

**City of Salem Massachusetts  
Public Meeting Minutes**

**Board or Committee:** Design Review Board, Regular Meeting  
**Date and Time:** Wednesday, March 23, 2016 at 6:00 pm  
**Meeting Location:** 120 Washington Street, Third Floor Conference Room  
**Members Present:** Paul Durand, Christopher Dynia David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Helen Sides, J. Michael Sullivan  
**Members Absent:** Ernest DeMaio  
**Others Present:** Andrew Shapiro, Economic Development Planner  
**Recorder:** Colleen Anderson

Vice Chair David Jaquith, acting as Chair, calls the meeting to order.

**Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review**

---

- 1. 139 Washington Street (Eastern Bank):** Discussion and vote on proposed installation of signage

\*Chair Paul Durand arrived during the discussion of this item.

The submission under review includes: a signed permit application, signage design with dimensions, existing and proposed condition photos, a map of building location. Mr. Richard Batten (of Batten Bros. Signs & Awnings), was present to discuss the proposed signage at their new branch at 139 Washington Street.

Batten requests approval on one sign, a 18”H x 10”L wall sign with a white background and blue border (blue - Eastern Bank’s corporate color). The sign would have blue fabricated raised lettering with halo white LED lighting – the blue lettering would remain dark and only the white background would be illuminated at night. The border is flat, painted, and would not be illuminated. The lettering is 2” deep, there is 2” gap behind the lettering, and the sign backer is 4” deep.

Sullivan questioned whether the halo lighting would illuminate the cavity of the letters. Batten replied that it would not. Kennedy added that only the area around the lettering would be illuminated.

Batten added that they are also requesting approval on an 18”Hx42”W projected sign that will utilize the existing steel bracket. It has raised 1/4” thick lettering, the sign is 1 1/2” thick, and external illumination might be requested.

Kennedy questioned whether the external illumination would come from the exterior wall. Batten stated that it would, and his tendency would be to use a small 2-3” diameter can lights, that has been incorporated at other branches.

Kennedy questioned how the power will get to the light. Batten responded that would come through the wall through an exposed conduit.

Kennedy suggested the address oval be entirely blue and the address number be white to eliminate the competing ovals and make the sign easier to read, similar to the Eastern Bank symbol. Mr. Durand suggests that the oval be eliminated entirely leaving just the address number. Kennedy & Durand agreed that either suggestion would be fine. Batten replied that he would propose both suggestions to Eastern Bank.

Shapiro added that a lighting specification be added before the SRA meeting. Shapiro requested that the projected sign be hard wired and not powered through an exposed conduit. Shapiro added that the sign design should also be revised, with either of the suggested DRB options, before the SRA meeting.

Jaquith opens public comment. No public comments.

Kennedy: Motion to approve the proposed wall sign as-is, and to approve the projected sign with either change of removing the oval surrounding the address or making the address oval blue and the numbering white, and that the lighting specification be reviewed by a DRB designee (Glenn Kennedy) prior to being reviewed at the SRA meeting.

Seconded by: Sides, Passes 6-0.

**2. 28 Norman Street (Gold Dust Gallery):** Discussion and vote on proposed installation of signage

The submission under review includes; a sign permit application, sign design with dimensions, proposed condition photos, and proof of insurance forms. Ms. Kristin Welch, one of the owners of Gold Dust Gallery, was present to discuss the proposed signage.

Welch stated that they would like to add vinyl signs, one attached to the building above the entrance, and window decals at the main entrance vestibule window and on their entrance door that also include a decal with their hours.

Shapiro questioned whether the vinyl sign attached to the building, over the entrance, was going to have light. Welch replied that only the bottom sign in that group of signs has ever lit up, and she has no issue with it being just a vinyl sign.

Sides stated that the first four letters appear very close together and the last 2 letters appear spaced out. Kennedy added that the first four of letters are very tall thin and the O's are very round, and that is because of the choice of font. Kennedy stated that the first three letters should be spread out – increase the kerning, and last three letters should be brought closer together – reduce the kerning, to make the sign more readable.

