

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee: Design Review Board, Regular Meeting
Date and Time: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location: 120 Washington Street, Third Floor Conference Room
Members Present: Ernest DeMaio, Paul Durand, Christopher Dynia, David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Helen Sides
Members Absent: J. Michael Sullivan
Others Present: Andrew Shapiro
Recorder: Colleen Anderson

Paul Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:05PM.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. Lappin Park: Discussion and vote on proposed installation of “Free Little Library”

The submission under review includes: mission statement & history of the “Free Little Library”, photos of previous libraries, library design with dimensions, and photos of three possible locations for the proposed library in Lappin Park. Deborah Greel (Salem Public Art Planner) and Salem resident Drew Meger (designer/builder) were both present to discuss the proposed “Little Free Library” in Lappin Park.

Greel stated that Meger had previously built one at the Carlton School. The spots in Lappin Park are being suggested and requests the DRB’s input for the best location to place the library. Dig Safe has been contacted but they will not visit the property until a location for the library has been selected.

Durand stated that the addition of this library should pull people in and activates the park. His preference is for option 2 or 3, which are more towards the middle of the park, as opposed to option 1 which is along the outer edge of the park which could cause people gathering there and block the sidewalk.

Sides stated that she prefers option 2, because option 3 competes with and distracts from the “Samantha” statue.

DeMaio stated that option 2 is the best. DeMaio added that the design should be altered to include signage on the back since it will be seen from both the front and back by people walking along the path.

Greel added that she hoped it wouldn’t become a bike rack.

Durand stated it will become a beacon and will draw attention to itself. How it is angled will be important. Durand reiterated DeMaio’s point of placing something on the backside since it will be seen from all sides.

Meger stated that the signage under the roof on the front can also be placed on the back.

Greel stated that she hopes more can be placed around the Salem in the future.

Shapiro questions whether the DBR is comfortable with the design of the schematic drawings.

DeMaio reiterates Greel's statement; hoping people will not use it as a bike rack, despite the fact that there are bike racks in the park. It is a popular area for people on bikes and bikes usually end up chained to trees.

Sides: Motion to recommend approval of the little free library conditional upon it being installed in location No. 2 as discussed.

Seconded by: DeMaio. Passes 4-0.

2. 9 Church Street (Remix Church): Discussion and vote on proposed installation of signage

The submission under review includes; a sign permit application, proposed condition photos, e-mail from the property owner allowing permission for the installation of the signage, description of the proposed signage, and a dimensioned photo of the exterior façade. Pastor Gary Miller was present to discuss the proposed signage.

Shapiro describes the sign as a vinyl decal to be applied to the face of the awning on the window and the "R" is raised lettering.

Dynia questions whether the circle is vinyl and just the "R" is what is raised.

Pastor Miller replies that the "R" will be raised $\frac{1}{4}$ ".

Sides questions whether the "R" and name are a logo and if it the first of its kind or if it's being used at another location(s). Sides also questions the spacing of the letters is also something they have used before/is it a part of their identity.

Pastor Miller replies that the logo is the circle with the "R" and added that the spacing between the lettering is not a part of their identity.

Jaquith arrives at 6:15PM.

Sides stated that there should be more spacing between the "X" and the "C" but understands that this could also be intentional, but it is legible so she has no problem with it.

Durand noted that the different text helps to differentiate the two words and separating the two words might not work because of the two fonts.

Sides: Motion to recommend approval as submitted.

Seconded by: Jacquith, Passes 5-0.

3. 50 St. Peter Street (Bit Bar Salem): Discussion and vote on proposed installation of signage and sidewalk designs

The submission under review includes; a map of the sign locations, proposed sign designs, images of previous signs used by The Great Escape restaurant and A&B Burger, a day-

time view with illuminated signs. Mr. Gideon Coltoff, Mr. Rob Hall, and Ms. Beth Swan (co-owners and co-designers of the signs) are present to discuss a proposed signage.

Kennedy arrives at 6:18PM.

Swan stated that they are proposing signs of their logo and they have both a horizontal and square version of their logo. Swan added that they are proposing signs at three locations; a wall sign, a blade sign, and a small plaque on an existing granite post next to the St. Peters Street parking lot. Coltoff added that the color shown on the images appears to be 'rust' but is intended to be 'copper'.

Swan stated that the Church Street parking lot provides no visibility for their restaurant. They are proposing a blade sign on the side of the building that will stick out and away from the building. It will be set back from the windows and the bottom of the sign will be 10 feet above grade. It will easily be seen from the Church Street parking lot as well as from train station. A second sign is proposed but will be a wall mounted sign that can be seen from the corner of Bridge Street and Sgt. James Ayube Memorial Drive. Along the side from the Church Street parking lot to the restaurant a third sign/ brass plaque on a granite post at an opening in the existing fence, is proposed to direct people where to go once they are at the property. This will keep them from walking further down towards Bridge Street, where there is no break in the fence to allow them to enter the restaurant, and will also inform people of the handicapped accessible entrance.

