

City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

Board or Committee: Design Review Board, Special Meeting
Date and Time: Wednesday, April 22, 2020 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location: Remote Participation via Zoom
DRB Members Present: Chair Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Catherine Miller, Marc Perras, Helen Sides, J. Michael Sullivan
DRB Members Absent: None
Others Present: Kate Newhall-Smith
Recorder: Colleen Brewster

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

Signs

- 1. 30 Church Street (Hive & Forge):** Discussion and vote on signage. Revised plans not submitted – To be continued to May 27, 2020

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting on May 27, 2020
Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand were all in favor.
Passes 7-0.
- 2. 73 Lafayette Street (North Shore Bank Signage):** Discussion and vote on signage. Revised plans not submitted - Review continued to May 27, 2020

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the May 27, 2020 next regular meeting.
Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand were all in favor.
Passes 7-0.
- 3. 193 Washington Street (East Boston Bank Signage):** Discussion and vote on signage. (continued from 2/26/20)

Mike Brewster of Barlow Signs was present to discussed the project.

Brewster presented revised plans with the signs within band above windows, painted to match other sign bands, reducing its projection by approximately 4-inches. The linear layout has been switched to stacked and the sign will fit within signage square-footage requirements. A new aluminum backer panel will be added above entry door. Sullivan requested the thickness of the lettering and the proposed lighting. Brewster replied 3-inches thick and the lettering will be face lit.

Newhall-Smith stated that Kennedy's comments from March 2nd were passed along to the applicant. Kennedy noted that he visited the site after their last meeting and

observed the other wall signs on the building and their substantial size and not all of them were easily visible. He felt the proposed signs should stay within the original sign band and noted that their sign is very visible. One of their banks in the South End are 1-inch wider and with a back lit black lettering on a white background, which is clean and easier to read. The size is also smaller than what's proposed but clean, clear and prominent from a distance than the proposed white letters. The proposed logo has the same number of letters as the Herbal Foot Spa and their application of the sign, even as a blade sign, is more appropriate.

Miller proposed a sign that does not extend outside the frame of the sign band and liked the alternative found by Kennedy. The proposed lettering maxes out the sign area and leaves little white space around it. She asked if the other building signs were lit. Kennedy replied the original sign bands are lit from behind. Bank of America was using that light and the new tenant would do the same.

Jaquith preferred Kennedy's alternative. The corner entry sign could be two lines but with a white background, blue outline, and black letters but not backlit, because raised lettering gets lost in the daytime. Sullivan agreed with Kennedy on the side sign bands. At the center entrance sign they should eliminate the lighting and have black letters on white background with no lighting on any of them. Kennedy suggested the full panel backlit signs could stay lit in the new condition. Chair Durand also agreed with Kennedy.

Brewster stated that the proposed sign is smaller than the neighboring tenant. They are allowed 80 square-feet, but that was cut in half because this is along an entrance corridor. The changes would reduce it by 50% more than what's allowed by code. Chair Durand replied that the requirement is for maximum allowed. Brewster noted that he can create more free area so it's not overpowering, however; his client doesn't want to be within the boxes, they want to be easily seen. The one proposed by Kennedy is in a location with more foot traffic and this location doesn't have that. It was also a historic sign with special requirements. Kennedy stated that the proposed is very large and is extending outside of the intended sign bands. It's overpowering and precedent setting for the other tenants. Brewster noted that the bank also has more sign panels when compared to the other tenants, but the neighbors are allowed more signage than code allows. Chair Durand suggested break up the logo onto two sign bands.

Sides suggested they use the logo coloring in the bank to indicate their space. The DRB want what's appropriate and fits within downtown. People will find locations with their GPS not just foot traffic, so it doesn't necessarily need to be big.

Perras stated that the stacked lettering at corner signage feels more appropriate than the flanking elevations Sullivan suggested the corner be kept stacked and the side be linear. Brewster found that to be a suitable approach.

Miller stated that the corner sign lettering is more appropriate, but still wants to see the panel trim around it and not all band and agreed that the alternative sign found by Kennedy was easier to read with black letters on a white background. Kennedy added that larger doesn't always make a sign easier to read and the proposed size and scale are off for this building.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Darleen Melis, 115 Federal Street. The logo with the compass pointing to east could be used as an upper panel, then East Boston, then Savings Bank. It would occupy all three bays, become more legible, and have an elegant flow.