Kennedy added that the lettering in the lower “We Are Open” portion is competing with the “Tattoo” lettering above it, and simpler sans serif would make the lettering above stand out more.

Kennedy questioned whether the exterior building sign was the only position available. Welch replied that it was the only space made available to them.

Jaquith opens public comment. No public comments.

Kennedy: Motion to approve with the suggestion that the flat wall sign have a spacing adjustment between the T's and the O's (tighten them), and for an alternate/simpler font at the lower “We Are Open” portion of the signage on the window.

Seconded by: Dynia, Passes 6-0.

**3. 25 Front Street (Lobster Shanty):** Discussion and vote on outdoor furniture, lighting, and fire feature

The submission under review includes; a design statement from the Kontseptual Architects, proposed lighting, furniture, & fire feature images, floor Plans, and elevations. Ms. Alexandra Peterson of Kontseptual Architects was present to discuss a proposed deck addition.

Peterson stated that there will be 6'H posts surrounding the deck and on each deck there will be jelly jar style light fixture and occasionally string lights will be added. The outdoor table and chairs will be mesh to match the existing outdoor furniture, and existing to the outdoor seating in and around Salem. There will be 3 or 4 (seasonal) outdoor heaters on the patio, the standard triangular commercial style with glass tubes that are powered by propane heaters. To keep the relaxed atmosphere, red Adirondack style chairs and tables will also be added. The chairs will surround a fire feature, with a protective glass surround that the Salem Fire Department will approve.

Kennedy and Jaquith mentioned that several outdoor fire features have been added to the Market Street Shopping Center in Lynnfield, and those also has a glass enclosure. Sides stated that if a glass enclosure wasn't a requirement she would make it a requirement.

Shapiro added that he brought the file on the previously approved deck for review by the Board.

Durand opens public comment. No public comments.

Jaquith: Motion to approve as presented.

Seconded by: Sides, Passes 6-0.

### **North River Canal Corridor Projects Under Review**

---

**4. 44 Boston Street and 401 Bridge Street (Gateway Center):** Continued discussion of proposed mixed-use residential and retail development with City's Community Life Center

The submission under review included a slide show presentation. Mr. Chris Semmelink, of The Architectural Team (tat), and Harry Gunderson of Gunderson Associates were present to discuss the proposed construction of the Community Life Center and the proposed residential building on the corner of Bridge and Boston Streets.

Semmelink stated that they are returning to present a revised design and that he would speak to the mixed-use building. The first change visible on the site plan is the larger proposed footprints that show both the original and currently proposed buildings. The original layout had two long lanes to travel through the parking lot and a separate area for parking at the other end of the site. In mid-2015 a plan was presented that opened the corner near Goodhue and Boston Streets. Concerns were made at that time as to whether the space would be large enough and access to sunlight in an area that is mostly in the shade.

Semmelink added that the latest building code calls for the building to be raised up another foot for floods, which created even more of a barrier to Bridge Street. These recent changes have led them to made additional revisions.

Semmelink stated that the latest parking layout consists of two lanes of travel and the separate parking area, for the CLC and residential units, has been moved to the middle of the lot.

Semmelink noted that the most recent change was that the original building was four story, 58' high office building - which has a higher floor-to-floor height, and the current building is now four story, 50' high residential building. The construction of the housing portion is as-of-right. This change also allowed the parking to be broken up which allowed a single lane of traffic to be created with two raised cross walks to slow the vehicle traffic. Semmelink added that the entrance to the proposed CLC building also has a slowed traffic pattern.

Semmelink added that the number of units has remained, however; the footprint has increased, and some of the parking had to be sacrificed.

Semmelink displayed an in-progress landscaping plan and stated that the civil engineer is working with the DEP and MEPA, and making minor alterations to the plan. Semmelink added that the landscaping plan shows the most recent layout of the CLC building. The two buildings are 168' apart. They are now being treated as two separate projects and are no longer working as a composition.