Swan added that many people who park in the Church Street lot don't know where the restaurant was because it's not visible. Previous signage was on the fence and only had the word "Restaurant". Coltoff added that residents of the building stated that people have entered in the lobby of the residences looking for the restaurant.

Swan stated that they are also proposing subtle guidance dots on the asphalt sidewalk to help guide people to their restaurant. The dots would be a glossy shade of black color that's darker than the asphalt.

Swan stated that neighbors have complained in the past about spot lights at grade level shining up into their windows, so they are proposing energy efficient LED neon that will light only the lettering from behind. Hall added that many of the grade level spot lights get kicked and aren't repositioned.

Hall stated that there is a question in the ordinance regarding allowing up-lighting because it creates light pollution. Swan added that up-lighting has been previously used on site.

Swan stated that the proposed signs are to be metal and the lettering to be cut out with a copper effecting paint over the metal, because the copper color will blend with the brick and granite building façade. Swan added that simple iron bars, reminiscent of the jails history, will support the signs. Permission from the landlord has been granted, should the DRB approve of the proposed signs.

Shapiro stated that the guidance dots will not be permitted through their ordinance and noted that a neighbor also didn't want to see them included. Questions were made on the precedence of allowing a business to utilize a public sidewalk to direct people to their business. Shapiro asks that the guidance dots not be include in the proposal.

Shapiro stated that the signage is compliant with the SRA design guidelines; in terms of size, use of lighting, etc. Shapiro added that there is a standard in terms of height of the

signs – the top of a sign cannot come above the second floor window sills and the proposed signs do rise above that level.

Shapiro stated that signs of previous tenants of the property had been approved by the DRB and SRA, and were granted sign permits without issuance of a variance. Those signs also rose above the second floor windows. Upon closer examination of the issue, the City is now asking that the applicant seek relief for being able to place signage above the second floor sills. Shapiro noted that he questioned the applicants on whether the top of the sign came above 25 feet and Coltoff previously assured Shapiro that that was not the case with either proposed sign.

Durand questioned whether the ordinance specifically restricts directional signage. Shapiro replied that guidance dots on the sidewalk are prohibited.

Kennedy stated that the simply designed proposed sign is easier to read than their other proposed signs – without the additional colors and imagery, so the more the signs are simplified the clearer they become.

Kennedy questioned whether the white seen in the background was part of the sign or simulated lighting. Swan replied that it was simulated lighting.

Swan stated that they have another version of the signs with a white border which may help the signs stand out. Kennedy replied that with the right contrasting colors the copper color should pop.

Kennedy noted that the texture of the copper will not be seen from a distance, just the color and possible reflection.

Kennedy stated that the DRB will question the text type, the sign itself, and whether it works with and respects what the building is and what, and right now he's not sure that it does. Swan adds that they want the signs to fit their brand and the building.

Durand stated that if the signs fit in too much they will blend in and not be noticed, so the signs needs a bit of contrast. Readability is less important than realizing that something is there. Kennedy added that the backlighting will help.

Kennedy stated that the signs also need the height and to be placed above the first floor windows and the dimension will also help.

Shapiro stated that recent photos of the building were taken and have been given to the DRB for their reference.

Sides stated that the DRB has learned from the approval of the A&B Burger sign that it became to abstract that ultimately you didn't need to know what it said. Sides added that the signs are overworked, they blend together, and need to be simplified. Sides noted that it is hard to read but if it is repeated throughout the space it could be okay.

Swan questioned whether using one solid color and not their brand colors would help with readability.

Sides replied that a strong contrast could also help.

Kennedy stated that increasing the bar size between the lettering will help the words to be seen from a distance.

Sides questioned whether the extra 'bits' on the sign could be eliminated. Coltoff replied that they reference video games that those who play video games will understand the reference.

DeMaio questions both the scale and number of signs, but with revisions using the DRB's suggestions they could work. DeMaio stated that he has the least issued with sign 4. Signs 1 and 2 are well situated, and with the vista that most people see the building from the signs will be seen, but they are large in terms of scale. The signage is trying hard to overcome the visibility constraints of the site. DeMaio added that he has the most difficulty with sign 3 because it is located on another part of the building, is a far distance from the restaurant, and it is very large. By the time you get to sign 3 you've already passed the entrance for it. The complex is beginning to be "branded" by their proposed signs, but understands why they want them. DeMaio added that their request goes beyond the sign package that he would advocate for.

Swan stated that they want signage visible from the St. Peters Street lot and that sign is placed as far as they can get it to their restaurant while still on that street.

DeMaio noted that Village Tavern did something similar because their entrance was so far away from flow of traffic.