Tim Jenkins, 18 Broad Street. Agrees on scaling down the signs and going horizontal on sides of building. He wondered if it could all fit into one panel on the center bay given that they have three side bays. He agreed with black lettering on a clear background for easy visibility particularly at night. The front entrance is out of plane with the remainder of building and the sign band should have a frame because it's missing detail. It's hard to read the sign even on a computer and the proposed solutions are good.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sides: Motion to continue to May 27, 2020 regular meeting.

Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand were all in favor.

Passes 7-0.

4. 72 Flint Street (Halstead Salem Station Apartments Sign): Discussion and vote on signage.

Attorney Michael Spillane representing the owner, Tom Mazza owner, and Bronwyn Hershberger were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Spillane stated that the proposed sign will be installed at entrance to the building. Hershberger noted that sign will be at a 90-degree angle to Flint Street rather than 45. The brick base is 22" high, the 48-inch-high x 12-inch deep gun metal gray I beam will act as an anchor for the 1" thick yellow "H" Halstead logo above it. The "H" will be 14-inches-deep x 40-inches-wide x 46-inches-high, with up lighting in the ground. Chair Durand stated that the proposed sign is larger than NRCC regulations allow and needs to be in compliance with the 32-inch square-foot per side. Atty. Spillane replied that his client will request a variance with the ZBA on the size of the sign and are only seeking approval on the sign design with the DRB.

Sides requested the total height. Hershberger replied 78-inches-high x 10-feet-wide, however; the "H" extends higher. Sullivan stated he preferred the sign without the "H". Jacquith agreed. Miller approved of the revised location for visibility but suggested it be moved to the other side of the concrete walkway, given that its current location would be a good snow storage location. She added that a 10-foot-high sign is very large. Jacquith suggested they reduce the size of sign. Sides noted that she likes the location off street but agreed that given the residential scale of the street and people not needing large signs of find locations, the sign could be scaled down. Miller agreed. Kennedy commented on the three different types of lettering proposed as well

as their spacing and scale. “Salem Station” is crushed to fit in. He suggested they make the type smaller and spread out the letters to make “Halstead Salem Station” more legible and less busy. Perras agreed and stated that the “H” on top is broken from the field. They could bring it down and to the left, so it fits in better with the grey field.

Atty. Spillane replied the proposed is the logo. If the 78-inch-height is a concern the “H” could be incorporated more into the grey area or removed and keep the sign at an overall height of 78-inches. Sides questioned the heights of the signs for other businesses and residences in the surrounding area. Perras note that 6’-6” is too high. Jaquith suggested 5’-6” high. Atty. Spillane noted that they want the sign visible from the curve along Flint Street and want it visible from Flint Street. Hershberger noted that the brick base is 22-inches-high to make it more visible with snow. Perras stated that when driving 35-42-inches-high is a good sign height for drivers and the present sign is longer than a vehicle. Sullivan noted that 12-inch-high lights are proposed on each since totaling 6 lights. Jaquith agreed with the new location proposed by Sides. Hershberger replied that existing trees in the new sign location suggested.

Mazza thanked the board for their help, understands the different text size they prefer, and will take the recommendations to the Sign Center Company.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Tim Jenkins, 18 Broad Street. The proposed sign size is large, but also more visible turned 90-degrees rather than along the street. The street gets a lot of traffic, and it will be well lit and easily seen at night. The sign is high for a residential neighborhood with minimal commercial spaces down the street. An apartment doesn’t need a sign scaled this large so scaling it down make sense, so the Board recommendation are good. At 6’-6” it’s taller than most people. You will be noticed because of the quality of the work

Steve Pelletier, 1 Washington Street. There should be more guidance from the Board, in case it’s still not small enough when the developer returns. 7-feet isn’t the size of the sign, there’s lighting below, and an “H” above so the actual sign is smaller.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Chair Durand stated that the Board gave sufficient size and text criticism for the applicant to return and there is also an ordinance to follow.

Jaquith was not logged into the virtual meeting at the time of vote.

Sides: Motion to continue to May 27, 2020 regular meeting.

Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, and Chair Durand were all in favor.

Passes 6-0.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

- 1. 15 Crombie Street** – Replacement of rotting columns on rear porch of 3-unit residential structure

Newhall-Smith stated that revised plans were not submitted so the review can be continued to May 27, 2020.

Jaquith was not logged into the virtual meeting at the time of vote.

Sides: Motion to continue to May 27, 2020 regular meeting.

Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, and Chair Durand were all in favor.

Passes 6-0.

2. 65 Washington Street: Review of 100% Construction Drawings

Revised plans not submitted - Review continued to May 27, 2020

Jaquith was not logged into the virtual meeting at the time of vote.

