

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes - DRAFT**

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board, Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, August 22, 2018 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	93 Washington Street, First Floor Conference Room
DRB Members Present:	Chair Paul Durand, Ernest DeMaio, Chris Dynia, David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, J. Michael Sullivan, Helen Sides
DRB Members Absent:	None
Others Present:	Matt Coogan
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

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

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

- 1. 70 Washington Street (North Shore Career Center):** Discussion and vote on sign permit scheme.

David McDonald of North Shore Career Center was present to discuss the project.

McDonald stated that the proposal is to install two vinyl blade signs, one on Washington Street and the other on Lynde Street. New regulations are dictating their colors and graphics to keep the imagery universal around the state and they must comply with those requirements.

DeMaio asked about the use of a URL. Kennedy replied that a URL's use has been prohibited within the Signage Ordinance, since they can be long, but that seems to be the method of communication these days rather than a phone number. Coogan stated that the Ordinance speaks to websites. DeMaio noted that there should be some clarification on certain types of usage including phone numbers. Sides asked if including the URL was mandated by the state. McDonald replied that the URL would be long but in small text size and including it is not mandated by the state, but it is widely accessed.

Kennedy suggested that it be approved but that the Board receive confirmation on approving a URL. DeMaio stated that since URL's are prohibited according to the Sign Ordinance the DRB enforces, it could be recommended to the SRA that they consider approving.

Kennedy asked if the address was necessary on the sign since it is also on the building. He suggested that it's detracting from seeing the sign itself and without it the sign would be cleaner and easier to see. McDonald replied that the address may not be easily seen when walking on the sidewalk.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Kennedy: Motion to approve with the sign scheme for the North Shore Career Center at 70 Washington Street with the condition that the URL is removed and with the suggestion the address be removed from the blade sign.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 7-0.

2. 244 Essex Street, Unit C (Vampfangs): Discussion and vote on sign permit scheme.

Ben Selecky co-owner of Vampfangs was present to discuss the project.

Selecky stated that a blade sign is proposed with raised lettering and an A-frame sign for the sidewalk. The logo will be carved into the blade sign and the logo will be raised ½" as indicated in the proposed cross-section. A molded plastic logo with an aluminum face plate was submitted, however; if their budget allows they would prefer to use a custom wood logo of the same dimensions. Coogan added that there is enough clearance below the proposed blade sign and the applicant worked with the Planning Department on the sign graphics. The sketch submitted indicated that there is enough clearance on the sidewalk for an A-frame sign.

Kennedy noted that the kerning/spacing between the lettering isn't consistent and could be spaced evenly so it can be easily read. Selecky replied that this is a 25-year-old branded custom logo and the spacing was intentional. Chair Durand noted that the A-frame is excessive, and he'd prefer a sidewalk clear of obstructions, especially when they are this narrow. They are usually needed when there is a lack of visibility or connector to the establishment. Selecky replied that they kept the branding clear for increased readability and the bottom half of the A-frame will be a chalkboard. They wanted to ensure the A-frame wouldn't extend past any street trees and they wanted additional visibility from Essex Street to call attention to their location.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to approve as presented.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 7-0.

3. 133 Washington Street (Boston Burger Company): Discussion on sign permit scheme

Mario Mendez of Boston Burger Company was present to discuss the project.

Mendez stated that they wish to keep the same sign location but to attach their logo. They would also like to install gooseneck lights to match their neighbors but haven't determined where they would be located. Chair Durand replied that when the proposed

locations are determined they must return to the Board and noted that the Board would prefer that there be no exposed conduits and their installation should be of good quality.

Kennedy asked if window signage was being proposed. Mendez replied no.

Coogan stated that he informed Mendez' colleague Jason that since the existing sign is large and there would have to be alterations if window lettering or a blade sign are ever proposed due to their amount of frontage. Also, the neighboring gooseneck lights are placed where their current sign is installed so any proposed lighting would need to be installed in a different location. Kennedy suggested LED lighting or no lighting at all.

Mendez stated that temporary signage has been installed. Coogan replied that temporary signage isn't a problem but he will work with them on including lighting on their next application prior to the September 26th regular DRB meeting.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Kennedy: Motion to approve as presented.
Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 7-0.

4. 9-11 Dodge Street, 217-219 Washington Street, and 231-251 Washington Street (Hampton Inn, Mixed-Use Development Project): Discussion and vote on proposed material changes and review of signage scheme.

Ken McClure – Owner's representative and Andrew Queen of Opechee Construction Corporation were present to discuss the project.

McClure stated that a building/foundation permit are being sought and they'd like to receive approval on the signage locations. They've also had difficulty locating some exterior materials and would like to receive approval on material changes. The current signage proposed is still not in conformance with the zoning code, but they requested the DRB's input on whether the signage would be a benefit to the project as proposed or if traditional signage would be more appropriate, specifically the blade signs.

Signage

10 different signs are proposed along Washington and Dodge Streets, but not along Dodge Street Court since it will be used as the valet entrance only.

1. One horizontal "Hampton Inn" sign is proposed above the main entrance at 38-feet wide, 3-feet 5-inches high, and 4-inches deep. The sign aligned with the edges of the opening. The lettering would be 20-feet long x 3-feet high. The red, white and blue colors and branding for the hotel are static; however, the hotel did offer an option using red and grey.