Semmelink displayed several images of Salem that were used as inspiration for this project, since this project will be a gateway into Salem; stone bases, patterning in concrete, tile, gable ends, coloration, and the breaking up of materials. These images led their office to their previously proposed design; a stone base, granite blocks, and protruded gabled forms with blue coloration. The prior consensus was that the proposed structure was "loud", which led them to develop an alternative design with subdued colors.

Semmelink introduces Gundersen to speak about the proposed CLC building.

Gundersen stated that at the previous meeting, the reorientation of the CLC building was discussed, turning the building 90 degree and placing it along the East end of the property, and that created three issues.

- 1) The site entrance would need to occur closer to Boston Street which could create a traffic back-up at the intersection of Boston & Bridge Streets
- 2) Dead-end parking aisles will be created at the East end of the site if parking was located at the front of the building
- 3) The CLC requires service and therefore a road to access the building and that would require a second curb-cut off of Bridge Street.

Gundersen added that these reasons lead them to not reorient the building.

Gundersen stated that the overhead power lines along Bridge Street will be placed underground. For safety reasons, the high voltage overhead line required the building to be 16 feet away from the lines, plus 6 feet for scaffolding. By using underground power lines, the buildings can now been moved closer to Bridge Street and the CLC building can be moved further east. The shifting of these building gives more room to the front of the building/parking lot, west end of the CLC building – outside the Great Room, and more open space and landscaping zones at the front of the building.

Gundersen stated that the ground floor plan has also been reconfigured to make it more efficient; mainly the CLC administrative has transitioned from closed office space to an open office, as well as relocating the stairs and toilet core. The reconfiguration has allowed the entrance to be recessed, and add a canopy which will provide a covered seating area for the café, especially during the summer months.

Gundersen added that previous comments were made about no glazing in the Great Room. The current arrangement places glazing at the west end but no glazing at the south end. A non-lit background would be best for entertainment purposes, seating, or presentations along that end of the room. Glazing at the west end and spill over lighting from the entrance will provide plenty of light to the room.

Gundersen added that the relocation of the stairs and toilet core provided even more usable space to the flexible multi-purpose rooms on the Second Floor, as well as some storage spaces.

Gundersen stated that the ground/floor level of the building was raised, which eliminated the direct entrance off of Bridge Street.

Gundersen stated that the building elevations have also changed. A prior suggestion was that exterior material look less residential, so the siding has changed from a hardi plank to a vertical siding on the lower level. A smooth cement plaster is planned for the upper level façade.

Gundersen added that the glazing type is a more accurate reflection of what will occur at the interior.

Gundersen added that the Landscape architect will discuss the plantings and materials at a subsequent meeting.

Semmelink noted that there is also a pedestrian path across the property. The path starts on Boston Street, moves through the site and over a raised crosswalk in the parking lot, to the CLC building, and then exits onto Bridge Street. Gundersen added that there are several raised crosswalks that will also slow the vehicular traffic.

Durand questioned whether there was a left turn option to enter the side off of Boston Street, when traveling south? Gundersen replied that there would be a right-in and right-out option only at that entrance, although it would be possible for a vehicle to make that turn.

Durand stated that the plan and design of the CLC have improved. Durand questioned whether one of the egress stairs needs to directly exit the building. Gundersen replied that the current design is possible in a two story building.

Jaquith stated that the overhang in the rendering and elevation differ. The overhang is very dramatic in the elevation and understated in the rendering, and his preference is for a decreased overhang in the rendering. Kennedy and Sullivan stated that they also prefer the rendering overhang. Durand stated that he prefers the larger elevation overhang.

Jaquith stated that he prefers the current window pattern and Durand agrees.

Dynia questioned whether the entrance could be more defined if the canopy were raised up and projected out past the façade of the building. Gundersen replied that he would look into that modification but that the canopy is already deep. Gundersen stated that the deeper the canopy gets the shadier the area becomes, which reduces the amount of light

that can enter the building. A couple openings in the canopy roof are also being proposed to allow for more sunlight.

Sullivan questioned whether skylight will be placed in the roof of the Great Room. Gundersen replied, no, although the CLC needs to be questioned on how they intent to use the space. Many similar spaces are windowless boxes with artificial light only, because the rooms are used for presentation purposes.