Coltoff stated that they looked into moving the St. Peters Street sign closer to the parking lot but that would make the building appear branded by the BitBar, placing the sign there would put it too close to warden's house which the Historic Commission may not even be allow, and the they didn't want the sign visible by the residents when they arrive home. Coltoff added that placing it at the opposite corner makes it within eyeshot of St. Peters Street and Bridge Street. Coltoff noted that there are no business in the area so people headed in that direction will more than likely be looking for the bar/restaurant and for signs to lead them too it.

Kennedy stated that sign 3 is 102 inches which is very big. Swan replied that the 102 inch dimension is overall and includes 6 inches of air space and bracket space at the top and the bottom, but the sign itself is 8 feet high.

Coltoff stated that the dimension from grade to the second floor is 18 feet and they are trying to maximize the space between the top and bottom allowable location for signage. Swan added that they made the top of the sign line up with the second floor windows. Hall added that the patio space is large and the proposed sign on the corner is close to the patio.

Kennedy questioned whether the signage fits within the guidelines. Shapiro replied that this is a very large building, they are proposing signage on two frontages, and the building is set back from the street. Coltoff added that they are below the allowable signage square footage. Shapiro added that the ordinance is written for storefront spaces.

Durand stated that the signs are huge and they seem out of proportion. Durand added that sign 1 needs to be big, sign 2 should possibly be near the entry – using the vertical format of sign 3 and scaling it down and placing it next to the door to draw people in and signify the entrance, and not have it on the corner which looks awkward in proportion to the building. Durand adds that he likes sign 4.

Sides stated that he prefers the vertical format over the square and questioned whether that should be the one that is repeated rather than having two different versions. Coltoff replied

that their logo is the square sign and they prefer to stay true to their brand logo. Swan added that people will also be able to see that vertical blade sign from the T and the signage can protrude up for 5 feet away from the building.

Jaquith stated that a free standing sign would be better than hanging a sign off the building. Shapiro replied that a free standing sign would not be allowed by the SRA.

A representative of the property owner, Symes Associates, who was present (Steve Feinstein) agreed with Jaquith but also stated that it was not allowed. Shapiro stated that if the DRB approved a stand-alone sign, that the ZBA & SRA would also need to approve it, and would take the DRB approval into consideration, but that also adds more to the process for the applicants.

Kennedy stated that the solution is to reduce the size of the larger sign.

Kennedy: Motion to continue the discussion and vote on proposed installation of signage
Seconded by: DeMaio, Passes 6-0.

4. 17 Central Street (Residences at Museum Place): Discussion and vote on proposed replacement of three sets of entry stairs

Tracey Rubin, James Warren, & Patrick Eddy – Board Members of 17 Central Street were present to discuss the replacement of the three entry stairs.

Eddy stated that they are looking to replace all three sets of stairs that are concrete and are deteriorating. Eddy added that they currently do not meet code and they plan to replace them with granite and reuse the existing railings.

Dynia questioned how the existing railing can be reused if the stairs do not meet code.

Warren replied that at two locations the sidewalk has risen over time and so the first step up off the side walk is what doesn't meet code.

Dynia questioned whether the first step off the side walk is what is going to be raised.

Warren replied yes.

Rubin stated that the granite stairs at the 52 Charter Street entrance, that were replaced approximately 10 years ago, has a rough face and they plan to install smooth face granite.

Jaquith questioned who was providing the granite.

Warren replied that that hasn't been determined.

Shapiro added that the location of the granite is not known but they are using Abbott Construction and Landscaping of Boxford, MA.

Jaquith questioned whether each step was an individual piece of granite.

Warren replied yes.

Sides stated that as long as the granite fits into the same spacing she has no issue with the proposed stair replacement.

Warren replied that it will be as close of a match as possible.

Jaquith: Motion to approve as submitted.
Seconded by: Kennedy, Passes 6-0.

5. 283R Derby Street (Notch): Discussion and vote on proposed outdoor seating area (café permit review)

Durand announces that he will recuse himself from participating on this agenda item; he leaves the room.

The submission under review includes: a letter from the owner with a description of the proposed outdoor seating area, a letter from the landlord – South Harbor Holdings, LLC stating that they approve of the proposed project, images of the proposed furniture, liability insurance certificate, proposed Site Plan, proposed furniture plan, existing and proposed condition fence photos, isometric and perspective views, and existing and proposed elevations. Chris Lohring owner/president of Notch Brewing was both present to discuss the proposed outdoor seating area.

Lohring stated that there have been some updates since he last presented on the café permitting path. The former rear accordion door is now a roll-up door and new LED parking lot lighting will be placed on the Derby and Congress Street frontages.

Lohring stated that the outdoor patio is being called “the Biergarten” will be located along the South River. The tables will have traditional hardwood tops with metal frames and are collapsible for easy storage in the winter months and securing at night.