2. One blue “P” parking sign, 4-feet in diameter and 8-feet 8-inches above grade, which are typical internally lit for night-time visibility.
3. Two vertical “Hampton Inn” blade signs are over 20-feet above grade, 24-feet-long x 3-feet wide. They don’t fit within the zoning code and the revised signs are similar to those that were previously shown on renderings but not approved by the DRB. The newly proposed blade signs would be cloth with up-lighting to add an historical tie-in, like at the Residence Inn at the Seaport District in Boston.
4. Two wall signs at the exterior corner entrance restaurant, one 13-feet long x 2-feet high sign and the second 11-feet 2-inches long x 2-feet high, both will align with the openings in the building.
5. Three wall signs at the three retail space signs at 10-feet long x 2-feet high to be placed over the glass enclosure, with the design to be determined by whomever leases the spaces.
6. “231 Washington” has been selected as the name of the residences and branding with the help of a graphic designer has begun but wasn’t included in the submission packet. One, 10-foot 6-inch x 1-foot x 10” high wall sign would be placed over the residential entrance.

Some of the signage could be back-lit, although they are open to the suggestions, and the typical retail signs will be lit with gooseneck fixtures. Coogan noted that internally lit signs are not allowed within the Commercial Guidelines and halo signs are the suggested option. Kennedy noted that a halo sign would work for the parking sign. DeMaio, Sides, and Kennedy agreed that the parking sign is oversized.

DeMaio asked what kind of parking will be provided. McClure replied that the Planning Voted to allow 28 public spaces on the First Floor and an additional 10 spaces on the third level to be accessed from Upper Washington Street. Whether those spaces will be open to the general public or the public that is specifically visiting the site hasn’t been determined.

DeMaio noted that the different parking uses, valet, hotel, etc. will need distinguishable signage. Kennedy replied that the blue “P” with a white surrounding band is a universal indicator of parking for the general public and it would be helpful to use it since the proposed sign resembles the blue “Hampton Inn” sign. A 36-40-inch diameter sign is standard rather than the proposed 4-feet and the “P” is oversized by approximately 15%. McClure noted that at 9-feet above grade the sign will be located mid-way down the block. Dodge Street Court is only for exiting vehicles and valet and an attendant will greet drivers at the Dodge Street entrance to assist them. Valet parking will also allow additional vehicles to be parked on that level during the busier season.

Sides requested the architect’s preference on installing either the blue or red hotel brand sign. Queen replied blue since it’s Hampton Inn’s recognizable color. Chair Durand noted his preference for the red option and asked for the background color. McClure replied grey but Hampton Inn would need to approve it. Kennedy noted that an approximate 20% additional color contrast would be required for an approval from an accessibility standpoint. He asked if the proposed banner color scheme would change if the option #2 Hampton Inn sign were approved. Queen replied that those would

also change and a scheme showing the entire change in color would need to be presented.

Sullivan noted that the "Hampton Inn" signage extends past the face of the masonry band and asked if the signage could be flush. Queen replied that the sign is 6-inches proud of the red brick masonry above it which will extend 6-inches beyond the face of the wall, a total of 12-inches. Sullivan and Kennedy agreed that the sign should be flush with the masonry rather than extend beyond it for a simpler look. Queen noted that the sign will be hung with framework behind it and they are already so close to the property line.

Sullivan noted that there may be some confusion seeing a blue "P" public parking sign at the marquee sign that says "Hampton Inn". Chair Durand and Kennedy agreed that that this is a unique situation and an urban design that they've seen previously.

DeMaio stated that in most of the signs the text is tight to the edge of the field which will impact their readability and there should be a bit more breathing space. McClure noted that the blade signs will either be on the window or slightly protruding from it. As for the "231 Washington" sign, the branding has been determined but how it is built will be determined later. Materials and attachments aren't being approved at this time and the Second-floor signage shown in the previous renderings has been eliminated.

Kennedy noted that the red hotel signs say, "Hampton Inn & Suites" and the grey option says "Hampton Inn" and they need to determine where their brand is changing. The red, white and blue sign would be more appropriate with the collective scheme for Hampton Inn in this building. McClure noted that the larger sign was provided by the signage consultant and it was scaled to fit the space. Kennedy replied that the text not being as tall fits the banner better and provides readability. It's scale and spacing should be followed at the other Hampton Inn signage. The "by Hilton" text could also be added horizontally to the sign below the vertical text.

Kennedy stated that generally these types of banners are more artistic and have a theme rather than just a sign turned sideways which he is not a fan of. Its inclusion helps the signage but not the integrity of the building from a visual perspective. The vertical sign would be a banner with posts and not a blade sign. If artwork was incorporated into it, it would work better. He would recommend not doing this sign as presented.

Kennedy stated that the "231 Washington" sign the lettering should be reduced to provide more room around it and make it easier to read. Using the blue sign will stay with the theme of the building and the lightening the grey will create more of a contrast and will also make it easier to read. McClure noted that the original sign was proposed as back-lit but the final decision has not been determined. Kennedy suggested the halo effect. The spacing at the three restaurant and retail signs is fine as is.

DeMaio noted that the spaces where signage was proposed and the types of signage being proposed were in keeping with the project, despite exceeding the ordinance. The vertical banners deviate the most and if executed well he would have no issue with them. Chair Durand added that the signage could be lower and smaller as a compromise.

Chair Durand opens public comment on signage.

Anne Sterling, 29 Charter Street. 10, 24-foot high vertical banners being up-lit is excessive and it sets a precedent in the neighborhood, especially since it would require a variance. She is in favor of the red lettering. McClure clarified that only 2 blade signs are proposed.

Chair Durand closes public comment on signage.