Kennedy questioned the vertical material on the elevations. Gundersen replied that Boral siding, (70% fly ash and 30% glue), will be used. The siding is large scale and comes in 10" wide boards with a 1" reveal.

Kennedy questioned the proposed color of the boards. Gundersen replied that the proposed siding is currently a warm grey with white above. Kennedy stated that the selection of finishes; materials, colors, and how they are applied, will determine whether the structure looks like a utility building or a community center, and you could get to a point where the building doesn't fit within the context of the area.

Gundersen added that the intention is to provide plantings between the First Floor administrative and the road. Sides added that a lot will be learned in the details in the future; how the projects are attached, the materials and their transition, material samples, colors, etc. Kennedy stated that what those materials are and how they are used will be key. Jaquith agreed and added that the texture, trim, and a full palette, will be very important. Durand and Kennedy agreed.

Sullivan questioned whether the band across the middle of the building was a relief. Gundersen replied that it was a form of a relief but the section through it has yet to be determined.

Jaquith questioned whether anything was to be placed on the roof. Gundersen replied that rooftop units and screening is shown on the elevations but haven't been designed yet.

Sullivan questioned whether the square windows were offices. Gundersen replied that the office area is on the First Floor and program rooms were on the Second Floor. Sullivan suggested that the windows of the open office area be treated differently which will create some variation on the façade.

Sullivan asked for a description of the vertical joints of the façade. Gundersen replied that the joints were a 1" wide and 3/8" to 1/2" deep reveal in the material. Mr. Kennedy questioned if the material came in sheets. Gundersen replied no.

Dynia questioned the step shown on the plans between the First Floor and grade. Gundersen replied that the transition is being developed but that there will be a gradual slope in grade and not a step off as shown.

Durand questioned whether the parking lot will have granite curbs and what the parking lot edging would be. Semmelink replied granite curbs.

*Durand opens public comment on the CLC building.*

Mr. Ken Wallace of 172 Federal Street. Wallace stated that the street view is bland, the parking lot view is better, and suggests the materials changing in pattern or color to enhance the view from Bridge Street. This project needs to be sold to the public and right now it is not.

Ms. Meg Twohey of 122 Federal Street. Twohey stated that she is disappointed in the design, it resembled a DPW building, it takes its inspiration not from the McIntyre District but from the industrial buildings across the river. There is no life on the street side of the building, it is not inviting, the windows are just openings, the parking lot side gives you a more welcoming feeling, and the building doesn't relate to this area.

Ms. Emily Udy of 8 Buffom Street. Udy agrees with public comments, particularly the street side. The building could be passed many times before one can figure out what it was. The landscaping frames the building corners and, and people will come from all sides so the entire streetscape should be addressed with substantial landscaping. The fact that it's moved closer to Bridge Street also eliminates the amenities that could be added – benches to invite the public to notice the building. The building lacks a civic presence. Using modern materials to make it a "cool building" wouldn't fit in the context and there needs to be something that ties it into the context. She also prefers the bigger overhang which makes a statement.

Ms. Jan Eschazier of 15 ½ River Street. Eschazier agrees with the streetscape comments. Believed that one of the objectives of the NRCC was to present building with their face to the street so that the pedestrian experience would be essential, so there wouldn't be just a building and a streetscape, they would be somehow connected through amenities or landscaping. She is concerned with the blank wall, the windows aren't welcoming, the entrance is confusing, and the building resembles a warehouse. Materials, landscaping, and lighting are essential as this area is a corridor to the MBTA station. If Salem wants to be a walkable, transient oriented City, these things need to be kept in mind and this building is a cornerstone of that experience.

Durand stated that the building has 4 sides and no side is being treated like the back of the back of a building. Durand agrees with Kennedy that the details will be important - how the openings are cased and the materials used. The buildings being closer to the street creates a hard edge, which is an urban solution as opposed to setting the building back, which is a suburban solution. The previous building had front doors on Bridge Street that would never be used. This building placement forces a corridor to direct pedestrian traffic to the MBTA station and parks. This building is true to what it is, a modern community center, not a house, so it has to stand on its own. Bridge Street has signage to direct and predominant entry to vehicular traffic will know where to enter, and the buildings pushed to the edge will screen the parking lot.