Lohring stated that the fence separating the two parking lots areas from the Biergarten will be a 5’ high metal framed fence with vertical cedar boards. The fence to separate the Biergarten from the river will match the black metal guardrail that currently stretches across the river.

Sides questioned whether the wood fence has been used at a previous Biergarten.

Lohring replied yes.

DeMaio questioned where there was a walkway between the guardrail and the river.

Lohring replied no. The existing seawall is approximately 4 feet wide and the new guardrail will be placed in the top of that seawall.

DeMaio questioned whether this project could trigger a public walkway on the water side of the property and whether the City is in the position to request one given that there currently is a path across the river, and the hope was to continue the walkway around the entire inlet.

Shapiro added that if a project triggers the requirement for Chapter 91 providing for a public accommodation – a shared use path. If that were the case the DRB will ask that that accommodation be included, but that is not the case in this project. Shapiro added that there hasn’t been a proposal to continue that path at this location at this time but that a bigger project may have triggered the requirement.

DeMaio stated that the DRB is recommending approval to the SRA on a scheme where they know the future intent is for a shared use path that has not been included.

Shapiro replied that if the inclusion of a shared use path is not a requirement is something the DRB can ask for but the decision to include one is solely that of the property owner.

DeMaio stated that the recommendation for approval of this project as presented may interrupt any future proposal for a continuous walkway.

Kennedy and Jaquith agreed that it may come up in the future.

Lorhing added that the neighboring building goes right up to the waterfront so the path in question would become an issue there as well. Lorhing questioned whether The Grapeview encountered this issue in the past.

Kennedy replied that there was a patio and a gap that was in consideration for a future path.

DeMaio stated that the neighboring building has a pre-existing condition and this project does not.

Shapiro added that he will mention and discuss the walkway at the next SRA meeting.

Lorhing stated that signage has been removed from the plans and will require a separate meeting. Lorhing added that the gooseneck lighting shown in the plans will also be included in the meeting regarding signage.

Lorhing added that black string bulb lights will be hung across the patio at night.

Kennedy questioned what the lights will be hung on.

Lorhing replied that they will be strung from the building to the black poles at the back fence along the river.

DeMaio questioned whether the parking lot light fixtures will be LED cut-offs that light down onto the parking lot and not out away from the building.

Lorhing replied that he will come back with lighting specs for the DRB to review and requested a product recommendation from the DRB.

DeMaio stated that he would provide the applicant with a light fixture recommendation.

Shapiro questioned whether umbrellas shown are the proposed design and color.

Lorhing replied that the umbrellas will be square and they are trying to get the fabric to match the maroon in the Notch logo and if not they will use a different color, not white, but they will all be the same color.

Kennedy questioned whether the wood bench color will match the image provided.

Lorhing replied that there are three color options; white, aged, and dark, and they will select white to match the furniture in the tap room which will contrast with the cedar in the fence.

Sides: Motion to recommend approval of the patio, layout, furniture and fence as submitted with the expectation that a new exterior light fixture will be proposed
Seconded by: Kennedy, Passes 5-0.

6. 168 Essex Street (Village Tavern): Discussion and vote on proposed lighting for outdoor seating area

*Paul Durand returned to the meeting.

The submission under review includes: a letter from the owner/general manager of Village Tavern describing the proposed work, sketches of the proposed new poles and lighting, proposed images of the outdoor lighting, photos of the proposed poles, anchor screws, cables, fasteners, and tension rods, photos of the proposed string lighting. Andrew Ingemi General manager/owner of Village Tavern was both present to discuss the proposed lighting over the existing outdoor seating area.

Shapiro stated that new poles and lighting to be strung across the poles and across the patio to above the awning is what is under review.

Ingemi stated that 6 poles are proposed.

Kennedy questioned whether the poles were metal and if they were black.

Ingemi replied that they were metal but would be painted black to mimic the existing black lamp posts on Essex Street.

Kennedy stated that the submission package read as steel.

Sides added that the paint on painted steel and fittings will wear away over time.

Kennedy stated that he is not in favor of pieces that were made black and did not have to be painted which will require upkeep.

Durand questions where the power will come from. Will it be exposed conduit or will it come through the exterior wall.

Ingemi replied that each string of lights coming through the wall will have its own power source and there will be no exposed conduit.

DeMaio questioned whether the lighting poles will be placed on top of the low brick wall and who owned the brick wall.

Ingemi replied that the low brick wall is the property of the mall and beyond that is City property. The low brick wall runs the entire length of the patio – 80 feet. The plan is to put the poles into the brick wall.

Sides stated that there is a lack of detail on how this will be constructed. Constructing and mounting posts and electrical connections through the wall could be more complicated than you think.

DeMaio added that adding connections through brick walls will require more detail.

Kennedy questioned whether the poles will sit on top of the brick wall or go into it the top of the wall.

Ingemi replied that the polls will go through the top of the wall. Ingemi added that they will consult a structural engineer to make sure everything is secure.