Material Changes

Queen stated that the two previously approved materials at the residential area were Nichiha fiber cement panels with a rough texture in an Autumn Brown and Desert Beige. A smooth textured panel in those two colors were to be staggered like stripes but they are no longer available. Panel colors Pearl and Flint were used at the hotel corner and the Graphite color was used at the upper panel. Other color options in this Cembrit panel were considered for this façade in the same striated pattern that was more uniform in color. The residential wall surface setback approximately 4-6 feet is also Pearl.

The newly proposed panel sizes would be customized to match the dimensions of the window and door openings. The Nichiha panel required flashing at every floor-line to allow for settlement of the structure, which the Cembrit system doesn't require it and creates a cleaner and more unified façade. DeMaio asked for the panel size of the newly proposed material. Queen replied that the Nichiha panels were 18-inches high x 6-feet long with a vertical score-line to make them appear 3-feet long. The Cembrit panels are 1-foot high and available up to 12-feet long. The seams are factory cut to align with the building openings, but they would also not have the texture as the previously proposed panel which gave the illusion of stone. DeMaio replied that the new product is a big change that reads as tile rather than block with everything aligns rather than a running bond.

Queen presented the image of a building in Cambridge, MA under construction using a grey Nichiha panel with the rough finish where metal was used the entire height of the corners, which the standard corner treatment. The Nichiha panel lock together and need differential settlement and the Cembrit panels have a rainscreen with an open joint to allow some panel movement. The corners of the Cembrit panels can either be mitered or a staggered butt joint but no metal strip. No pre-fab corner pieces are provided.

Sides asked if there is an alternative Nichiha panel with a rough finish without doing the striping. Queen replied that the striping surface at grade striates from a rough lighter tone to a smooth darker tone and above it striates from a rough darker tone to a smooth darker tone. Sides noted that using all rough surfaces could be an option because the texture is nice. DeMaio stated that buildings are looked at obliquely and light will catch the rough surfaces, but the building will look different with smooth surfaces which is a concern. The upgraded materials were what sold the project but, using a different scale and switching from a rough to a smooth finish are big design changes that could make the building look pre-fab and value engineered. Jaquith noted the minimal difference between the smooth panel and the smooth glass. Kennedy stated that the texture created a separation between the hotel and residential buildings. Sullivan noted that the stacked coursing makes it look more vertical. Queen replied that the joints could be a running bond for a staggered appearance.

Sullivan stated that this change will lose the alteration between the smooth and textured surfaces and leave a full textured façade. Sides noted that recesses will still be smooth will create the distinctions in the façade. Queen noted that the expansion joints will occur at the corners if the Nichiha panels are used to make that transition.

Jaquith asked which panel leads the to the 4 to 6 foot recessed Pearl façade. McClure replied that the façade material will turn the corner and extend to the recessed Pearl panels. The three faces of the Pearl panel will vary in depth along the length of the façade.

Queen asked if there was any concern with the masonry stone bonding not matching up with the façade openings. Sides replied that the Board had previously approved that detail. Sides and Chair Durand agreed that that detail is less noticeable than the vertical lines at the edges of the windows.

Sides noted that the texture of the panels that resembled stone is an important element that broke up the massing and agreed with DeMaio that a textured façade will look nicer over time than a flat finish. DeMaio noted that the crisp lines and smooth surface would work well if this was a contemporary building but since that is not, it is a loss for the building. He could live with disjointed edges if the façade had more interest.

Chair Durand asked if other product options were considered. McClure replied that there aren't many options given the hybrid of construction with steel at the lower level and wood above. Queen noted that a running bond pattern could be used to maintain the look but without the texture. The Board agrees that they prefer to keep the textured panels using different colors and alternate corner options need to be determined and not aluminum trim, even if the panel ends need to be painted to match the field they are in to downplay the corners.

Chair Durand noted asked if using two colors in a smooth finish at the base may highlight the stripes. Sullivan replied that the Nichiha has variations in it to de-emphasize the stripes. The strips give the base more life and making it all on color would cause it to lose some of its vibrancy.

Coogan noted that the applicant intends to return in September with 100% construction drawings, a corner detail solution, and signage.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Gary Gill, Ward 3. The number of panels are very busy, there are too many stripes at the lower level, especially when 3 facades will be seen at the same time. He prefers a less busy façade. He asked if the window trim could match the silver on the corner pieces or the dark trim at the top of the building. McClure replied yes, the window trim will be a dark bronze.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the next regularly scheduled meeting on September 26, 2018.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 7-0.

5. 132 Essex Street (Philips Library, Peabody Essex Museum): Discussion on Final Design Review.

Bob Monk of the PEM, John Traficante of Schwartz Silver Architects, and Dennis Gray of Gray Architects were present to discuss the project.

Monk stated that revisions have been made after last month's review. Their proposed fence option along Brown Street will be presented, although it hasn't been reviewed by the Salem Historic Commission yet. Tonight's recommendations from the Board will be implemented and shown to the Historic Commission.

Traficante stated that they will widen the brick sidewalk along Brown Street between the Armory and The Bray House and raise the sunken curbing, new plantings will replace the existing ones around the transformer, and at the rear parking area the left vehicular entrance will be removed and two brick posts will be relocated to widen the entrance to 20-feet. At the Brown Street fence the brick piers will be rebuilt with a granite base and the iron picket fence replicated on the parking lot side. Elm trees with a higher canopy and low shrubs will be planted at the restored fence. The double-sided parking lot will be reduced to 8 spaces, the spaces will face the garden, the landscaping will be added along Brown Street, and the ground cover will be gravel.