Kennedy stated that the long building doesn't create a view that someone would want to walk into but added a door along Bridge Street would create a pick-up and drop-off location which would stop traffic for the intersection at Boston and Bridge Street. Durand added that the security of two issues will also be a concern.

Durand questioned whether there was a rendering of the Bridge Street view. Gundersen replied no, but all view of the building from Bridge Street would be a perspective – as people travel down the street. Kennedy added that is an important perspective to consider.

Durand questioned how wide the sidewalk would be along Bridge Street. Gundersen stated 8 feet.

Sullivan stated that not having an entrance along Bridge Street is an advantage and questioned where the pathway through the site ends. Durand added that plantings or screening will need to be placed at the parking area between the two buildings to keep people from trying to exit the site at that location. Semmelink stated that in the North River

valley, which rises and falls, is requiring the building to have a certain flood plain height, and an escarpment towards Federal Street is also pushing the buildings up considerably above the sidewalk. The CLC building is at the lowest elevation and at the middle part of the parking lot there is a drop to get down to the sidewalk. There is a potential plan with the DEP to create an opening for overflow water in that area. The initial plan was to continue the path to the east side of the CLC building and exit onto Bridge Street.

Sullivan questioned whether a bike lane was in the works for Bridge Street. Semmelink replied that he did not know where that stands.

Jaquith stated that there could be more transparency at the Great Room. Jacquith added that signage and lighting could be the cool/modern touch to the project. Udy, Durand, and Kennedy agreed.

Ms. Barbara Clearly of 104 Federal Street. Clearly mentioned that the rooftop units on the CLC roof will be seen from the Federal streets, since Federal Street is higher than Bridge Street, and perhaps higher rooftop screens can be designed. How the raising of the flood plain will be seen at the sidewalk and how high is the ground next to it? Gundersen replied that the sidewalk is at its highest point at the Boston Street corner, then steadily drops towards the center of the property line along Bridge Street, and then gradually rises towards the CLC building. The First Floor level at the CLC building is about 3 feet above the sidewalk, when next to the CLC building. Clearly questioned what was below the first floor. Gundersen replied that the grade will slope up towards the base of the building and planting will be placed on that slope.

Ms. Sides stated that what has been gained with the current placement of the buildings is the greenspace on the usable side of the buildings, which is a great improvement on this project. That space can be used by the inhabitants of the building. The orientation of the sun will create a nice gathering spot that is not confined to the street.

Mr. Tim Jenkins of 18 Broad Street. Jenkins stated that is a much more attractive building, in terms of the entrance and greenspace. The canopy over the entrance is inviting and will provide protection from inclement weather. He liked the simplicity of the West end the prairie style of the building. The east end of the Bridge Street side is busy and the portion that extends out does break up the façade.

*Durand opens board comments on the mixed-use building.*

Jaquith noted appreciation for aspects of both of schemes, but prefers the base in the second scheme and the movement in the first scheme, but the material could be more natural in the metals. Semmelink noted that the plan is to angle the blue protrusions slightly, to break up the long line of the façade and provide alternate views from inside rather than just straight on. Durand questioned the materials of the outstanding features. Semmelink replied hexagonal metal shingles.

Jaquith commented on have the pieces that extend above the roof be functional within the top floor units – using it as a screen. Semmelink stated that they are looking to making the extension portion a plane and bringing the color of the top band that is between them, down as a side finish to make the extensions stand out, as opposed to making them a pop-up. Utilizing that space becomes a dollar issue for the developer.

Jaquith noted that the units have gone from rentals to condominiums. He admires what they are trying to do but they are not yet there. The building should move because it is a long building. The vehicles passing have a kinetic feeling coming down the street.

