – "A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that interprets the property and its restoration." He recommended that the restoration period should not be 1966, but 1907 and 1913, after the vault was built. The 1960's Stack wing will be removed since it doesn't correspond with the appropriate restoration period. Within the limits of the requirements of the building code, life safety, and ADA, the PEM will restore the general massing and character of Daland House to something close to its 1913 state.

Mr. Monk stated that the removal of the Stacks wing would allow the PEM to add required egress to Daland House. He presented options for a new ramp egress if the Stacks wing remained but stated that he didn't believe it was a good option. Mr. Traficonte noted that the ramp would need to make up 2'-2" of height at the rear stair and would project out into the existing driveway and be visible between the Daland House and the Gardner-Pingree House. Mr. Monk added that future development of the Essex Block could include a pathway that serves as a gateway or entry into the restored garden space at the rear of the Block. He suggested that the ramp option is less flexible. Mr. Silver noted that if the Stacks building was to remain it would be locked and not used due to its inaccessibility.

Ms. Herbert reported that she spoke to Michael Steinitz at the Massachusetts Historical Commission. His opinion was that the Essex Institute was established in 1962 and the Stacks was constructed in 1966. Therefore, due to the 50-year threshold for historic significance, the Stacks would have needed to have been built prior to 1922; therefore, he has no issue with the removal of the Stacks wing. Ms. Herbert also reported that she spoke with Paul Holtz at the MHC who will be responsible for reviewing the Massachusetts Historic Landmarks and he stated a similar opinion to Mr. Steinitz. She spoke with a third consultant who also agreed and suggested the museum think of the back of the building as a second entrance because they will create a new façade by removing the Stacks building. By renovating the garden and the houses it will become a programmatic area again and they can look toward the future and possibly add on to the end of the vault since the building will become an office space. Ms. Herbert also suggested that the PEM consider fenestration that would be appropriate and possibly the chair lift that



Mr. Spang mentioned. Mr. Silver noted that there was a rear ramp to provide access but the building meets ADA requirement at the front entrance on Essex Street.

Ms. Herbert stated that maintaining the 1907 appearance of the front of the building by not reinstalling the stairs in front of Plummer Hall was the expert opinion, as was adding the balustrade over Plummer Hall and Daland House. Mr. Monk noted that they have pieces of the original balustrade to recreate them both above and below the entry.

Mr. Spang noted that the museum could go in either direction in regards to the stairs. Mr. Silver noted that they've shown façade plans with and without the stair. Ms. Herbert expressed her opinion that reinstalling the stairs in front of Plummer Hall would recreate what had never existed. The stairs were removed when the Connector was constructed in 1907 to join the two buildings into the Essex Institute. Mr. Silver noted that before 1907 the Connector did not exist so an elevation with no stair is how it looked in 1907. Ms. Herbert noted that a photo of Plummer Hall had a transom with the word "Athenaeum" painted on it so they wanted to honor that major change. Mr. Spang stated that he doesn't see the historic precedent in the removal of the stair that appears to have been crudely removed. He doesn't agree with the purity opinion about returning to 1907 because there will still be some manipulation done at the connector. In addition, the original stairs exist and do not need to be recreated and if they are not reinstalled, they will be placed in storage. Mr. Monk noted that most of the brownstone is in decent shape and it would be salvaged if it isn't reinstalled. Mr. Spang noted that Daland House has a stair that goes nowhere which isn't a concern. Mr. Silver noted that much of the roughness seen around what was once the doorway on Plummer Hall is damage from when the balustrade broke off. Recreating the balustrade would eliminate this raw and crude look. Ms. Herbert noted that there is some subtle water erosion at the stair. Mr. Monk noted that the archway wasn't restored in 2013 because they knew the building would need more work. Ms. Herbert expressed her opinion that creating a balanced look would result in 2 stairs to nowhere.

Ms. Bellin stated that she isn't sold on the 1907 version of Plummer Hall without the stair since each part is being treated under different standards and any confusion can be dealt with fencing and landscaping. She expressed her opinion that the stairs should be reinstalled in their original location because she's not hearing good arguments to the contrary.

Mr. Hart stated his agreement with Mr. Spang regarding reinstallation of the stair at Plummer Hall. Mr. Monk noted that reinstallation would provide an opportunity to tell the story of Plummer Hall. Mr. Hart stated that he spoke with Paul Holtz of the Mass Historic Commission who will review this application. Mr. Monk stated that they haven't filed with MHC yet but they have given them a letter of their intent. When the SHC completes its review, they will present the approved plans to MHC. Ms. Kelleher stated that the Essex Block is a Massachusetts Historic Landmark, which requires review and approval from MHC for any proposed exterior changes.