Along Essex Street, the 4 new Elm trees with a matured trunk diameter of 6-8-inches will be planted, American Elm trees instead of Gingko Bilobas will be used as the street trees along Essex Street and they will be planted closer to the sidewalk and new benches are proposed along the façade of Plummer Hall facing Armory Park. Birch trees will still be planted along the rear ramp, the garden paths will be extended to the parking area, the row of Poplar trees at the Federal Garden will have an open limb structure to allow people to look and walk through them, and the historic planting and paths at the garden will be restored.

The rear pole lights have been changed to lit bollards that will be installed along the East driveway and the rear leading to Armory park, in ground up-lighting would be placed in the front façade, and lighting will be placed at the front entrance. A historic fixture will be used at the rear porch, sconces will be installed at either side of the historic portico, and LED's will be integrated into the underside of the rear porch railing to illuminate the steps.

DeMaio appreciated the campus feel but questioned how a pedestrian feels crossing from Brown to Essex Street and vice versa since it is heavily trafficked heading towards the Ward House. He asked whether cues regarding how a pedestrian moves through the site could be added because the paths of travel aren't people friendly. Traficante replied that the brick walk along the back will help.

DeMaio noted that these paths don't need to be heavy-handed, someone years ago would have walked around the block, but the site is now being upgraded and those new paths should be incorporated. He's always wished that Plummer Hall acknowledged that pedestrians can walk behind it. Sullivan noted that new bollards provide pedestrian character. Monk noted that he recognizes that access to the entire block needs to be more lively and user friendly and they will be addressed in the future. Items such as

removing the green shed, and a future garden expansion and elimination of the rear parking could be considered.

Sullivan asked if the parking lot area will have the same finish as the pedestrian area. Monk replied yes.

Kennedy noted that the revised presentation is a nice response to the Boards feedback in just one meeting.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Polly Wilbert, 7 Cedar Street. She spent the past 18 months working on a tree ordinance for Salem that is under consideration by the City Council. She is concerned with the proposed American Elm trees on Essex Street that can grow to be 100-feet high, have a 4-foot diameter trunk, and its roots tend to up-lift sidewalk along Essex Street. The applicant needs to be sure they have enough space for a mature American Elm trees, especially the 4 that are proposed. It's regrettable to plant something that is the right size today and in the near future but in the distant future when its overgrown it will need to be removed. Her group has compiled a list of street trees they can share with the applicant. There is more room for it at the rear of the property than the front. Gray replied that other types of shade trees can be considered.

Jessica Herbert, Historic Commission Chair. At the last meeting there was some confusion with the stair being moved back in front of Plummer Hall and the Palladian window being replaced with a door. The image was presented to the Commission, but they voted to move the stairs only. The application was submitted to Mass Historic who has yet to make a decision. She spoke with Michael Steines of Mass Historic and they are wrestling with whether the stairs should be moved at all since it doesn't meet the 1907 concept as well as the main entrance. The proposed fencing along Brown Street is a good choice and it was the consensus of the neighbors to install a wrought iron fence on a granite base. She and Monk spoke earlier in the year about future changes for the block, including possibly relocating the Ward House to the parking area and the back of it would face the Federal Garden. If that occurs in the near future the brick piers along Brown Street would no longer fit the site. She suggested that the plan be expedited for the neighbors benefit by removing the wooden fence and trimming the existing bushes and to not wait until next spring. She asked if the cars could face the fence instead of the garden house and the back entrance to the garden is as beautiful as the front. Signage with historic details could also be used to direct visitors through the site.

Gary Gill, Ward 3. The revised plan is beautiful and he is in favor of the proposed fence. He also questioned the planting of American Elm trees along Essex due to their mature size and the problems they create around the City and suggested Red Maple trees. He is in favor of the bollard lighting instead of the pile poles. He asked for the proposed parking area material. Monk replied crushed stone. Gill noted that gravel creates piles when plowed and puddle in the voids. He suggested hydrangeas along Brown Street because of their color and noted the appropriate fence height. If the Ward House was to be reoriented a brick path leading to each destination would be nice and a red brick patio to use for functions.

Barbara Cleary, 104 Federal Street. Moving people from the Armory onto the site without overdesigning it would make it a great space.

DeMaio noted that Daland and Plummer Hall also have two fronts because of the way people do move through the space.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sides: Motion to recommend SRA approval as submitted with the condition that the applicant work with the City staff to identify a different street tree species on Essex Street.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 7-0.

North River Canal Corridor Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. 70-92 ½ Boston Street and 11 Goodhue Street (River Rock Residences):

Discussion on revisions to the mixed-use residential and retail development, including an additional building and 5 residential units.

Tanya Carriere of Khalsa Design was present to discuss the proposed project. Attorney Kristin Colic, Anthony Roberto, Owner, and John Tilton, Civil Engineer from Williams and Sparages Engineering, were also present.

Carriere stated that they've revised the plans based on the Board's previous comments. A 50-unit large residence building with 6 townhomes along Boston Street were originally proposed. The existing garage along Goodhue Street will be demolished and 5 additional townhouse units are being proposed in its place with entrances on both Goodhue and Boston Streets.

A Board comment regarding the previously shown landscape plan was to eliminate the fence with a single gate and the common path through the yard and to provide individual gates and private yard areas to make the rear entrances more inviting. The applicant proposed an 18-inch high stone wall with a lattice style cedar wood fence above that will allow light into the rear yard.

The Board also commented on the previously proposed 2-gable end dormers and 1-shed style dormer along Goodhue Street elevation of the townhouses and their preference for all shed style dormers. The applicant provided all shed style dormers.

