

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board – Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, December 20, 2023 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	Remote Participation via Zoom
DRB Members Present:	Chair Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Catherine Miller, Elizabeth Murray, Marc Perras, Sarah Tarbet
DRB Members Absent:	None
Others Present:	Kate Newhall-Smith
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

Chair Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:00PM. Roll call was taken.

Newhall-Smith and the Board welcomed Elizabeth Murray to the DRB. Murray noted that she has been a resident of Salem for 1-1/2 years and is happy to join the Board. Her educational background is in Interior Design, with representative experience for both owner's and general contractors.

Signs in the Urban Renewal Area

There are no signs in the Urban Renewal Area to review.

Projects in the Urban Renewal Area

1. **278-282 Derby Street:** Small Project Review Modification – Addition of stripes below the windows on the Funhouse Donuts façade.

Wren Werner, Owner, was present to discuss the project.

Werner stated that her designer redesigned the façade images, added solid red columns at their side of the entrance, and kept the "Funhouse Donuts" sign above the windows on the far right. They've proposed to balance the strips at the top by adding stripes to brighten the bottom dark panels, below the first-floor windows.

Perras asked if there would be any changes to the canopies. Werner replied no. Perras asked if the decorative element at the top of the columns would also be painted. Werner replied that they would want to add bands of color like the entrance of Bit Bar that include painting the embellishment.

Chair Durand requested the color of the bottom panels if they weren't painted. Werner replied black. Miller asked if the lower panels would be painted or if something would be attached to cover them up. Werner replied paint. Miller noted a previous discussion regarding painting without overpowering the building elements. She stated that adding the idea of the stripes is nice to brighten up the blank aluminum panels and suggested that the painter align the mullions with a red stripe to make spacing of the stripes look less random. Perras argued that only the panel should be painted and not the mullion. Chair Durand, Kennedy, Jaquith, and Murray agreed with Perras, and to paint the panel only and not the frame. Perras suggested not painting the embellishment at the top of the column. Miller noted that the Bit Bar painted to the top of their door frame. Kennedy

suggested painting the rectangular areas above the stripes, next to the upper stripes. Additionally, filling in the third rectangle to the left of “Funhouse Donuts” and possibly the third column as well. Werner noted that she originally wanted to add stripes to each columns and it was reworked to only highlight the entry columns as a solid. Kennedy also suggested not painting the columns and painting a solid color over the windows. Murry suggested painting the columns either solid red or white for a complete look. Kennedy agreed with Murray. Tarbet preferred the painted columns that frame the entry. Miller agreed with Tarbet noting the similarities to Bit Bar’s painting approach.

Murray asked what architectural element was inside the rectangles at the tops of the columns and if anything would frame the upper striping to match the lower striping. Werner replied that the upper embellishments have their own frame that the strips sit in-between. Kennedy suggested painting all three columns red and not the upper rectangles, noting that not painting the third columns makes the overall design less complete. Warner noted that there is a fourth column to the right of the “Funhouse Donuts” sign. Tarbet noted that the fourth column is shared with All Souls. Murry noted that a lot of red paint is being proposed. Perras noted his preference for not painting any of the columns when looking at the overall street façade, so all materials read the same. Jaquith agreed with Perras. Werner raised concerns with the awnings making the windows dark, the tree blocking her façade, and not having enough to draw the eye. She noted that the small awning over the entry door will be removed. Perras noted that the entry door is recessed and suggested the interior lower panels at the lower level be painted with stripes where the walls turn inward. Kennedy and Jaquith agreed.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Perras: Motion to approve not painting the pilasters on either side of the entry door and allowing them to remain white, painting the panels at the bottom of the façade windows in-between the mullions leaving the mullions exposed, and continuing the striped painting at the sides of the recessed doorway at either side of the entry door.

Seconded by: Tarbet.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 7-0.

Projects Outside the Urban Renewal Area

1. **266 Canal Street:** Entrance Corridor Overlay District – Design review of proposed amendments to the approved project.

Attorney Joseph Correnti of Correnti Kolick LLP, Chris Koeplin of Beverly Crossing, Robert Uhlig of Halvorson Design Partnership Inc., Jack Englert and Freerk van Aarem from Criterion Development Partners, Nancy Ludwing of Icon Architecture were present to discuss the project, Residences on Canal Street, LLP.