Mr. Hart asked if the site has any preservation restrictions. Ms. Herbert replied no, and noted that she is not in favor of the stairs returning to Plummer Hall because that creates something that never existed. The Plummer Hall stairs came off when it was purchased in 1907, the Connector was built, the Daland House was private so this is what it became as of 1913. She expressed her opinion that the Commission is charged with honoring the Secretary of Interior Standards. Therefore, the Commission should not approve moving all the pieces back to where they were since the most significant argument is for the 1907 period when it became the Essex Institute.

Ms. McCrea stated that it doesn't honor Plummer Hall to not have the stair. Ms. Herbert replied that when Plummer Hall was purchased, the balustrade that said "Plummer Hall" was removed and "Athenaeum" was removed from the transom because the building became something else. Mr. Silver noted that the residentially-scaled Plummer Hall was never a house. Ms. Bellin asked why the rooftop balustrade wouldn't also be replaced. Mr. Silver replied that it would not be replaced for practical and economic reasons due to damage from snow shedding. Ms. Herbert noted that the reconstruction is essential to the public's understanding of the property when it became the Essex Institute 111 years ago. Therefore, they shouldn't put all the elements back.

Mr. Cutting asked which option was being offered. Mr. Monk replied that the PEM is okay with either option, although their original plan was not to return the stairs to Plummer Hall; however, there are compelling arguments

for both. Ms. Herbert noted that although she would have liked to have had the stairs and top balustrade reinstalled, that's not what they are supposed to do and both experts say that the stairs shouldn't go back and Mass Historic may override the Commission's decision.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Diana Warren of Sudbury, MA stated that she had researched the standards and she concurs that replacing the stair is creating a fictitious history. The Secretary of the Interior Standards states "changes that create a false sense of historical development shall not be undertaken." She presented 3 photos of the former Athenaeum from 1906 showing where "Essex Institute" had been chiseled into the façade of the entrance portico, the wooden doors were changed multiple times and don't match any other previous images including one with diamond pane windows. In 1885 when the Essex Institute took over the Daland House the Plummer name and top balustrade were removed, and in 1907 the Connector was added. In her opinion she would reinstall a balustered railing in front of the Plummer Hall window, add a balustrade on the lintel, add balustrade at the roof edge of Daland House and its portico, install fencing in front of Plummer Hall, but not reinstall the stair in front of Plummer Hall since there has been an interim iteration since its removal.

Ms. Warren argued that the Secretary of the Interior Standards look to the use and history of the building and disagreed with demolishing the Stacks building to return the structure to its residential scale. The building has evolved from being a residence for 50 years to being an institution for almost 150 years. Mr. Traficonte noted that the Vault, 1-story boiler room, and the chimney will remain and in 1966 a 3<sup>rd</sup> floor was added to the Connector that extended towards the rear and towards Essex Street. Ms. Warren noted that Daland House speaks to being an institution and is no longer a residence; it also speaks to the use and history of the structure, and the Stacks building was added sensitively with cornices and quoins despite it being a repository with no window. According to the Secretary of the Interior Standards, unless there are mitigating reasons in the future, the demolition of it shouldn't be approved, and cost, landscaping, and interpretation of the Essex Block have no bearing on it. It should be reviewed by a structural engineer and repurposed instead of demolished. She spoke to Gretchen Schuler, President of The Association for Preservation Technology, and other preservationists, and no one came to conclusion that the structure has to return to the 1922 design. The Mass Historic Commission stopped granting landmark status through certification in the 1980's so that standard shouldn't apply to these buildings. She noted that Elizabeth Server is the head reviewer at Mass Historical. Ms. Warren asked that Michael Steinitz recuse himself from the review by Mass Historical because he attended a working group meeting convened by Mayor Driscoll and PEM, which was inappropriate and he has been part of that group in other ways. Lastly, she thanked the Board for their time and energy with the review of the historic structures within Salem.

Michael Steinitz, Mass Historic Commission, spoke to clarify that he was invited to participate in the sub-committee by Mayor Driscoll, but he declined the invitation. He reported that Paul Holtz is in charge of the Landmark Review. The Stacks building was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1972, at which time, the Connector building would have been less than 50 years old, and therefore not considered historic significant. Buildings can achieve such significance over time but until the nomination is updated it would still be considered a modern element. Mr. Spang asked if MHC has an opinion on returning the stairs to Plummer Hall. Mr. Steinitz replied that although they haven't received a formal application for the project, Mr. Holtz concurred in general with the 1907 significance date. Therefore, the stair reinstallation would not be in keeping with the date of significance and he would not be in favor of restoring it. Ms. Herbert noted that Mr. Holtz was in favor of replacing the balustrades at the two entrances.