There is a 14.5 foot grade change from the front to the back of the site. Tilton noted they have a program that allows them to simulate vehicle movements, but they were most concerned with sight distances and turning routes along Goodhue Street which is one way. They believe there is sufficient visibility for vehicles exiting the garages and they are proposing cautionary signs warning pedestrians of any exiting vehicles. They find similarities of vehicles exiting garages to vehicles backing out of parking spots at shopping centers or hedges were in the way. Drivers are more cautious until they confirm their clearance and then will resume backing out.

Chair Durand noted that the City of Salem Zoning Ordinance doesn't allow vehicles to back out onto a street from a parking lot, in Section 5.1.6 Setbacks: "In no case shall parking lots be designed to encourage cars to back onto a public or private way to leave the lot." He assumed the intent was not to back onto a public way against traffic. Tilton

replied that even if the driveway was 30-feet long a vehicle would still have to back out onto a street. Vehicles can drive by a car at the side of the road because Goodhue Street is wide but that doesn't make it safe despite it being a one way street. He stated that he would approve if Salem Traffic reviewed and approved it first.

Coogan noted that this was requested at the last meeting and the engineer submitted the turning template to the Planning Board and Stantec did a preliminary review and determined that based on the size of the project and limited street traffic that it wouldn't be a major issue although they haven't reviewed the turning radii document. The Planning Board also hasn't reviewed the parking for this project and they didn't have an August meeting. The parking and circulation are a Planning Board issue which they will review when they meet on September 6th.

Sullivan asked if an audio alarm could be proposed when the garage doors open. Chair Durand suggested a flashing light and reiterated his concern with create a dangerous situation, for instance if a driver is backing out of a garage and looking to their left at on-coming traffic and a bicyclist is approaching on their right. This project will create additional vehicular traffic and may also require ZBA approval.

Sides noted that the proposed project on Washington and Church Streets will have vehicles exiting from a garage onto Federal Street and the Planning Board discussed including a flashing light to alert pedestrians of vehicles exiting the garage. After traffic studies and discussions, they decided not to request it because there was adequate time to alert pedestrians of exiting vehicles and those vehicles were pulling out not backing out.

Jaquith noted that the buildings look better with shed dormers and the rear fence and yards are good changes. Chair Durand and Sides agreed.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Gary Gill, Ward 3. He visited the site and took photographs. The new bike path along the development will narrow the street and the intersection has no cross-walks to provide safe pedestrian access. This corner in front of Public Storage is very tight and has a high accident rate. The applicant needs to convince the Board that it will work, and he suggests a Board site visit where a vehicle backing out of an existing garage is tested during rush hour. Flooding is also still an issue at that intersection. Chair Durand replied he tested it at 2:30PM and 4 vehicles drove past him within 20 seconds and one of them beeped at him. All the concerns will be passed onto the Planning Board.

Polly Wilbert, 7 Cedar Street. Asked if the 5 spaces in the lot will become visitor parking since the garages are proposed for the townhouses. She noted that at lights from headlights and tail lights will be able to pierce through the proposed fence at night and suggested installing slat fences.

Larchmont Road. With the Mass grant they received a couple years ago that intersection will be redone with crosswalks and a more robust bike path. She is worried about drivers backing onto Goodhue Street. While upgrading McGlew Park they wanted parking spaces that would back out onto North Street and Bob Callahan of the Park and Recreation Commission wouldn't allow it and the applicant should verify that with the Traffic Commission. She questions why parking couldn't be in the small lot.

Jessica Herbert, Historic Commission Chair. Suggested that traffic be slowed down to 20 mph on this dangerous section of Goodhue Street. Less busier streets in Salem do allow vehicles to back up onto them. She suggested a bollard height flashing light at the end of the building to alert others. Chair Durand agreed and suggested signage or speed bumps. Vehicles backing onto a street is a legitimate concern that needs to be addressed.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith noted that he isn't concerned about vehicles lights entering through Kitchen windows.

Jaquith: Motion to approve.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 7-0

1. **16, 18, and 20R Franklin Street (Ferris Junkyard):** Discussion on design changes to proposed five building, 48-residentail development.

Ryan McShera, architect from Red Barn Architecture, and Mark Tranos, Owner of Jupiter Point Development, were present to discuss the project.

McShera stated that plan revisions have been made. The townhouse massing has been considered and the step back along the front façade has been eliminated, the window and fenestration style has been revised, they've introduced a flat roof to the townhouse building to further reduce the massing along the street, and the utility spaces were relocated away from the development entrance and added additional landscaping. The landscaping at the entrance was revised, the size of the hardscape was enlarged, and a couple steps were added that lead to built-in seating features were added to a curved stone wall to make it a destination rather than a pass-through. On both the townhouse and mid-rise buildings the window size and style have been reviewed, as have the materials.

Site Plan: There have been minimal changes to the site plan and the 5-buildings remain with the three mid-rise buildings at the rear and townhouses towards the side and rear of the development.

Elevations: Boral siding is still being considered for the finish material. The previous design included strong vertical elements at the stair towers and a horizontal treatment at the remaining façade, but they've now used a mixture of reveal sizes and profiles to achieve a varied look. At the recessed portions of the decks, on either side of the mid-rise buildings, they've specified a 6" vertical nickel gap siding and on the body of the building, a variation of channel beveled profiles between 6 and 10-inches. Stainless steel railings are proposed at the decks. The buildings also have a traditional style window pattern to help connect it to the neighborhood. The curtain wall at the second-floor gym has been replaced with large picture windows to make the space more residential. Stucco will be used as the base material and the cornice details are similar to what was previously presented.