Sides: Motion to continue to May 27, 2020 regular meeting.

Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, and Chair Durand were all in favor.

Passes 6-0.

3. 14 New Derby Street:

Marc Moschella of Goldberg Properties and Peter Pitman architect at Pitman & Wardley were present to discuss the project.

Jaquith joined the meeting.

Moschella stated that Deland Lighting was on left, two existing tenants are the barber shop and shoe cobbler. They will reconfigure the left-side entries to add an entrance for another future tenant. They will change the building windows, make masonry repairs in kind, patch and repoint the brickwork, make minor repairs to the columns, adjust the curbs so the windowsills at the first floor are all on the same elevation since right side is currently slightly higher. All window heads and sills will be at the same height.

Pitman added that they will add windows at fire station and parking lot sides of building. The windows will have a black aluminum finish, the second-floor windows will be double hung. The first-floor commercial tenants will be responsible for their own signage.

Miller asked if the new doorways will remain recessed. Perras noted that the entrances won't be flush with the building; but they will be slightly recessed. Pitman replied that the fourth entrance will be recessed, and the main entrance will not change. Miller suggested that the upper window be black or dark bronze. Pitman noted that they will all be anodized bronze, but everything will match. Perras noted that the existing faded bronze works well with the existing building and black may be too modern for the color palette and sandstone features, and he suggested a study of other entries for comparison. The entry third from left is centered and doesn't match the other bays, which may be more appropriate. Pitman replied that all existing entries are recessed as Santander.

Miller noted that the current Deland entry sidelites are angled and the doors is parallel from street and asked if the new storefront sides will be angled. Pitman replied that they will be recessed but flush with the brick, but the sidelights don't currently have brick. Perras asked what is proposed at the returns. Pitman replied wood panels at the angled walls will be squared

off at the columns. Perras noted that the new entry should be of a similar scale and type as the barber shop side entry where the door is not centered. Pitman replied that the storefront will move forward, and the current niches are too tight for the required pull clearance, but they are exiting conditions.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Miller stated that the rear elevation showed new windows that didn't line up with brick infills. Moschella replied that they had a different permit to repair the rear wall, the area was rebuilt, and the windows can be placed anywhere.

Sides: Motion to continue to May 27, 2020.

Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand were all in favor.

Passes 7-0.

4. 30 Federal Street: Discussion and vote on residential redevelopment of existing structure

Dan Ricciarelli and Sanir Lutfija of Seger Architects and Mike Becker Owner were present to discuss the project.

Ricciarelli stated that they are providing an addition onto the rear of the office building. There will be a new front entrance to the 800 square-foot of new retail, and new parking at the rear. After a discussion with the Tree Warden, they won't replace street trees and will focus on new plaza, where there are proposed new planting against a brick wall. There will be glass along the Washington Street at the new retail and a new elevator for accessibility. The upper floors will house several residential units.

Ricciarelli stated that they looked at the neighboring buildings for connection cues. Some are 2 ½ to 4 stories and they are attaching to a low ridge wood frame building. This is diminutive when compared to the neighboring buildings and it's scaled appropriately for downtown. They want to break up the façade but there is not enough headroom at the top floor. They propose to clad the addition in cementitious clapboard to separate it from the existing building with glass to signify the beginning of the residence. There will be a new canopy over retail and brought the columns to the ground over a masonry plinth, so the openings appear carved out of the building. They've reduced the number of materials although the material at the bottom of the storefront hasn't been determined.

Ricciarelli stated that at the rear of Washington Street addition, there will be an open bay for the garage at grade with a larger board façade that carries over to the exit corridor. The upper level dormer will be clad in Nichiha cementitious panels. At the North elevation they removed the tower and added eyebrow dormers at the roof. The facades will have mitered corners, Boral trim, the storefront will be clear anodized, there will be wood panels at the exterior decks, metal soffits at the underside of the garage area, and asphalt Slateline singles to match the existing. Lighting will be added at the new egress and garage area only. At the West elevation

they again picked up on some cues from neighboring building. The clapboard may be more appropriate as a masonry material to blend in better with downtown Salem.

Perras stated that in comparison this is a small addition, but he doesn't like the small gables in the overall massing and suggested a series of shed dormers. Ricciarelli replied that that scheme was in their first iteration. Becker noted his preference for copper. Sides stated that she likes the shed dormer only on the addition but only where it needs to be, such as over just the windows and the roof should be the dominant element. Lutfija noted that they will continue the ridge line from the roof and the dormers will serve just the unit.