Atty. Correnti stated that the project has been reviewed by the Planning Board (PB) and by the DRB via the Entrance Corridor zoning regulations. He confirms the program, which includes 250 residential units with commercial space along the Canal Street frontage and significant site improvements. The DRB provided a positive recommendation to the PB several months ago. The PB gave unanimous approval on the planned unit development (PUD.) The property is nearly 15 acres, with approximately 4.5 acres developable and the remaining is Rosie's Pond. The site is now fenced off and preparations are being made to begin construction. They've returned to the DRB for amendments that will help the project, taking into consideration the previous comments from the PB and DRB, they've revisited some of the site considerations after a review by the Conservation Commission (CC) such as flood storage.

Miller requested the future review process. Atty. Correnti replied that they will return to the PB on December 21st and January 7th 2023, to review tonight's amendments. Mr. Koeplin noted their schedule to present landscape and architectural revision to the PB on December, 21, 2023, civil drawings on January 4, 2024, and to obtain a vote from them on January 18, 2024. They will present revised civil drawings to the CC on January 16, 2024 and hope to receive a vote that night as well.

Uhlig stated that the changes increase the outdoor amenities and open space from 12,200+ SF to 13,300 SF. An amenities terrace and pool building, previously located between Buildings C and E, has been relocated to the north-west corner of Building A. It was moved out of the low-lying area closer to Rosie's Pond and placing it next to Building A provides solar exposure throughout the entire day, has a raised grade elevation, and strengthens the indoor/outdoor connection to the gym, co-working space, and leasing office within Building A. The previous location was near unit windows and this change in location will reduce sound reverberation for residents. The square footage and amenities like grills haven't changed. Between Buildings C and E, is more intimately scaled and will become a passive area/community gathering space. This area steps down 3 steps, 18-inches each step, towards the wetlands allowing the area to be used as a mini-amphitheater. With café tables and chairs at the upper level, an accessible route to the lower level, planting and trees will adjacent to the wetlands making this an enjoyable amenities space.

Adjacent to Building A, there have been minor modifications adjusting the roadway entrance off Kimball Road and the driveway around the pool area. At the north-west corner of Building A there have been modifications to the terrace to include a continuous planting strip/buffer outside the leasing office and co-working space along Canal Street, as well as an accessible route and stairway.

The pathway at the northern end of the site connecting the parking lot north of Building D to the uplands adjacent to the wetlands and existing train tracks has been modified due to flood storage. The invasive plantings will be removed, the area regraded, and replanted for an improved view of Rosie's Pond. Flood storage will also be increased, and a wood deck will create a clearly defined connection to the new overlooks and the Rail Trail.

Subtler modifications, south of Building B, a retaining wall has been introduced to accommodate grade changes. At the north corner of Building E, planting islands have been introduced to accommodate grade changes by the vehicular entry and the ingress at this end of the building E.

Most of the perimeter fencing surrounding the pool will be more visually transparent, while the side facing the parking lot and service area will be more concealed. A planting buffer will also be included between the fence and the pool.

At the seating area between Buildings C and E, there may be a combination of plantings, stone dust, and pavers at the lower level, which they envision being periodically floodable, with low-maintenance plantings. The open structure amphitheater steps down will be wood decking with catenary lighting above. Koeplin suggested using the area to host movie nights.

The improvements at Rosie's Pond include a bridge/boardwalk connection to the Rail Trail and removing the invasive plants and replanting with trees, understory plantings, and reseeded, providing better views and a better ecological environment overlooking the pond.

Ludwig stated that their firm was asked by Criterion Development Partners to come on board and move this project forward. She believed their refinements and modifications are within the spirit of the heavily DRB reviewed project, and those changes meet the market and include building code and design considerations. The amenity areas have been expanded to two-stories, are centralized at Building A, and highlight Canal Street. Window adjustments were made, including a reduction in overall glazing square footage to less than 28% to meet the Stretch Energy Code. Units have been realigned and the windows have been sized for location – sleeping/open living room, the windows have been sized for efficient fabrication and purchase. The garages were enclosed with masonry to meet energy demands and create a safer environment at the buildings lower level, such as strong winds from the wetlands and freezing temperatures. Some changes were made to the decks for variety, which now include 70 projecting decks and 84 French balconies. For a stronger residential image, there has been an increase in the use of residential materials, such as square channel and lap siding to reduce the amount of Hardie-panel. The masonry at the stair tower will no longer extend to the roof due to the need for back-up steel in a wood framed building, so Hardie-panel is now proposed.