At the townhouse buildings, the flat roofs have reduced the building height from approximately 46-feet to below 40-feet high. The Board commented on the variation in the windows, so they've been revised and are more in line with one another. At the front elevation of the townhouses a panel system has been introduced at the top floor as a trim panel at the windows and doors. The nickel gap and horizontal siding treatment at the facades will continue at the townhouses.

The main body color of all buildings will be a light grey with a softer Seafoam Green at the vertical stairs and at the decks on either side of the mid-rise buildings. The townhouse buildings are maintaining their original color concept, light grey on the body and a darker grey accent color at the vertical siding at the entrances and trim panels at the top floor. The reduction from a gable end to a flat roof significantly reduces the massing as it relates to Furlong park and Franklin Street.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Victoria Ricciardiello, 5 Foster Street. The townhouses appear to have gone from three stories to four, the center mid-rise from four stories to five which increases their height, and the two mid-rise buildings along the river remained at five stories. McShera replied that there has been no change to the building heights since their previous iterations when the unit count was reduced from 48 to 42, four stories at the townhouse and 5 stories at the mid-rise buildings. Ricciardiello stated that looking North from this development this type of design is not compatible with any of the homes in the neighborhood up to the Greenlawn Cemetery. In the Table of Dimensional Requirements indicated that R1 and R2 zones have a height limit of 35 and 45-feet. B1 and B2 has 30-foot height limits. The maximum number of stories in R1 is 2.5 and in R3 3.5. The maximum number of stories along the NRCC is four not five, which is contrary to those NRCC specifications, and this design is not compatible. This site in the established residential neighborhood of Northfields and not downtown. McShera replied that the height limitation in the NRCC is 50-feet which they meet, but their first floor must be brought up out of the flood plain. They included parking under the proposed mid-rise buildings to eliminate large paved areas on site and will build above them and will meet the 50-foot requirement.

Gary Gill, Ward 3. Preferred the gable roofs and associated details to the flat at the townhouses because the revised design doesn't fit the residential neighborhood and lacks the charm it would have brought to the neighborhood. The body color will blend-in, but he is unsure of the green.

Beth Girard, Ward 6 Councilor. Each rendering is an improvement upon the last and many of her continuants are in favor of these designs. She questions snow removal with the flat roofs. McShera replied the roof structure will be designs to support the snow load and the snow will melt and drain.

Polly Wilbert, 7 Cedar Street. Wished the design related more to the neighborhood since the rest of the street has brick and clapboard façades. It doesn't fit and feels as though it was dropped into the neighborhood. Many people enter the neighborhood from Franklin Street and it will be unfortunate to have something that is so disconnected have such a prominent space with such a light color. It's not grounded and doesn't relate to the neighborhood.

Barbara Cleary, 104 Federal Street. The DRB struggles with materials but many of the real issues relate to density. This project must need variances so why doesn't the applicant get approval for the variances prior to the DRB's review when they don't know if they'll receive the variances. Tranos replied that he would have preferred to do that, but this order of review was recommended to him by City employees and his attorneys, to get a project that satisfies parking requirements, Site Plan Review, traffic, etc. prior to a ZBA review. This project is the least dense in the NRCC, 25% less which is what the master plan calls for, as well as a "village like community."

Sally Byers, Franklin Street property owner. Salem is removing a junkyard next to a nice park and the residents must accept the transition, because the result will not be single family houses. The revenue is needed in the City and people want to see something different than the traditional entrance corridors. Franklin Street is a blight, things are changing, and they will change for the better.

Judy French, 16 Foster Street. Read a letter from Diane Robichaud, 7 Franklin Street, who is opposed to the proposed project. French agrees with Robichaud because this is a precedent setting project. She questioned whether anything else in the NRCC is 50-foot high because the building will act as a wall as well as the required lot area per dwelling unit. Mr. Tranos replied that the proposed for this project is 25% less dense than the average of all the projects within the NRCC. French added that she prefers the warmer colors and the gables to the flat roofs.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Coogan stated that in terms of the Planning Board's review of this project in 7 meetings beginning in September of 2017. Early on the Planning Board urged the applicant to redesign the site to deal with the lack of order on the site, the buildings not relating to the neighborhood, and the original positioning of the curb cut. The pedestrian experience from Franklin Street was discussed in February of 2018 to which the applicant created a new conceptual plan and redesign of the site, which the Planning Board felt was a major step forward and addressed their concerns. The Planning Board has completed their review process and is awaiting the DRB's review of the design. McShera added that a traffic study was completed.

Sides stated that many of their concerns have been addressed and she prefers the flat roof to the gable roof that high off the ground. The wood framed look resembles a mill building which is more appropriate and how has a connection to the mid-rise buildings. The site plan has been in a good place for a while, the window regularity and material issues were addressed. There is too much of a contrast between the light body color and dark trim, but a tone change could resolve it but she would like to see a sample. The scale is good, she is in favor of the use of panels at the upper level, the larger the exposure of the Boral trim the better because the variation in trim sizes will distinguish the massing. She requested more information on the treatment of the stucco base to ensure it is not just a flat surface. The removal of the shed at the ends of the townhouses is also an improvement.

Jaquith was not in favor of this scheme in this location since the concept has changed very little. This is a failure for this site.

