

## **Newburyport Historical Commission**

May 12, 2022

Online Meeting

Minutes

### **1. Call to Order**

Chair Glenn Richards called an online meeting of the Newburyport Historical Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

### **2. Roll Call**

In attendance were members Joe Morgan, Glenn Richards, Christopher Fay, Andrew Bernhardt, Marc Cendron and Malcolm Carnwath. Also in attendance were Planner Katelyn Sullivan and note taker Gretchen Joy.

### **3. Demolition Delay Applications**

#### **30 Carter Street**

The applicant is seeking a demolition permit for a roofline change. According to the district data sheet, the side-hall Italianate structure was constructed between 1855 and 1870. Marc Cendron that moved the structure is historically significant and considered for preservation. Joe Morgan seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 5-0 vote (Glenn Richards, yes; Joe Morgan, yes; Christopher Fay, yes; Andrew Bernhardt, yes; Marc Cendron, yes; Malcolm Carnwath, absent).

Haley McLane described the plans to renovate the structure. She is proposing to add dormers on either side of the roof to make the third floor functional. The dormer on the north side of the structure would meet the dormer guidelines but the dormer proposed for the south side would not. Its roofline has been designed to accommodate a staircase that would be located within the dormer to provide access to the third floor.

Ms. McLane said the architectural detailing is dilapidated and the windows are in poor condition. The vinyl siding would be removed and the wood clapboards would be restored to the extent possible. The existing windows would be removed and replaced with two-over-two wood windows. The locations of the windows would be changed. Windows on the north elevation would be removed to provide privacy for the neighbors, while windows would be added to the west façade to accommodate the interior layout of the structure.

The hearing was opened to comments from the public. Tom Kolterjahn, 64 Federal Street, said he is concerned about different roof pitches on the dormers, which he said would look odd. Also, the placement of the windows does not appear to be logical. He encouraged the Commission members to attend a site visit. He said there should be a better way to address the windows and dormers.

Stephanie Niketic, 93 High Street, said the window placement is confusing. The dormers are lopsided and not appropriate for the style of the house. The applicant should be able to find a better way to achieve her goals. The public comment period was closed.

Andrew Bernhardt said most of the homes in the neighborhood have small footprints and are close to each other. He said the south dormer would create the appearance of a wall.

Marc Cendron said he does not understand the placement of the windows on the north elevation. He wants to have more information on the plan for the clapboards. The dormers are awkward and do not make architectural sense.

Joe Morgan said he does not have a problem with the dormers and they would not be visible from the street. He said while the fenestration on the north and south elevations is troublesome, he does not observe that the structure has any relevant features that should be preserved.

Glenn Richards responded that the applicant is seeking to improve the appearance of the house through the removal of the vinyl siding and the restoration of architectural details. He added that on the north side of the structure, the dormer does not extend to the plane of the lower wall. He said it appears there would be enough room to construct the same type of dormer on the other side of the structure. He said the mismatched dormers would be awkward, although they would be 13 feet from the front of the roof and might not be visible from the street.

Ms. McLane said the clapboards that could not be restored would be replaced with wood. The dormers would be set back and would not be seen at one time. The solid wall that would be created by the removal of windows would not be visible from the street, but she would be willing to retain the windows. She said the architectural details are rotted and covered in vinyl. She intends to replace them with appropriate materials. She wishes to restore the structure and make it more attractive.

A site visit will be scheduled through the Planning Office. Christopher Fay moved to continue the public hearing to the May 26 meeting. Marc Cendron seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 5-0 vote (Glenn Richards, yes; Joe Morgan, yes; Christopher Fay, yes; Andrew Bernhardt, yes; Marc Cendron, yes; Malcolm Carnwath, absent).

#### **4. DOD/DCOD Advisory Review**

##### **22 Market Street**

##### **Review of Draft Historical Report**

Joe Morgan moved to approve the historical report as drafted. Andrew Bernhardt seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 5-0 vote (Glenn Richards, yes; Joe Morgan, yes; Christopher Fay, yes; Andrew Bernhardt, yes; Marc Cendron, yes; Malcolm Carnwath, absent).

#### **5. General Business**

##### **344 Merrimac Street**

##### **Review of Proposed Preservation Restriction**

The applicant is seeking a Planning Board VI-C Special Permit to construct two structures on a single lot. To fulfill the public benefit requirement, the applicant is proposing to place a preservation restriction that would be held by the Historical Commission on the 1805 Levi Carr house. A site visit took place on May 7.

Nick Cracknell reviewed the elements of the preservation restriction. He said all 17 windows would be replaced. On the front façade, the lower windows would be nine-over-six, while six-over-six windows would be installed on the second story. The

window casing, trim and sills would be restored where possible, and where not, would be replaced in kind. A new Federal-style entry door would be installed. The central chimney would be repaired and parged. The interior chimney would be retained. Copper gutters and downspouts would be installed, along with wood shutters. The soffit, trim and clapboards would be preserved and repaired or replaced in kind.

Christopher Fay said he approves of the revised plan. Joe Morgan said the revised plan accurately documents the discussion that took place at the site visit.

Andrew Bernhardt moved to approve the revised restoration plan so that it might be incorporated into the draft preservation restriction for final Historical Commission approval. The motion was approved by 5-0 vote (Glenn Richards, yes; Joe Morgan, yes; Christopher Fay, yes; Andrew Bernhardt, yes; Marc Cendron, yes; Malcolm Carnwath, absent).

Lisa Mead clarified that for preservation restrictions, the baseline documents show the existing conditions. Restriction may also include an exhibit called the “grantors proposed and approved changes,” which would indicate the approved conditions.

### **90 Water Street**

Lisa Mead represented the applicant, who purchased the two-family structure in 2016. It was found at that time that the use was not legal and the applicant sought a variance from the ZBA to continue the use. The Historic Commission agreed to hold a preservation restriction on the property. The restriction would run with the land in perpetuity. The conditions of the restriction were that the roofline would not change, any change to the rear addition would not include a roofline that would extend above that of the main structure, the pediment on the Water Street façade would be retained and two first-floor windows on the Water Street façade would be replaced with wood windows to match those on the second floor and would have spacers between the glass and the muntins on the exterior portion of the sash. Attorney Mead confirmed that this detail has been met and the windows are aluminum-clad wood.

The Commission discussed the public benefit associated with the placement of a preservation restriction on a structure that is a minor contributor and for which no Form B existed. Attorney Mead said the structure was worker housing and it contributes to the streetscape. The restriction and the Form B were drafted but had not been brought before the Commission for approval. The draft preservation restriction contains some typographical errors that will be corrected.

Christopher Fay moved to approve the draft preservation restriction subject to the final review of the document. Andrew Bernhardt seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 6-0 vote (Glenn Richards, yes; Joe Morgan, yes; Christopher Fay, yes; Andrew Bernhardt, yes; Marc Cendron, yes; Malcolm Carnwath, yes).

### **6. Minutes**

Andrew Bernhardt moved to approve the minutes of the April 28 meeting. Joe Morgan seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 4-0 vote (Glenn Richards, yes; Joe Morgan, yes; Christopher Fay, Andrew Bernhardt, yes; Malcolm Carnwath, abstain; Marc Cendron, abstain).

**7. Adjournment**

Malcolm Carnwath moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:48 p.m. Christopher Fay seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 6-0 vote (Glenn Richards, yes; Joe Morgan, yes; Christopher Fay, yes; Andrew Bernhardt, yes; Marc Cendron, yes; Malcolm Carnwath, yes).