Ludwig stated that in July 2023 there were two approved amenity programs with 2,163 SF interior space in Building A and a 2,068 SF exterior roof deck on Building B, totaling 4,230 SF. The revised proposal includes 4,536 SF interior space at level 1 of Building A, 2,660 SF interior space at level 2 of Building A, 264 SF interior "common" area at level 5 of Building B, and 933 SF exterior roof deck also at level 5 of Building B, totaling 8,220 for an increase of 4,000+/- SF, including a centralized mail room. The amenity space at Building A has been expanded by 36-feet and the programming is still being developed, although the linear lobby will still look out at the pool deck, can be accessed from both the interior roadway and Canal Street. There are also work share office spaces, a bike

room, mail rooms. Another reason to centralize the mail room is because the postal service doesn't like sending carriers to multiple buildings. The amenities spaces have been extended vertically to the upper level of Building A, where units have been turned into public space that look out over the pool/site and Canal Street, supporting the goals of the city's downtown plan.

Ludwig stated that even with the unit realignments they still have 250 residential units with a slightly different mix to reflect what they believe is the current market. The shifting of the windows has affected the elevations and some of the balconies have sliders. The Hardie-panel siding would have a 9-inch width and a grooved/wood-look appearance is being proposed. At the garages, they'd tried to stay true to the V-pattern at the openings by using banding/stripping while using the same light and dark materials originally proposed, a ground faced CMU block. They've included windows at the garage level with entries in the same location. The overall color combination also remains, with white paneling at the leading façades, brown wood-look siding, the stair tower having dark grey Hardie-panel, similar canopies and they will return to review the signage package.

Ludwig noted that the elevations have stayed consistent, except for the design changes. The three units removed from Building A have been relocated to Building B, and the façades on both the south and east have been set back to include a common roof deck on the fifth floor, which the building code limits to 750 SF. Anything larger would have affected the classification of the building. There will be some private open space as well that looks towards the pond and pool.

Ludwig presents a sun study showing the breaks between the buildings allowing for ample sunlight and sunshine all day long at the pool. Shadows will be present in the spring and fall morning but by my afternoons western sun will shine between the buildings.

Miller asked if access to the pool will only be from the interior of the building. Uhlig replied that access is also provided from the north side of the fence next to the building. Miller raised concerns with that location being a high traffic area. Miller noted that one of the successes of Sofi was having a pool whose location wasn't visible from the street to keep it from being an attractive nuisance on a highly trafficked street. She suggested the use of a solid fence for privacy and so residents don't feel as though they are sitting in a sea of asphalt. Miller suggested adding grilles to the sunken area between Buildings C and E for additional activation, despite the flood potential. Miller also suggested confirming the inclusion of a minimum 30-inch landing at the accessible route required for 30-inch drop in grade. Miller requested confirmation that this project would return to the DRB for signage review since this review is because of a PB referral, and she noted that the DRB would like to review future signage. Miller requested specifics on the revised unit mix noting her desire to not see a reduction in bedroom in multi-bedroom units. Ludwig replied that they've increased the studio count by 6 units and some of the one-bedrooms became a 1+ to have at home work space post-COVID. Koeplin noted that the number of 2-bedrooms went from 49% down to 47%. Miller noted that a decrease for families would be unfortunate, but a 2% reduction is not a huge change or issue.

Perras noted that the DRB worked hard with the previous design to have some irregularity with the window pattern, however the current fenestration is now quite regular. At the back of Building A, introducing single windows does a lot for the project and more should be introduced, despite the slight variation in the living room and bedroom windows. It will be more apparent in the larger facades which are almost exclusively double-windows, and he suggested making some double living room windows into two single windows or adding additional single windows. In general, the changes are very well considered and well executed. Perras asked if the loss of storefront and tenant space was a result of the stretch energy code. Ludwig replied that using the same window system as the residential windows is best for cost and for better insulating quality. Perras noted that the change in window system and infilling some areas with masonry also changes the look of that end of the building, which he's not necessarily opposed to. Ludwig replied that buying the entire window system from one manufacturer is also preferred, which are getting difficult to find. She noted that the storefront system is also expensive, given the quantities shown, framing between the window openings will be necessary, and what's shown is what can be built reasonably while maintaining thermal qualities.