DeMaio asked what critiques were permissible at this point. Barbara Cleary replied that the DRB must determine that the proposed project is within accordance with the NRCC plan. Coogan added that the NRCC Zoning Ordinance does not include detailed design guidance and also refers the DRB to refer to the design guidelines in the Urban Renewal Plan.

DeMaio stated that his concerns are with scale and massing. This project could comply in every way with the NRCC plan, but his concern is whether this project belongs this way and in this neighborhood in terms of its architecture. There is a combination of 1 and 2-story buildings leading from this site up to North Street and none immediately beyond the intersection at North Street. Furlong Park is residentially scaled and the residences across the street are a maximum of 2 ½ stories. Understanding the difficult site and flood plain issues the argument is doing something in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and five stories is not within the scale of the neighborhood. A lot of cost is involved in the clean-up of the junkyard and more development may be permitted than usual to mitigate those costs knowing the first floor can't be livable space due to the flood plain. Two-floors over the parking area makes more sense than five and there is no way to make a case that what is proposed is in keeping with that neighborhood character, whether commercial or residential use was proposed. He cares what this project looks like from street level rather than from the other side of the river. The Board has tried in several ways to encourage the applicant to reduce the massing close to the ballfield and change the building scale but once the Board's feedback became positive the design stopped evolving and became about materials, windows and colors rather than making it a better project. This could be a nice development in another part of the City, but this site is surrounded by structures of a radically reduced scale. He appreciated that it has become a better project in the two months since they've reviewed it, but it is too big.

Jaquith agreed and added that the Site Plan could still be improved, and some lower level parking spaces don't provide enough space for a vehicle to back out of a parking spot and some windows still don't line up. A much better design could be developed.

Dynia agreed with DeMaio. He's not in favor of the direction and every building has one story too many. If the overall scale could be reduced it would feel more comfortable. He has no issue with the warehouse look of the buildings and the materials which do relate somewhat to the houses in the neighborhood but have a modern take.

Kennedy agreed with Sides. He believed the flat roof at the townhouses is more appropriate, there is too much contrast with the color and there should be less, he'd like to see material color samples, particularly the Seafoam Green, prior to approving the color scheme.

Sullivan stated that the pedestrian experience close to the townhouse along Franklin Street has improved as well as the scale. The right-hand side of the perpendicular townhouses do face the street, so he encouraged more thought should be given to make it more interesting. The plaza at the front is very inviting. The flat roof is a good vernacular because it's different than everywhere else and will hopefully establish a different kind of quality in this area along Franklin Street. The size of the building and the units has always concerned him as they related to the overall massing when the average unit is approximately 2,100 SF when compared to Bell at Salem Station. McShera clarified that the parking below the buildings has been included in their gross

square footage calculation, the townhouse units are 1,600 SF and the mid-rise units range from 1,110 – 1,600 SF.

DeMaio stated that Bell is located on a wide and fast-moving commercial street and not on Franklin Street in a residential neighborhood. This project would be a better fit on the other side of the river and you can't take Bell and put it in Northfields and say it works because it's doesn't. Chair Durand noted the transitional location of the site. Tranos noted that this site that was B5 was changed to NRCC and 15 years ago a 6-story 70-foot high building would have been allow by-right, and this is a transitional point. McShera noted that the height of the roof decks at the townhouses was reduced to 28feet from grade.

Chair Durand stated that he's never liked this design or the site organization. Most projects are built up in a more positive way but this one has gone in circles which is frustrating. He agrees with most of the negative comments, but it has moved in a more positive direction. He's disappointed with the revised color selection. It's transitioned from something he could barely accept, to an esthetic he didn't like, to a better aesthetic, but he's not comfortable with it. It's such an important parcel in the City and the NRCC but it's a challenge. The site amenities are nice, and the landscaping has improved. He's not convinced he could send this back to the Planning Board as is and he doesn't know how to get to that point where he is okay with it. It hasn't progressed in the ways the Board wants it to, which is a first for the Board, and the applicant hasn't made the changes and instead has focused on colors and materials. It may be too tall which the flood plain has played a part in, the site is expensive to clean-up so there is a need for the added density. He's hasn't liked the 5-building layout and there are still 5-buildings and he suggested the project be continued.

Coogan stated that the applicant has responded to the feedback given by the Board with different iterations, the building height does comply with the zoning ordinance, and he questioned whether a continuance was necessary. The Planning Board can't vote on the special permit without a recommendation by the DRB, whether it's positive or negative.

Sides stated a lot of projects in the NRCC go through this process and many have been approved but not yet built. She is still struggling with why this project is so different than the others. The initial planning, scale, and massing always start out as the problem, but this project seems to have been scrutinized more than others. Chair Durand replied that other projects evolved more to the criticism than this project from the very beginning. He's trying make the buildings better, fit in with the neighborhood, and to be of an appropriate scale. Jaquith noted that he never agreed to the initial plan.

Tranos stated that this project has gone on for 18 months, they've had 50 concepts, and with the 5-building site plan every unit gets a view which will be a huge selling point. They did not want a building along Franklin Street, but the Planning Board requested a streetscape. The project has evolved due to input from the other Boards. DeMaio noted that several months ago he requested contextual views of the proposed development to the neighboring buildings and only one contextual view of a building across the street was provided but everything on Franklin Street is 2-stories or less. The birds eye views, access and streetscapes were effective but the disconnect for him is how it fits in this location. Kennedy and Sides are more forward thinking but he's concerned with this development in this area. This development must be bigger because of the flood plain

and denser due the clean-up, but how much is too much. The design is still too heavily weighted on scale and massing in his opinion.