Durand stated that the wall is not a very tall wall and may not be reinforced and the pole will create lateral forces.

Ingemi replied that the poles will be secured however the structural engineer requests it to be secured.

Durand suggested that the poles should be anchored with a concrete foundation below the frost line and that Ingemi's architect should determine whether the poles should be installed on top of the low brick wall or on the interior face of the wall. Durand likes the overall concept but wants to make sure the details are designed; pole cap detail, connections, etc. and to make sure the design has been thought out structurally.

Ingemi stated that he can provide plans for his Architect to the DRB prior to construction.

Jaquith: Motion to recommend approval of the lighting concept conditional further review by the DRB of the architectural drawings and details on how the pole will be capped.
Seconded by: Kennedy, Passes 6-0.

7. 50 St. Peter Street (Old Salem Jail): Discussion and vote on proposed design revisions to previously approved plans for Phase II of "Old Salem Jail" redevelopment project – new multifamily housing development

The submission under review includes: a letter from Seger Architect describing the recent changes to the design, a full set of plans including; site plan, floor plans, elevations, and images of the proposed materials. Dan Ricciarelli of Seger Architects and Steve Feinstein of Symes Associates were both present to discuss the recent plan changes.

DeMaio questioned whether the changes were a revision or an amendment of the previously approved plans.

Shapiro replied that they should be considered an amendment.

Ricciarelli stated that the new owners are looking to build a new residential building, the fourth building on the site. The project is fully permitted and the new owner is looking to make some changes, such as the addition of an elevator, but many of the details that have changed are similar to what the presented to the DRB approximately two years ago.

Ricciarelli stated that the building will be L-shaped, residents will enter the site off of St. Peters Street, and parking will be both below the structure and in the surrounding parking lot.

Ricciarelli stated that the building is somewhat split into two because of the difference in grade. The garden level units in the North building will be three to four feet below grade and are designed as townhomes, with the bedroom below and living space on the first floor above. The remaining units on the North building are a mix of townhomes while the South building units are flats.

Durand questioned whether the floor plans have changed.

Ricciarelli replied that there have been a little bit of modification.

Shapiro stated they were granted an insignificant change requests to add one additional unit. Ricciarelli added that the insignificant change was the division of one large unit into two and not a change in footprint.

Ricciarelli stated that the elevator is off of the St. Peters Street entrance, where the separation between the two buildings is located. The elevator will provide access to some units but those without elevator access will have access from grade.

Ricciarelli stated that the previously proposed base and main front façade was a ground face block, but will now be a large scale masonry material – El Dorado Stone Veneer – in a 1'x2' running bond pattern. The proposed Hardiplank clapboard will have a 7" exposure to the weather. Corner boards will be used instead of mitered corners due detailing challenges and material costs. Dormers, gable ends, and the other areas of the facade will have lead coated copper cladding. Screening will be installed to conceal the parking below the building. Faux slate will be used on the roof. Balconies will have painted steel railings.

DeMaio requested the previously approved plans to compare to the proposed changes.

Sides stated that the material change and the addition of corner boards dramatically alter the look of the façade. Ricciarelli replied that the corner condition was never finalized, and the proposed corner boards will be the smallest they produce and will be painted to match the clapboards.

DeMaio questioned the difference in scale between the previously approved elevations and the proposed elevations, especially the doors.

Ricciarelli replied that the previous exterior door product by Solar Innovation, were 9 feet high pocket doors, and their function was not clear when in the open position. The proposed doors are now by Jeld-win, and the doors heads are now at 8 feet, which has changed some of the proportions.

Ricciarelli added that the building is now stick built and no longer modular, so there is no longer a double thickness at the floors which has allowed them to gain more head height. The windows of the previous dormers were 5 ½ feet off the floor but those have been brought down to sill height. Now all of the space on the top floor is functional and the mass of the building has been brought down.

DeMaio stated that the changes to the front façade now make the building read as three separate masses and the North East and South East façade read differently now.

DeMaio questioned whether the water table material was the same.

Ricciarelli replied yes.

Dynia questioned whether the elevator was added as a convenience.

Feinstein replied that an elevator would make the units for marketable.

Shapiro questioned if the units would be rentals.

Feinstein replied yes.

Jaquith noted that there was more emphasis on the balconies and changes in the fenestration.

Ricciarelli replied yes, but in size.

Durand stated that the presentation was confusing because it is difficult to tell what has changed. To expedite the approval the changes need to be clear. Durand added that the DRB spent a lot of time on the previously approved plans.

DeMaio stated that the previous elevations had a contemporary feel and the feel of the current project has a New England style. DeMaio added that his favorite parts of the original project were the contemporary elements and those are the pieces that have changed the most – balconies, railings, sidings, windows. The previous dormers had more windows than wall and subtly popped up from the roof and now there is more wall space around them and the dormer reads as a mass, which feels like a significant change.