Tim Jenkins, 18 Board Street, spoke that he visited the Morgan Library in NY which consists of 2 mansions repurposed into libraries with a major addition by Renzo Piano. These buildings provide storage to the finest private collection of books in the US, and the original historic structure still resembles a brownstone. The Stacks building should be peer reviewed to determine if it can be repurposed since its intention was to be a vault and store books. In terms of accessibility, since it is not open to the public, he stated that he didn't understand why the Stacks can't continue as it has for over 50 years or build an addition and make it a library again. He noted that documents were filed with the Attorney General stating that when the Essex Historical Society was founded, both

included a geographic description for both the Library and the cabinet. He believes that Massachusetts law states where libraries can be moved and what actions can be taken and those restrictions may still be in place so he encourages them not to move the collections. He questioned why the structure can't be turned into something similar to the Morgan Library because the Philips Library should be in Salem and not in Rowley.

Flora Thonat, 30 Northey Street expressed her belief that an independent non-biased assessment is necessary. Returning to the 1907 period and making the Daland House all offices, which it has never been, erases the existence of the Philips Library as an institution. She noted that she has a letter with 8-9 signatories concerning the archives and library collection and she would appreciate that there also be a discussion regarding the collections.

Gary Gill, Ward 3 spoke on the three issues under discussion, including rear improvements and the original master plan for the Crowninshield garden was listed on the registry as a historical garden, but no one has focused on it. He reported that Donna Seger is helping him find the master plan for the garden and he believes it should be used to restore the garden. He stated that he and several others want the Plummer stairs returned because it would be aesthetically pleasing but he is willing to accept the 1907 façade without the stair. He will be on board with whatever the Commission decides on the Stacks building, but his biggest concern is the rear garden, in which Ty Hapworth, the new owner of 6 Brown Street, has a direct view from his front door. Mr. Gill created a wish list of 4 items for that back area and he received signatures from property owners on Brown Street, the Essex Street businesses, and everyone in the condominium building in front of the Plummer Hall and Daland House. He believes a former neighbor sold his property because he could not move forward with getting the PEM to deal with their existing 6 foot fence that was in a state of disrepair, the landscaping, use of the rear of the property as a parking lot, mud puddles, dirt piles, dead bushes, and smaller buildings in disrepair. The PEM has not been a good neighbor, they need to stop taking and start giving back by providing a new library space and returning the library and artifacts to the City in time for Massachusetts 400 year anniversary or create a space to keep them in rotation each season for people to see. He is also in favor of returning the stairs to Plummer Hall which will be aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Spang asked that the wish list be provided to the Historic Commission.

Josiah Fisk, 358 Essex Street, asked if any relief from ADA requirements on the Stacks building could be sought and why something must be done at all. Mr. Silver replied that ADA requirements kick in due to the extent of the overall renovation. If the building was not renovated, it could remain and be grandfathered. Once the renovation cost goes over 1/3 of the value of the building it sets off requirements to comply with ADA. The Stacks is not a public building but employees of PEM could be handicapped and the building would not be accessible to them. Book carts already do not fit down the aisles of the Stacks building and stairs are the only means of access since there no elevator to provide accessibility. All of the proposed plans for a new book vault removed the Stacks building because it is not seismically correct, has no insulation, water seeps through the solid masonry walls, etc. If a new stacks wing were to built at the rear of the existing 1966 Stacks building it would be an impediment to the new building. Mr. Fisk noted that in 1907 before the Plummer Hall steps were removed everyone had to use them so it's hard to understand why moving the steps back is a concern. They are picking and choosing elements to include which is a compromise since they aren't completely going back to what existed in 1907 and he'd rather see the stairs in place instead of in storage.

Kate (last name unknown), 71 Webster Street, stated that providing grade level access is changing the 1907 design, the stairs were important at one time, and it's still changing the building by removing them.

Becky Putnam, 27 Broad Street, stated that the public has been vocal, a working group has been put together, but she wants the process to move ahead. The PEM keeps returning with changes to address the Historical Commission's concerns but suggested a "thinking group" can be put together to come up with a plan and a "giving group" to raise money. It is time to work together and move ahead.

Ty Hapworth, 6 Brown Street, asked when the plans for the garden project and the Safford House would begin. Mr. Monk replied that he will go over it with him and other neighbors.

Wendy Riley Harris, Bridge Street, stated that in 100 years the beauty and symmetry will matter not the rules of what should go back. She appreciates all the effort with trying to find these ideas. She asked what will happen with the interior and the archives and when the PEM will talk about what is planned for those spaces. Ms. Kelleher noted that the working group is planning to have a public meeting towards the end of May.