Sides noted that the dormer could remain the darker color and not highlighted as a different material. Ricciarelli replied that it would be painted the existing building color and that canopy will interrupt the façade. Jaquith stated that progress was made but it doesn't match the retail below at the new building. The left side of Washington street looks like a strip mall indicating that they could be trying too hard. Sullivan noted that the columns interrupt the look at the retail, but the right side now makes sense and there is now an order to the structure, but the stair tower is disconnected from the ground. Chair Durand stated there needs a sign band for the commercial which currently seems to be more of an after-thought. Ricciarelli presented a sketch of the Washington Street elevation with wood at the connection pieces and dormered façade. The Board preferred this iteration best, which highlights the old building and has a rooftop connection that isn't bothersome. Jaquith asked if a portion of the dormer can be usable. Becker replied only a portion of it. Chair Durand is preference for the wood at the face of the addition that make the original building stand out and the addition read as an addition. A sign band could be added in easier too. Ricciarelli replied that the canopy could be a fit and stand-off letters could be used for signage. Sullivan noted that in this iteration the canopy has other members relating to it and a relationship between the bottom and top of the canopy. Kennedy stated that no sign band is needed with this sketch. Sides noted that it has a more classical look with a cornice, and it relates to 65 Washington Street. Ricciarelli noted that the gable would be eliminated. Perras stated that the North elevation could be too tall. Chair Durand stated that the image resembles a downtown feeling with but a modern version of a residential building.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Alice Merkle, 28A Federal Street. Asked if the walkway from the parking lot to Washington Street enters into their last parking space against the property, does it require a shifting of their parking spaces, or does interfere with their parking spaces. Ricciarelli replied that they have ½ parking space and that leftover space will not be located on their property.

Steve Pelletier, 1 Washington Street. Their building is perpendicular to 30 Federal Street and the new addition will make a U-shaped space between their three condominiums and their clapboard facades. He's concerned with the shadows and privacy because of the U-shape. Their building is residential and commercial, the additional material is beachy and doesn't fit in with historic Salem. This is what tourist will see first and the DRB shouldn't determine what fits.

Darleen Melis, 115 Federal Street. The Tree Commission has new manual coming out tomorrow. The proposed trees coming down doesn't explain how the setback trees will be treated. How do people exit this area and connect to Washington Street when people are used

to walking where they are placing their new stair? Ricciarelli replied through their parking lot, the walkway used is on someone else's property, and it's being relocated to an area 30-feet away. Anything on their property will be maintained but the walking path can be striped, so tenants know where to go. Melis asked if the developer will replace any trees. Becker replied that he volunteered to replace them but the Tree Warden wasn't amenable to that and they would be penalized. Lutfija replied that they will add three to the new patio area. Melis suggested they plant something that casts shade since we are losing street trees. She also suggested the developer make a donation of trees as a good stewardship deed.

Bill Yuhas, 28C Federal Street. All the property is private and only those condo owners can use the walkway, which will be voted on by the Association in May. He acknowledged a letter he sent to Newhall-Smith on this application. At the West elevation he would prefer not having 3 gable lines facing Washington but two shed dormers. There is also no synchronization with the proposed gables. The siding material works but he would pull it back from the North elevation, so the shed dormer connects better to the existing building, to match the shed dormer on the other side. They should also add wood siding because the cementitious board looks too much like masonry and that's too heavy for the roof above. From the North, the gray siding material should continue to the corner board instead of creating an awkward joint. The eave and gutter line may not be aligned but it can be worked out. Ricciarelli, Lutfija, and Becker agreed. Yuhas questioned the usability of their spaces during construction, which should be discussed with the SRA in advance. Ricciarelli replied that a staging plan will be issued to the City and maneuvering of the neighboring vehicles will be taken into consideration. Yuhas requested that the final color palette to be shared with neighboring condominium owners. He complimented the Architect and Developer on making the changes so far and the DRB for their review.

Linda Finn. Wanted to clarify whose property the walkway would be on and its dimensions. Lutfija replied their property and it will be 3'-6" wide.

Pam Broderick, 28 Federal Street. Please that the walkway and path have been explained and that's it's only to be used by the condominium owners. Agreed with Pelletier's concerns with it fitting in with the neighborhood and it's the first thing tourists will see. It seems very Disneyland with its modern touches.