Shapiro stated that the DRB should review the current presentation rather than compare the two versions and give their opinions on what direction the project should go from here. A new Architect is working on this project and the construction method has changed.

Durand stated that this is a new project that is similar to the previous project.

Jaquith stated that this building is very broken up and there is no unity.

Kennedy stated that the building should have a more contemporary/modern feel.

DeMaio stated that the middle portion of the North West façade is trying to literally to mimic the jail across from it and that is dividing up the façade and causing it not to look unified.

Jaquith stated that the Architect is working off the previous plans which is challenging.

Feinstein stated that the height and massing were important throughout the planning process which is what they are trying to keep. Previously selected products didn't work in this area and they are trying to work with the other buildings on the site. A contemporary feel with oversized windows is nice but windows of a regular size that can be maintained is another.

Ricciarelli questioned if the DRB's concerns are with the materials or the way they are treated.

Jaquith replied that it is challenging to see how the materials work with one another in the computer elevations.

Durand opens public comment.

Emily Udy of Historic Salem. Questioned if the chimneys can be a stronger feature.

Ricciarelli replied that they were lanterns.

Jaquith noted that the dormers in the elevation vs. the perspectives do not match. Jaquith questioned the roof pitch and floor to floor height.

Ricciarelli replied that the roof pitch was 8/12 and the floor to floor height was 10 feet and they are trying to maintain a 9 foot high ceiling.

Durand stated that normalizing the previously approved contemporary design made it less successful. Durand suggested that they either redoing the design to make it more of a standard construction or to make it more contemporary.

DeMaio suggested reconsidering how the window read in the façade so they can look more contemporary. The balcony railings unified the façade and now they have a builders punch-out feel. They could be address by changing what goes on around them.

Sides stated that the previous plan was very clean and everything fit neatly and the railings were within the balconies and didn't overlap and tie into the face of the façade. That kind of detail takes away from the clean look of the façade. The neatness of the previous plan is what made it so successful.

Ricciarelli replied that executing that design was the problem but he understands that the DBR would like the building to be more streamlined.

Shapiro questioned if the previous landscape plan was being used.

Ricciarelli replied yes.

Jaquith: Motion to continue the discussion at a future meeting.
Seconded by: Kennedy, Passes 6-0.

North River Canal Corridor Projects Under Review

- 8. 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 plans have been refined. Some minor plan changes are being made for the planning board along Boston Street (the east façade) at a more detailed level – to improve the Boston Street experience and flipping the planting with the sidewalk to make a more welcoming right turn entrance lane. There is now a path through the middle of the site to get to Bridge Street. The tree and planting requirements are being maintained and the lighting will be reviewed with a consultant tomorrow.

Semmelink introduced a color coded floor plan that highlights the different use groups within the building.

Semmelink stated that the design concerns from the previous meeting have been addressed, namely at the corner of Boston and Bridge Streets. The façade is a mixture of fiber cement products - panels and lap siding. The window have larger surrounds to make them appear larger. The tan base is a board and batten style panel. The tan façade on the upper levels is a mixture of 3", 5" & 7" lap siding in a repetitive random pattern. The window

surrounds are a cellular PVC trim that could change. There are panels between the windows.

Semmelink noted that the building will be a 4 story wood frame with wood trusses. The building has been lowered and the mechanical equipment will be shielded by a screen placed 15 feet away from the building edge.

Semmelink introduces Gundersen to speak about the proposed CLC building.

Gundersen stated that questions were asked at the previous meeting, regarding how it would be detailed, materials, and color. Gundersen presented Boral siding in the proposed trim in scale and color. The colored trim has been added to the elevations, in the band that runs around the second floor level and on the lower level of the façade.

Gundersen stated that there was a previous question regarding the wall sections and how the building will be detailed. The view of the building from Bridge Street was also questioned. A perspective of that view has been added to the documentation.

Durand stated that the DRB's comments would begin with the CLC Building.

Jaquith stated that he is in favor of the improvements and would like windows included in the Bridge Street side of the Building.

Sides stated that she is happy with the changes and the DRB's previous comments have been addressed.

Dynia questioned whether the dumpster would be seen along that side of the building.

Gundersen stated that "T" shown on the plan is a transformer not the trash.

Semmelink replied that that area will be screened with dense planting. Transformer will be placed at floor level and fencing options are being considered.

Dynia questioned whether the transformer could be moved further away from Bridge Street because the transformer will be easily seen when traveling down Bridge Street.

Semmelink replied moving it inwards is more costly.

Gundersen added that this building does not have a back, it is seen from all sides, and where to place things has always been an issue.

Kennedy stated that the contract between the two colors differs between the plans.

Gundersen replied that the right color green has to work in contrast and some experimentation will be need to make sure the colors work.