Mr. Jenkins stated that if a new storage facility was built they could return and apply for a Certificate of Hardship and the public would support that. Salem's future is its history, the PEM is lucky to have the archives and many want it back in Salem. It is not accessible in Rowley and if the PEM proposed to return the collection, he believed more funds would be forthcoming to allow it to happen.

Ms. Thonthat stated that discussing the garden restoration is premature since a legal brief has been filed with the Attorney General requesting that the archives must remain in Salem, and alternative repository plans have been developed which residents are holding out for and she doesn't want to eliminate the opportunity for a future repository behind Plummer Hall.

Ms. Warren stated that a decision regarding the Stacks building removal would be premature, there are mitigating reasons to consider removal of the vault, there is no point for the use of the structures to go forward with a new library Stacks addition or to add new windows to the Vault. She agrees with giving full flexibility to a creative new Stacks addition. She's still not convinced that a creative case has been made for how the Stacks building could be repurposed and made into meeting space, etc.

There was no additional public comment.

#### Front Façade Discussion

Mr. Kelleher noted that Ms. Turiel has missed two meetings and therefore was not eligible to vote on the application.

Ms. Bellin stated that she is still in favor of returning the stairs to Plummer Hall. The architectural and historical experts don't all agree on all the various pieces of the project and she is not convinced that there is a right or wrong decision since returning to the 1907 building would mean removing the top two floors of the Connector, and Mass Historic could disagree.

Ms. Herbert noted that the Connector modification is required for ADA purposes, but reinstalling the stairs is a decorative change and would result in another stairway to nowhere.

Mr. Cutting stated that he is in favor of the 1907 date, but he would have no issue if the stairs did return.

Ms. McCrea stated that the issue that most are concerned with is the removal of the City's history and making the building look pretty is meaningless and sad, especially before the 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary. The PEM should find a way to show more of the history through exhibitions. She stated that moving the stairs back is a good idea, as is creating ADA access.

Mr. Spang agreed that the proposed plans are a result of "cherry picking" but the stairs belong in front of Plummer Hall.

Mr. Hart was also in favor of reinstalling the stairs.

Ms. Herbert stated that reinstalling the stairs and the Daland House balustrades both require a vote.

**VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve reinstalling the stairs in front of Plummer Hall and to make the modifications to the front façade of Daland House as shown in the drawings presented. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. Four (4) were in favor and two (2) were opposed (Ms. Herbert and Mr. Cutting) and the motion so carried.**

Ms. Herbert believed that this was an impulsive decision and not a good one.

### Stacks Discussion

Mr. Hart requested more time to think about the new information provided on the Stacks building but he could make a vote on it in two weeks. Mr. Spang noted that Mr. Wathne had identified the issue with reusing the Stacks building which is not a handsome addition to an otherwise nice grouping of buildings. He stated that he is in favor of removing it to improve the space and could vote on it tonight.

Ms. Bellin asked for clarification with the ADA complaint issue. Mr. Traficonte replied that the MA Access Board is the code that prescribes the accessibility of the building and is triggered when renovation costs surpasses 30% of the accessed value of the structure as a whole. The American with Disabilities Act (ADA) is civil law which has guidelines to follow. If the building is not brought up to the ADA code, the PEM is liable for a lawsuit if someone says they can't access the space, even as an employee. Mr. Hart noted that the PEM could apply for a variance from the Access Board although whether or not it would get approved is an unknown. Mr. Traficonte replied that there is a case to be made with historic structures, however, the challenge of this addition is that its floors do not line up with any of the floors of the other buildings. Librarians have stated that they can barely get a book cart down the aisle and plywood was placed over the stairs and used to move the book carts between floors. Mr. White stated that in their judgment they do not believe the Access Board would approve a variance for access to this building. Mr. Spang added that the Access Board would want some sort of mitigation. Mr. Traficonte added that the building would also require sprinklers, etc. and when you start adding these necessary elements, even as tightly as possible, the space would no longer have the required clearances.

Ms. Bellin stated that perhaps the Commission should delay the decision on whether to remove the Stacks building. Ms. Herbert replied that the use is not within their preview. Mr. Monk stated that the Stacks building is inadequate to house the collections. Mr. White added that the Stack building would not be used because they feel it is not appropriate for human use and inadequate for the collections. Removing it opens up options for future opportunities.

