

Newburyport Historical Commission

May 26, 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 and Malcolm Carnwath. Marc Cendron was absent. Also in attendance were Planning Director Andy Port, Planner Katelyn Sullivan and note taker Gretchen Joy.

3. Demolition Delay Applications

a) 30 Carter Street

The Commission determined at its last meeting that the structure is historically significant and considered for preservation. The Commission members attended a site visit.

Haley McLane and Al DiBiaso described the plans to change the roofline of the structure. The applicant is proposing to add dormers on either side of the roof. The dormer on the north side of the structure would meet the guidelines but the dormer proposed for the south side would not. It would be flush with the exterior wall and would have a steeper pitch to create headroom for a staircase. The applicant is also proposing to remove the vinyl siding and restore the wood clapboards to the extent possible. The existing windows would be removed and replaced with two-over-two wood windows.

Joe Morgan said the proposal is a good one, as the restoration of the building is important.

Christopher Fay said there are not many dormers in the neighborhood. He does not like the dormers, but the house is not a great representative of its style.

Andrew Bernhardt said he would not object to the dormers, as they would not be visible from the street.

Malcolm Carnwath said he does not like the dormers and the house has existed for 150 years without them.

Glenn Richards said the house is typical of the older neighborhood. The dormers would be set back from the street. They would not be highly visible and both would not be seen at the same time. He said the proposal would improve the structure overall. The dormers are not appropriate for the period of the structure, but would not create a disruption to the streetscape.

Malcolm Carnwath moved that the structure is preferably preserved. Joe Morgan seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 4-1 vote (Glenn Richards, yes; Joe Morgan, no; Christopher Fay, yes; Andrew Bernhardt, yes; Malcolm Carnwath, yes).

The hearing was opened to comments from the public. Tom Kolterjahn, 64 Federal Street, said the houses on the street were occupied by mill workers. Dormers are inappropriate for structures of this time period. Very few houses on the street have dormers. The historical nature of the building is being overlooked. It would be appropriate to add a modest addition at the rear of the structure.

Stephanie Niketic, 93 High Street, the house is a part of a historic district. The neighborhood was a modest one for mill workers. The city was made up of people of all economic classes. Proposals should not be considered house by house, but rather district by district. The public comment period was closed.

Joe Morgan moved to approve the plans as submitted and to lift the Demolition Delay. Andrew Barnhardt second the motion. The motion failed by 3-2 vote, as four affirmative votes are needed to pass a motion. (Glenn Richards, yes; Joe Morgan, yes; Christopher Fay, no; Andrew Bernhardt, yes; Malcolm Carnwath, no).

b) 29.5-31 Purchase Street

Ben Taylor represented the applicant, who is proposing to construct a dormer at the rear of the structure. The house does not appear on the 1914 Sanborn map but is shown on the 1924 Assessor's map. The house is set back from the street. A second structure had been located on the street in front of this structure that was destroyed by fire.

The structure is listed as contributory and there is no Form B. Attorney Taylor said many changes have been made to the house over the years. An 8' x 8' front entry was added in 1984.

Christopher Fay said the house looks like a suburban one that was built in the 1980s. He does not see a necessity to preserve it. Joe Morgan said the house does not have a character-defining feature, it is not a part of the historic streetscape and is not associated with a historic event or person.

Christopher Fay moved that the structure is historically significant but not 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; Malcolm Carnwath, yes).

4. DOD/DCOD Advisory Review

None

5. General Business

a) 344 Merrimac Street

Preservation Restriction Review

Nick Cracknell represented the applicant and reviewed the changes made to the draft document. Language that had been added by the applicant's attorney was removed, the restoration plan was inserted and it was indicated that the entire chimney would be included in the restoration plan.

A stipulation will be placed on the Planning Board approval that all restoration items must be completed prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit for the new structure or surety must be posted for the completion of any remaining items. Mr. Cracknell asked the NHC to endorse this stipulation.

A preservation restriction for 5 Moseley Avenue was used as a template for the draft restriction. That project included CPA funding and a paragraph related to this was removed. As a result, the numbering system must be changed. Paragraph 4.1 also relates to CPA funding and must be removed as well. The restriction for 342 Merrimac Street

included a paragraph regarding additional mortgages and leases that was omitted from the draft restriction in error and must be included. The plot plan and Assessor's map will be added as exhibits. The document will be updated for approval at the June 9 meeting.

b) Correspondence

A letter was received from Peter Mackin regarding 93 State Street, in which he inquired if the Commission should review the revised plans. Andy Port said that according to the remand order from the court, no further submission to the NHC shall be required of the plaintiff. This does not mean that the Commission could not comment on the application. The Planning Board hearing will be opened on June 1 but likely would be continued. The decision is due June 24. The revised plans are available on the Planning Board website.

6. Minutes

Andrew Bernhardt moved to approve the minutes of the May 12 meeting. Christopher Fay seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 5-0 vote (Glenn Richards, yes; Joe Morgan, yes; Christopher Fay, yes; Andrew Bernhardt, yes; Malcolm Carnwath, yes).

7. Adjournment

Joe Morgan moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m. Christopher Fay seconded the motion. The motion was approved by 5-0 vote (Glenn Richards, yes; Joe Morgan, yes; Christopher Fay, yes; Andrew Bernhardt, yes; Malcolm Carnwath, yes).