DeMaio questioned whether seniors took mass transit to the site and if there was a drop-off site at the CLC building.

Gundersen replied that is was mostly a van service and many people drive. Gundersen replied that there is a drop-off site.

Semmelink added that T service was limited in this area and presently only comes to Boston Street but they do know how many people would use the T service. They would have to walk across the various paths from Boston Street to get to the CLC building.

Jaquith stated that the storefronts have a large amount of glass and questioned whether the storefront will have horizontal sections so people will know where the doors are.

Gundersen replied that they may put horizontals in the storefront or something can be placed on the glass.

Durand questioned why the window pattern changes along Bridge Street and questioned if the far left window could be removed to help with the spacing.

Gundersen replied that how the spaces are used inside the building changes but that window could be eliminated.

Durand opens the CLC building to public comment.

Shapiro stated that a letter regarding this project has been given to the DRB.

Meg Twohey of 122 Federal Street. Questioned whether the refuse area was outside and screened. This area has a rodent problem. Trash storage should be considered.

Semmelink replied that the mixed-use building has indoor trash storage that will only be placed outside on trash days.

Jane Arlander of 93 Federal Street. Questioned if the transformer would make noise and will that disturb people sitting on the patio. Arlander stated that many children will also use the building and questioned if there will there be bike racks and if the roadways will be more bike-friendly than they currently are. Arlander questioned if the pathway off the Boston Street between the parking lot and Federal Street will be inviting, clearly visible, and safe so people will want to take it.

Semmelink replied that the planning board requested the walkway be moved towards the cars and made wider and to move the plantings closer to Federal Street. it would only create a minor hum and the traffic will .

Joyce Wallace of 172 Federal Street. In favor of a more open pathway off of Boston Street, questions if there will be a planting buffer between the retaining wall further down the property.

Semmelink replied that some drainage will be at the base of the retaining wall, plantings won't grow on top of the retaining wall but that area will be cleaned up.

Boris Schopf of 1 Cambridge Street. Questioned the retaining wall height and the height should be known and the buffer area keeps being reduced. Questioned the finish floor height of both buildings and the sidewalk beyond. Questioned whether the temporary fill level is higher than the finished floor level. Stated that both buildings are too close to the street, there is not enough of a landscaping buffer throughout the site – it should be either bigger or smaller, car bumpers will overlap onto the sidewalk. No elevations are shown from the parking lot side, the saw tooth stepped portions seem too large, the building is very long and should be broken up into groups with several entrances on the main floor to break up the façade. The CLC building should be built as it was rendered.

Semmelink replied the finish floor is at 12.11 feet, the sidewalk at Boston and Bridge Street is just under 12 feet and at its lowest point is approximately 7.5 feet. Semmelink replied that the temporary fill is a couple of feet higher than the finished floor level.

Emily Udy of Historic Salem. In favor of the CLC building signage change. Some design element should be repeated along Bridge Street which is a plain. In favor of the paving/landscape outside the building.

Durand closes the public session.

Jaquith stated that he is not in favor of the vertical and horizontal elements on the façade of the mixed-used building. He agrees with Schopf's views on the steps along the Bridge Street side. The corners could be improved. He is not in favor of the brown siding or the windows.

Sides stated that building differs every time they see it. Her favorite part of the building is the Boston Street view looking North, as opposed to the long elevation looking South West, because the building is more broken up.

Semmelink replied that the Boston street elevation is short compared to Bridge Street. The steps in the building are placed where they are because as the building steps down it is also stepping away from the sidewalk. It allows them to jog the main corridor which lessens the length of the corridor and helps them create fire halls with doors midway in the corridor. It also gets them out of the Chapter 91 requirements.

Sides stated that she prefers the Boston Street façade which has been broken up and has nicer proportions than the Bridge Street façade. There were strong elements in the scheme with blue that helped break up the façade and that is missing from this design.

Kennedy stated that a larger break is needed on the Bridge Street side.

Jaquith questioned whether the window pattern was developed from the floor plan and is not in favor of the skinny vertical windows and doesn't think it is a successful design.

Semmelink replied that the larger windows are living spaces, and smaller windows

Durand stated that the direction last time was to bring the two different schemes together, which was successful, but there is a muted color palate. The waves and angles are the same but it is a very long building.

Kennedy stated that the building is dense and needs something to break it up like the Boston Street façade.

Semmelink replied that the pattern of the windows was trying to break up the length of the building. It's a smaller pattern of window that are grouped with trim and panels to give it some vertical height.

Dynia stated that the blue was lively and playful and the current elevation looks like campus housing. It went too far when it comes to taking the playfulness out of the project.

Jaquith questioned the corner materials.

Semmelink replied fiber cement paneling with an aluminum reveal.

Dynia requested more detail on the breaking up of the internal corridor and questioned if it would include the addition of an egress stair tower.

Semmelink replied that the breaking up of the corridor has occurred midway down the corridor with a set of fire doors.