Ms. McCrea stated that she appreciates PEM's information but they've been working on this for approximately 5 years but the Commission just heard about this in December. The PEM could have worked with the City or determined a creative way to keep the collections in Salem but there seems to have been no thought to the upcoming 400 year anniversary and the history that is known throughout the world. The constant postponing of decision is draining but it is good that information is coming out. She stated that she wants a long range plan from the PEM and more time to work together with other experts to determine what to do with the collections and how to present them. She questioned whether these artifacts are being used in the way the families who donated them intended. Since more and more information is still coming out regarding the building, she expressed her reservation on making a decision at this time.

Ms. Kelleher stated that they can continue the discussion and keep the public hearing and comments open or the Commission can deliberate at the next meeting with no public comment if they choose. Mr. Cutting suggested the item be at the top of the agenda at the next meeting and no additional public comment be heard.

Ms. Bellin requested clarification on Historic District vs. Historic Commission. Ms. Herbert replied that a historic district commission deals with the exterior of buildings in local historic districts while an historical commission serves as an advocacy voice for resources city wide.

Ms. Kelleher added that the Salem Historical Commission has operated as both commissions for decades. She noted that the Historic District Commission is a regulatory board that reviews the exterior of buildings viewed from a public way and the Historic Commission is an advocacy role with no regulatory power. They can advocate for history and historic resources and has meetings not hearings. Ms. Kelleher added that it is unknown whether the two must take place separately but they have advocated and provided support for various projects during regular

meetings, but with this particular application those roles should be kept separate. The City Solicitor is still researching whether the Salem Historical Commission is authorized to be a historical commission with special legislation adopted by the City Council. Ms. Herbert noted that Mass Historic considered the issue to be resolved.

Mr. Spang stated that there are still some items to be looked at and suggested a provision to not to allow an occupancy permit while the improvements are happening.

Ms. Warren asked the Commission to consider allowing written comments for the next meeting and not closing the public hearing. Ms. Kelleher replied that the public comment is still open and any new information she receives will be forwarded to the Commission. Mr. Cutting suggested a cut off of comments one week from this meeting.

Mr. Monk noted that work on the rear of the property would happen regardless of the Commission's vote and if this project does not move forward a separate landscape architect will be commissioned to deal with the garden and Brown Street independently of what occurs at Essex Street.

Ms. Herbert asked if the Lye-Tapley Shoe Shop and Summer House would be moved. Mr. Monk replied that this would be part of a reinterpretation program of the Essex Block that would occur sometime in the future. Forensic investigations and an analysis of what has occurred at the Ward House would be key to a future relocation to its original orientation. Ms. Herbert asked that the PEM make their findings public at a meeting.

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

#### Other Business

##### 24½ Winter Street

Ms. Kelleher reported that the owners of the property have proposed minor modifications to the approved new window at the rear of the house. She noted that the subject window would be only marginally visible. Mr. Spang stated that he reviewed the proposed revisions and the new window change made sense.

##### Minor Change applications

Ms. Kelleher reported that she has processed several new applications under the "minor change" policy after receiving no objections from Commission members. Notices were sent to abutters about the proposed change and if no objections are received within 10 days, Certificates of Appropriateness will be issued without a public hearing.

##### 25 Chestnut Street

Ms. Kelleher reported that the owner would like to remove a section of picket fence along the street edge. She asked the Commission to consider this a "minor change" to be approved without a public hearing. Ms. Bellin noted that the fence creates a dangerous issue for vehicles trying to exit the property. As there were no objections to the classification as minor change, Ms. Kelleher stated that she will send out abutters notices and will issue a certificate if no objections are received within 10 days.

#### Violations

##### 95 Federal Street

Ms. Kelleher reported that the mock-up has been installed at the property indicating the new location of the slim duct pipes to bring them closer to the utility box and the downspout. She suggested that the Commission could approve the new location for the current owner with the caveat that the pipes be removed upon sale of the property to a new owner. The Commission discussed their options with getting the piping and heat & A/C units rectified. Mr. Spang noted the lack of specificity on the certificate but a lien and request to reroute when the property changes hands. Ms. Herbert noted that this way they know it will go away at some point.

**VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve it as proposed. Ms. Turiel seconded the motion. Mr. Hart abstained as an abutter. 6 were in favor and the motion so carried.**

**Meeting Minutes**

There were no meeting minutes to approve.

**Other**

Ms. Kelleher noted that there will be a site visit at 16 Broadway in Beverly with the developers of the Knights of Columbus building on Thursday, May 3<sup>rd</sup> at 10AM.

**Preservation Month Activities:**

Ms. Kelleher reported that the Preservation breakfast will be held on Monday, May 7<sup>th</sup> to celebrate the accomplishments of the past year. Several workshops are planned held in May and June.

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:05PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher  
Community Development Planner