Sullivan questioned the new design team and the process that led them from one scheme to the other, which he doesn't see. Semmelink replied that the second scheme was a reaction to the previous comments to quiet the building. Kennedy stated that it seems like an overreaction. Sullivan added the first scheme had exciting characteristics and the second scheme looks like a completely different project – there is no consistency. Semmelink replied that the second scheme used the same footprint but included larger window openings making it less formal while the first scheme had more classic window proportions and was meant to be modern and memorable gateway. Durand added that it is a large building and the adornments made it interesting despite it not fitting within the Federal neighborhood.

Kennedy added that he liked the first scheme. A smaller version on Derby Street would be great but it does not fit in this location. A slightly scaled back version could fit in.

Ms. Katie Braaten of 141 Federal Street. Braaten is in favor of the first scheme, and it makes a statement about the sea and Salem. If the white were less white and it were more tone on tone with the top colors, the blue would work. Subduing it a bit would enhance the wave look.

Kennedy stated that the corner is disappointing. Previous schemes did something more with the corner but now it is a flat white wall. Semmelink stated that some of the decorative portions could move closer to the corner. Durand added that some relief to break the plane. Kennedy added something strong and proud at that corner that starts to fade away as you move towards Federal Street should be included. Imitating the tower design by having the corner step inward would also break up the corner.

Sides stated that she was anxious to hear the Board comments this time but the project has drastically changed. The project needs to continue to impress for a long time, not just in the short term. The first scheme was dramatic in the color, the angles, and the massing, and the suggestion was to tone it down and make it feel like it would last, and the latest plan is thin. The Board spoke of more natural colors – using natural/organic colors in the metals – that will work with the neighborhood but also make a statement in its newness. The second scheme is too shocking.

Kennedy stated that from a pedestrian standpoint this is a long building that is higher than the sidewalk. Sides added that there was also a band that ran along the back of the building on the ground floor in the first scheme. Kennedy agreed and added that the missing band is what connected the pedestrian to those spaces a bit. Semmelink replied that at the corner of Boston Street the first floor is 5 feet above the sidewalk and space between the building and the sidewalk at that corner may be kept low and densely planted to provide greenspace along the street.

Kennedy states that the rendering could be adjusted to alter the grade in scheme one. The percentage of materials on the building shown in the student housing building slide could be increased and incorporated into the second scheme. The design of the second scheme could work but it needs to be pushed further. Durand added the second scheme is too massive block. The first scheme helps scale it to the neighborhood but there is enough variety that it appears to be townhouses. Kennedy added that scheme two is headed down the path of the Archstone Apartments in Cambridge and that is not the path they want version two to take.

Durand questioned if the ground floor corner unit was a condominium. Semmelink replied yes, and they are considering raising the floor up off the sidewalk. Durand questioned

whether the storefront glass could wrap around at that more prominent corner for a loft feel that would highlight the morphing of the two building uses.

Durand requested to view the slides of the aerial view to see the scale of the buildings. Semmelink added that the Goodhue building was not added to the aerial view but is approximately 1/3 of the size of the multi-use building.

Sullivan questioned the opportunity to incorporate public art into the project/site. Semmelink suggested the area at the retaining wall.

*Durand opens public comments on the mixed-use building.*

Ms. Katie Braaten of 141 Federal Street. Braaten stated that she likes the protrusion along the bottom portion of scheme two, and asks if that also occurs with the blue waves in scheme one. This design breaks up the monotony of the corner and the proportion is more comfortable with the stripe along the top, especially if the bottom is raised. That protrusion in a tone-on-tone softer color would visually reduce the length of the building. Braaten added that making the blue panels in scheme one appears to dive into the building would have a nice effect and would add some dimension.

Mr. Ken Wallace of 172 Federal Street. Wallace stated that the corner looks like the prison. This corner is start and doesn't fit.

Ms. Jan Eschauzier of 15 ½ River Street. Eschauzier stated that the panels resemble the façade at Kings Bowling.

Ms. Suzie Welden of 106 Federal Street. Weldon stated that she doesn't like the color, which doesn't relate to the historic colors of Salem. The bright blue and white doesn't feel like Salem. This has always been an industrial corner and her preference would be for more earthy colors. This is too contemporary and should complement the neighborhood it is sitting next to. Same material and design, just different colors.