Kennedy stated that that is the opportunity to provide a break in the façade with the metal panel used at the corner and have it wrap around that corner.

Durand questioned whether this scheme reflects the neighborhood.

Semmelink replied that it has some contrast but uses some lap siding in a familiar but unusual way. The “urban village” feel is on the Boston Street side which will breed better future projects.

Durand introduces a letter that was given to the DRB just prior to the meeting that highlights several issues.

1. Path at the buffer zone and if it is required. Perhaps people can follow the sidewalk.
2. Refuse storage close to Bridge Street
3. Inadequate parking concerns. Durand questions the ratio per unit and states that if there is not enough parking people will not rent the units.
4. How will bicycles access the site, especially the CLC building?

Semmelink replied

1. It minimizes the number of times someone has to cross the parking lot to get to the CLC building when coming from Boston Street. The existing sidewalk is almost ramp like and is in a flood zone. A Boston Street pathway entrance will be the most comfortable.
2. The service area at the mixed-use building is a loading area only and trash is stored indoors with a chute system and a collection area for recyclables that will be rolled out for pick-up.
3. The client is satisfied with the number of parking spaces for the building. The ratio is less than 1.5, possibly 1.2. There is a balance between the different uses. The client is currently not assigning parking.
4. Sidewalks. The mixed-use building has a bicycle room. Gundersen added that bicycle racks can be added to the site at the CLC building.

DeMaio stated that with just a long façade there is no opportunity to open more to Bridge Street and that is a loss. The vision of the master plan was to reconnect the neighborhood and breaking up the mass of the building with pass-throughs like the earlier schemes did. The proposed design is monolithic and impervious.

Durand request specific recommendations from the DRB for proposed modifications.

DeMaio suggested that the ground floor datum be raised so the first floor appears less compressed to help with the sidewalk experience.

Kennedy suggested that the building be broken up and backed away from the street.

Durand questioned whether 3 feet of depth can be removed from the building.

Kennedy mentioned another point in the previously mentioned letter.

5. Whether this building fits in with the neighborhood and the master plan. That is something the SRA needs to determine.

Semmelink replied that it has been squeezed already to provide more green space. The building also cannot get any closer to the street because of a piping that's being relocated along the property line.

Shapiro stated that the DRB needs to be comfortable with the plan and feel that the proposal is congruent with the plan. Does this project constitute an "urban village." Is it a good start for future construction projects. Shapiro added that utility lines will be placed underground which will great a better public experience. The Planning Board conditions will include traffic calming conditions.

Durand noted that the "urban village" concept is great but things evolve and that is better than having empty storefronts and commercial spaces. Durand added that this has been successful along Boston Street. The idea is to bring the people which will make this project successful.

Durand opens the mixed-use building to public comment.

Ken Wallace of 172 Federal Street. Requesting that the DRB pursue breaking up the long façade on Bridge Street, and do something different with the various corners, possibly curved glass.

Emily Udy of Historic Salem. Pathway through the site is not a substitute for the sidewalk, and hopefully be more reason to walk along the sidewalk in the future. Requests that more thought be given to the landscaping and possibly varying the width of the sidewalk to give the pedestrian an opportunity to notice the surroundings. Window placement is an improvement from the previously approved commercial building windows. Appreciates the idea that the parapets could being used as screening.

Meg Twohey of 122 Federal Street. Requests that the DRB look into the color scheme, which resembles Salem State colors. Twohey is not a fan of the fins, believes this building is not appropriate at this location, and requests elevations of the parking lot side that will face Federal Street, which will also determine if the rooftop mechanical equipment will be visible from Federal Street.

Jane Arlander of 93 Federal Street. Questions the two entrances ways. What happens when Bridge Street floods and Boston Street is the only entrance left which currently only allows for a right turn in and out. The residential and commercial spaces and the CLC building wanted 80 spaces, all have specific parking requirements and the numbers don't add up with the number of spaces they currently have. This version of the project has the least amount of parking spaces so far.

Durand closes the public session.

DeMaio stated that visibility may be a concern at the Boston Street entrance with planting concealing those first few spaces. Cars pulling into that entrance that have to stop for cars pulling in/pulling out of parking spaces could cause a backup onto Boston Street.

Semmelink replied that this is not a retail parking lot so there will not be a lot of vehicular activity similar to a shopping center. Activity at the mixed-use building will be less than at the CLC building.

Shapiro requests a special meeting in a couple weeks to continue the review of the projects, the week of May 9, 2016.

Jaquith: Motion to continue the discussion to the next available meeting.
Seconded by: Durand, Passes 6-0.

Old/New Business

Approval of the minutes from the March 23, 2016 regular meeting.

Jaquith: Motion to approve.
Seconded by: Sides, Passes 6-0.

Adjournment

Jaquith: Motion to adjourn the meeting.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

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.