Steve Pelletier, 1 Washington Street. Looking at rear and side of building, if it were clapboard it would tie in better with the neighboring buildings. It appears the cars below the overhang and neighboring cars would have difficulty maneuvering out of the parking lot. Lutfija replied there is 24-feet of clearance. Ricciarelli added that the parking spaces meet the zoning requirements.

Sullivan stated that the project is moving in the right direction.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the May 27, 2020.

Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand were all in favor.
Passes 7-0.

5. 49 Federal Street: Discussion and vote on façade restoration and construction of a rear addition.

John Seger of Seger Architects and Mike Becker owner were present to discuss the project.

Seger stated that when taking off the aluminum siding they found clapboards in good condition. There are three dormers on mansard roof, and they are trying to match the middle but it's too tight of a fit. They will restore the existing dormer and add 2 windows and will remove fire escape above it. The eave will be repaired, they will add balusters, roof decks and railings but needed to acquire more detail. The railing will need to be 42-inches high because it is a multi-family, so they will do a double railing at the top. They were going to use 2 ½ diameter turn baluster but they are too elongated. At the West elevation above existing entry vestibule and at the rear 3rd floor addition they will use the same railing system and provided a cut sheet for the PVC railing from Intex. The top railing will be double, turn balusters in lower section, and a newel post with composite cap are all paintable materials. They will use clear tempered glass for upper lite panels at door and the door will also be painted. The new rear upper decks are not visible from the street at upper deck will have vinyl clad doors.

Seger noted that the only new windows are on South elevation. Becker noted that the existing windows are 3 over 3 but the new windows are minimally visible. Seger noted that the two side by side skylights are proposed and they are blocked from a view from the street by dormer. The windows are 3 over 1, but the addition windows will be 2 over 2. Becker added that the windows will be true simulated divide lite.

Becker stated that the façade color will be Winthrop Peach, with Monterey White trim, and the door color will be Witching Hour or Cheating Heart. Many of these colors have been used further down Federal Street and were suggested by Jessica Herbert. The roof shingles at the mansard will be GAF Slateline in Antique Slate.

Sides stated that the dormer to remain is small compared to the existing small one. Becker replied that the dormer lines up with edge of soffit, the mansard with the valley runs into the soffit and adding onto the dormer will crowd the valley, as would adding a gable dormer. The larger window size is needed for egress, light, and ventilation. Sullivan asked if the dormer is sitting proud of mansard. Becker replied that 4 to 5-inches at the bottom and top will touch, but it can be up to 44-inches off the floor making the cut into the curve less dramatic. He added that Velux makes a skylight that is operable for egress.

Perras stated that the eye is drawn to all the woodwork on the home and an ornate railing system will compete with those details. He suggested metal railings to make them blend with the color of the house which will also make the details pop. Sides noted her preference for square balusters because 36-inch-high turned railings look too busy. Jaquith agreed with the use of square railings for subtly. Becker and Seger agreed.

Miller noted that the front door and steps have been changed and if the planters will be new granite because they won't be able to match it with the foundation wall. Becker replied that reclaimed granite will carry onto of the steps. Miller added that there are no railings at other door. Becker replied that they will clean and reuse the existing railing and reuse it.

Miller asked about the location of the A/C units and trash. Becker replied that A/C units will be along on East elevation in the alley and at rear. There are five and some are stacked. Alley side slim units will be mounted to the side of the building, approximately 6-7-feet above grade to

eliminate the ductwork, and the fifth will be at the 3rd floor roof deck. The mini-splits are low profile 18" high. Any ductwork will be concealed above the ceilings.

Miller noted her concern with window opposite the wall mounted windows. Becker replied that there are no windows on the neighboring building, dating back to a time when the two lots used to be one.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

HSI sent a letter to discuss several items. The parking and impacts on converting a business structure that was one residential back to residential, and not on the design. This site has mostly asphalt around it for parking. Becker replied that he will remove some asphalt and install brick pavers at the rear that could be parking and/or snow storage. The parking code is being vetted but he is not adding to the asphalted area. At east elevation there is no window being changed to two windows and the windows do not line up with the window below it. They aren't very visible, and it will add light and increase safety, which is good but it's also less proportional. At the ground floor the new 6 over 6 window could find a better home. The new rear addition is an improvement despite the expanding footprint. At the railing and balustrade, they like the 2 double railing but it should be less elaborate but consistent. The asymmetry is good and makes the building more interesting. The windows are now 2 over 2 and they will replace the 6 over 6 with one of the 2 over 2's. The West improvements are significant. The 3rd floor deck is okay, and they don't mind the asymmetry. The second-floor doors become smaller windows which is good, and the addition is a beneficial improvement.