Perras noted that he was not in favor of the masonry not vertically cladding the stairwell, but the overall façade will have a lot of texture, therefore he was in favor of using larger scale panels. He requested the material of the vertical lines that rise to meet the coping. Ludwig replied trim, like the verticality used in the pervious plan. Koeplin added that it was a subtle color-matched detail that provided some definition for the window groupings and to eliminate long runs of clapboards. Perras reiterated that the use of single windows in the previous design helped add texture to the façade. Perras was not in favor of the corner bead. Ludwig replied that it was a manufacturer example image that does not have to be used on this project.

Tarbet found the programmatic changes with more light and eyes on Canal Street to be a positive improvement, agreed with Perras' comments on adding single windows for a more varied rhythm along the façade. She agreed that while the larger panels at the stair tower work well, she encouraged the return of the previous design that anchored them to the base and breaks up the long run of masonry. Ludwig agreed to extend stairwell paneling to the base. Tarbet appreciated the banding trying to mimic the previous angle but didn't believe it was necessary given that openings have been added to the façade. She asked if railings would be added to the sloped walk at the sunken area and raised concern with the use of so much CMU, where more texture could be added by pushing and pulling the banding along the façade. Ludwig replied that the concrete will be at crash rail height within the garage and reglets would be added to the concrete and agreed with doing something more engaging with the perimeter walls and noted that the final grading is still being determined. Uhlig noted that he would determine if railings were required along the accessible route.

Jaquith noted that he was not in favor of the site plan that creates challenging spaces between the large buildings; however the architectural improvements are evident and he

agreed with Perras regarding the need for singular windows that don't necessarily need to be the same size.

Public Comment:

Councillor Jeff Cohen, 12 Hancock Street, Ward 5 Councillor (where this project resides.) He served on the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Board as a designated Councillor for 2-years and noted that a real deficiency in Salem is smaller units and the development team is proposing much more affordability than the new inclusionary housing ordinance will require, which is a positive. He noted the need for workforce and transit housing and this site is an ideal location for the potential new MBTA rail stop. There is also a real need for workforce housing at the Salem State University, Salem Hospital, and the Amazon distribution center. This development team has been sensitive to the neighbors and the environment, and he looks forward to its ground breaking. He thanked the Board.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Perras noted that he didn't personally feel the need to review the project again and to approve it with comments made.

VOTE: Perras: Motion to approve with comments: relocating the perimeter fence at the pool and using a privacy fence, adding grilles to the sunken area between Buildings C & E, confirming landing, to review future signage for the project, adding single windows or converting double-windows to create irregularity within the window pattern, to not include corner beading, to anchor the stairwell by extending the large scale paneling down to the base, to confirm whether railings were needed at the accessible route to the sunken area, and adding reglets to the base of the Buildings C and E facades for texture, and to refer to project back to the Planning Board. Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor.
Passes 7-0

New / Old Business

1. Officer Elections – Chair and Vice Chair

Newhall-Smith stated that Durand and Perras have expressed interest in continuing their current roles.

VOTE: Miller: Motion to approve Chair Paul Durand and Vice Chair Marc Perras to continue in their current roles. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor.
Passes 7-0

2. Board Membership Updates

Newhall-Smith reminded the Board that J. Michael Sullivan submitted a letter of resignation, and the Board thanked him for his service. She also stated that Glenn

Kennedy also submitted a letter of resignation, and this will be his last meeting with the DRB. Kennedy noted that he appreciated his time with the Board, but after 18 years there is new talent on the Board and time for another voice. With recent Board comments regarding signage, he feels it's time to step away. He's learned a lot from the Board, appreciates them all, and has enjoyed watching Salem grow since he moved to the area in 1999, and he will remain available to the Board for any questions regarding future signage.

3. Approval of Minutes:
 - a. November 15, 2023

Miller noted asked if someone followed up with 16 Franklin Street. Newhall-Smith replied that she sent the revised plans to Perras and Chair Durand for their review and sign-off.

VOTE: Miller: Motion to approve the November 15, 2023 meeting minutes. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Murray – abstained due to not being a Board member at the time, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 6-0.

4. Staff Updates, if any:

Miller noted that Silly Bunny would not return to the DRB this month. Newhall-Smith noted that the applicant wanted to re-evaluate their signage so their application was pulled, and they will refile.

Newhall-Smith noted that the Magic Parlor is expanding to focus on make-up.

Newhall-Smith noted that there is no new information regarding the first-floor condominium at Brix being sold. Perras noted that some of the cornice lighting has been out or off for the past year, and it is not a good look given their prominent location. He suggested the cornice lighting be turned off until it is fixed. The Board agreed.

Adjournment

Kennedy: Motion to adjourn. Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 7-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 7:45PM.

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