Ms. Meg Twohey of 122 Federal Street. Twohey hates the design. The corner should not be the entry corner into Salem. What happened to the older drawings that were approved? This plan is so monolithic and has no change in height. If this project is done wrong it will be a disaster that Salem will have to live with.

Mrs. Joyce Wallace of 172 Federal Street. Wallace stated that they are abutters to the CLC building. The previously brick building that the residents helped design had a much nicer corner. Will rain gardens be installed? Semmelink replied that there are some geotechnical issues because of the high water table right along Bridge Street. Recharge to get rid of surface water is a goal but it cannot be done with the dirt that they have.

Mr. Tim Jenkins of 18 Broad Street. Jenkins stated this building has the potential to make a huge statement but it reminds him of a large ship with too much on it and it lacks the simplicity of the CLC building. A prison-like structure should not be the first thing you see.

Ms. Barbara Clearly of 104 Federal Street. Clearly understands the desire for this building to have some cool factor. The larger window on the second scheme will make it more marketable. Clearly has no problem with the fins but believes it will be dated quickly. Over the years many designers come to Salem, take photos of the water, and push for a water theme to their projects, but it doesn't translate well into real buildings. The corner has most recently been industrial in use and industrial materials with a warm feel should be used, and the project can relate in scale to its surroundings.

Ms. Katie Braaten of 141 Federal Street. Braaten stated that the colors of scheme one are stark. The corner is abrupt and beige, and the materials/colors should wrap around the corner.

Ms. Emily Udy of 8 Buffom Street. Udy state that the corner resembles a stair tower. She participated in the other meetings and a lot of thought was put into that corner, but there are three corners that will be seen my people every day. There is an opportunity for some wow factor and a more subdued residential condo. Udy stated that you can see movement of the building in scheme two because there aren't colors distracting you and the heavy base of scheme one has merit. The heavy field stone base in scheme one isn't work the hassle with such a modern building. The intent of this North River corridor was to allow people to live in a neighborhood and many of these buildings don't allow you to do that. People who live here will take the train and walk towards the parking lot, around the building and down to the street. Was there any consideration to providing street access through stoops or that could be tucked into the façade? Semmelink replied that there is a flood plain, accessibility and security issue with creating private entrances and Bridge Street is not pedestrian friendly. Udy argues that Bridge Street will become pedestrian friendly; walking next to something interesting will encourage pedestrians. Whatever is built here allows it to become a pedestrian street. Don't make it so it can't be a pedestrian street because of what is there.

Ms. Meg Twohey of 122 Federal Street. Twohey questioned the proposed width of the sidewalk. Semmelink replied that it would be the same width but without the poles. The ground dimension is 8 feet the walk dimension could be less.

Sullivan questioned if any trees will be placed on the sidewalk. Semmelink replied that the proposed trees would be placed on the property and not on the sidewalk because it is so narrow and right on the street.

Ms. Jane Arlander of 93 Federal Street. Arlander questioned the distance between the L part of the building on the eastern side and the property line closer to Federal Street. Semmelink replied more than 100 feet.

Ms. Suzie Welden of 106 Federal Street. Weldon questioned if there would be balconies. Semmelink replied no.

Mr. Tim Jenkins of 18 Broad Street. Jenkins stated that units with direct access to the outside is what he is trying to find for his mother but he has had no luck, and it would be a good selling point if it was offered and would make it feel more like your own.

Durand closes the public session.

Jaquith: Motion to continue.

Seconded by: Sides, Passes 6-0.

Shapiro added that he received a notice from Attorney Joe Correnti who is representing the project to schedule a special meeting the week of April 11<sup>th</sup>. Semmelink questioned if the next meeting would be a continuation of this meeting. Shapiro replied yes.

## **Old/New Business**

## **Minutes**

Approval of the minutes from the February 24, 2016 regular meeting.

Sullivan: Motion to approve.

Seconded by: Jaquith, Durand abstains, Passes 6-0.

***Adjournment***

Kennedy: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 7-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:15pm