Becker added that the building will be sprinklered.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Darleen Melis, 115 Federal Street. Agreed with Miller and question why they need to remove the granite of the staircase. The Victorian balusters could have turn balusters. From the North, you can look all the way down the street to the building beyond and there are no interior trees so the internal area of black lacks internal cooling features. Becker replied that he can investigate parking and how to incorporate a small tree well. Melis suggested the applicant have a discussion with the Tree Warden about a water permeable soil and a tree that may cast a canopy.

Sides stated that the painted entry should be all one color.

Jaquith stated that the window in alley should be 2 over 2.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to approve as presented with new comments the installation of square balusters.

Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand were all in favor.

Passes 7-0.

1. 13 Hawthorne Boulevard: Advisory design review of propose reuse of building for multi-family residential purposes and related commercial uses

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti Navins, Bethany Moody and Janice Mamayek of ICON Architecture, and Mickey Northcutt of Northshore CDC were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Grover stated that this will go before the Planning Board (PB) and they require the DRB's recommendation. Northcutt noted that 70% of the units will be affordable, given the buildings light exposure they would prefer the tenants be people working in the creative economy. This is also their first school renovation and they want to save the spaces and features.

Janice Mamayek, Head of Renew Practice at ICON architecture, stated that she will work with historic planners, the site is tight and there are no additions or demolition proposed. The existing front entry will remain, and a new rear accessible entry and walkway is proposed. The 7 rear parking spaces will remain and there is little site remaining. They will restore front façade using historic tax credits and meet current energy codes with new windows. Sullivan noted is excitement for creative spaces within the building.

Miller requested additional information on the new rear accessible entry. Moody replied that they didn't want to disturb the historic nature in the front and a rear accessible route existing, so they kept it in place. Northcutt added that if a tenant needs the HC space it can be theirs or they can be flexible by creating time limits.

Kennedy stated that the large open spaces shouldn't have too many potential uses because people have different needs. Find creative ways of how to use and elevate the two-story space such as including work pods that raised, without building up.

Perras asked if all new windows were proposed. Moody replied yes.

Newhall-Smith asked about preservation restrictions on the façade. Mamayek replied that MHC is reviewing it and they will follow the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. Atty. Grover noted that the structure has been owned by Archdiocese of Boston from the beginning, so nothing has been imposed.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Carol Carson, 7 River Street. Asked if they will rent any parking from Immaculate Conception Church parking lot next door. Northcutt replied no.

Mike Becker, asked how many units and parking spaces are proposed. Moody replied 29 units + 7 mixed use spaces, and 7 on-site parking spaces.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sides stated that she is happy there are is a plan in place for the use of the building.

Sides: Motion to approve as submitted.

Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand were all in favor.
Passes 7-0.

2. 160 Federal Street: Advisory design review of proposed reuse of building for multi-family residential purposes

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti Navins, Bethany Moody and Janice Mamayek of ICON Architecture, and Mickey Northcutt of Northshore CDC were present to discuss the project.

Atty Grover stated that this too will go before the Planning Board (PB) and they need the DRB's recommendation.

Northcutt stated that 70% of the units will be affordable, the location is walkable to downtown and it's near the Community Life Center.

Mamayek stated this will be a 55+ community with its primary entrance on Federal Street and the parking entrance will be from Bridge Street. They will add a new rear walkway to connect through the site, as well as stepped terraces and some outdoor space along the side of St. James Church. The Federal façade will remain mainly unchanged. The entry will remain active but only the right-side door will be functional. At the Bridge Street entry, they will add a canopy over the doors, and accessible ramps to lower the parking. The interior corridors will remain, and the high-pitched roof will house the mechanicals, and an elevator will be added for accessibility.

Perras asked if all new windows were proposed. Moody replied there will be a combination of new and existing, based on a study of the condition of the existing windows. Perras asked if the new windows would be color matched. Moody replied that the window will match the historic configurations and colors. MHC will request that they submit all proposed window cut sheets and materials proposed.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to approve as submitted
Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand were all in favor.
Passes 7-0.

Old/New Business

Minutes

The minutes of the January 22, 2020 meeting were reviewed.

Jaquith: Motion to approve the January 22, 2020 meeting minutes.
Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand were all in favor.
Passes 7-0.

Adjournment

Jaquith: Motion to adjourn the meeting.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 7-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 10:15 PM.

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City
Ordinance Sections 2-028 through 2-2033.

DRAFT