Tranos stated that in May the Board seemed okay with reduced massing to increase the circulation, reduction in scale, elimination of units, and lowering the building to 50-feet which is an allowable height by-right, but by June it seemed to become a problem again with some of the Board members. They are doing what they can to satisfy all the various Boards. Without an exemption from the State he can't build within Chapter 91 jurisdiction, and neighboring owner Mr. Goldberg is waiting for the junkyard to be cleaned up before they make their own multi-million-dollar investment. He lives in Salem and wants to do right by the City, but they had no choice but to build up because of a hardship for the parking.

Kennedy stated that rejecting this application wouldn't result in a much smaller proposed development and no one will make that investment.

Coogan read the NRCC design standards. He stated whether the re-conceptualized design from a suburban to an urban feel with a streetscape, townhouses along the street, and mid-rise higher density buildings beyond that aren't necessarily seen from the street level was still being questioned or considered unsatisfactory by the Board. He questioned whether the applicant needed more feedback or guidance to move forward.

Jessica Herbert (Historic Commission Chair) suggested that a sub-committee of Board members brainstorm about their specific concerns and come up with a concept that would satisfy them since the other buildings being compared to this development are in an entirely different environment.

Sides stated that large scale buildings in an old City with toxic sites there is always an edge that connects it to a residential area and that's where she sees the similarity to what is across the river. The geography of the larger industrial sites along the river is the reason the houses are pushed back so far from the waters edge. Kennedy added that taking a floor off each mid-rise building wouldn't make much a difference and his concern is with the finish and details than with the density and height. Sides added she wouldn't want finishes, details, ground experiences, landscaping to be dramatically compromised by cutting back on the money invested and the profit the developer is trying to make on the property. If it's downsized too much there will be no money left to finish it appropriately.

Gary Gill stated that the one-way street to and from the site is a problem for the neighbors because of the density that will be added to the neighborhood. The scale may meet the requirement, but it could be higher.

Victoria Ricciardiello stated that this is the only development on the NRCC that is 5-stories high and the rest are 4.

Barbara Cleary agreed that Mr. Goldberg is ready to start a project of his own but that will not change the narrow one-way street that is Franklin Street. It just so happens that this project is located on a narrow street is a small neighborhood.

Chair Durand asked whether any Board members would like to establish a sub-committee and continue reviewing the project and suggested Sides be included. Tranos

stated that he'd prefer the Board vote on recommending it to the Planning Board than to forming a sub-committee to create a redesign.

Kennedy: Motion to recommend the Planning Board approve the overall schematic plans as submitted with further review of details relating to colors, finishes, trims.
Seconded by Sides. Vote is 3 in favor, 4 against.

Old/New Business

Coogan stated that many big projects have gone through the SRA and DRB in recent years and now that some of them are completed the SRA has requested a DRB review of one project, and their suggestion was Salem Jail - Phase II. The DRB report should include their thoughts on the overall permitting process, the end result and whether it was completed as expected, and any suggestions to improve the process going forward for a better end result. He would provide the Board with the original submission, meeting minutes, and SRA decision. This could be done as a group or individually, with a site visit, and the discussion can be broken up between meetings and a report given to the SRA in time for their October meeting.

DeMaio stated that some projects get approved other than what they recommend. Chair Durand noted that gas meters although neatly installed their location was never presented to the Board. The right to approve of such items as; meters, pieces of equipment, screening, and sign bands could be included in their list of conditions and those items would need to be reviewed and approved prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. DeMaio noted that sometimes even architects don't know what their consultants have planned in terms of equipment to install at the exterior. Chair Demand agreed and noted that schematic design drawings don't show that level of detail, but the Board should review the site and call for additional screening or plantings to shield these items. This is also a way to learn from mistakes made and to ask where gas meter banks will be located. Sullivan suggested that revised elevations be submitted by the builders, so the Board can respond to it.

Sides stated that the DRB is asked to scrutinize more in some cases and less in others. The City Council approved DRB oversight through the Planning Board but there was some objection from within the Planning Department, because of the pressure that puts on development time by adding more steps to the process. Jaquith noted that many times the Board is thanked for improving projects. Coogan replied that items missed may not necessarily be the case the request may just be about the Boards overall thoughts on the project. Many more projects are in the works with City owned property, expanding the HDIP zone is being explored which will encourage more downtown developments, Utile will conduct a downtown visioning plan for the Northern end of Washington Street, court buildings, and Church Street lot, Bridge at 211, etc. The SRA is asking for public input for the general visioning of the neighborhood with the intention of going through the RFQ/RFP process to develop some of the parcels. This is an opportune time to reflect and see if the design guidelines are working. Sides suggested a joint meeting with the SRA to review project images and discuss the process openly rather than sending a report. Chair Durand stated that the SRA values the DRB's design opinions and generally takes their recommendations. A DRB representative can visit the site and generate a list of items to review. Kennedy noted that the second Salem Jail architect from Symes Associates returned to the DRB with a redesign of Diamond Sinacori's previously approved and well-liked design claiming that it wasn't structural

feasible when it could have been financial which resulted in the DRB feeling let-down. Chair Durand stated that Seger Architects also seemed to have a difficulty responding to the DRB's criticisms.

Coogan stated that the SRA will meet on October 10th, the Salem Jail – Phase II project will be the focus, and the DRB should have their own discussion prior to this joint SRA meeting.

Minutes

July 25, 2018

Jaquith: Motion to approve with Sides' edits.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 7-0

Adjournment

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

Meeting is adjourned at 10:00PM.

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