

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board – Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, February 23, 2022 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	Remote Participation via Zoom
DRB Members Present:	David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Catherine Miller, Marc Perras, Helen Sides, J. Michael Sullivan
DRB Members Absent:	Chair Paul Durand
Others Present:	Kate Newhall-Smith
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

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

Signs in the Urban Renewal Area

1. 11 Church Street: Residency Records

Ken McTague of Concept Signs was present to discuss the project.

McTague stated that the two windows to the right of the entry door belong to the neighbor. The sign band would be painted black, and the business name will only be over their business, so visually it will look off-center; however, the other business owner is willing to pay for the black façade to match his neighbor to continue the colors scheme. Sides asked if there are brick piers breaking up the façade. McTague replied yes, there is a pilaster between this business the bakery next door. Eventually all the sign bands will be black, and the colors will no longer vary. Perras suggested the continuous painting be part of the condition and he asked if the window will be opaque as they appear in the renderings. McTague replied no, the windows will be clear. Kennedy suggested the Records signs be center on each window. Sides asked if the signage complies with the signage regulation requirements. Newhall-Smith replied yes.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Jaquith: Motion to approve as presented with the entire awing face to be black.

Seconded by: Kennedy.

Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Jaquith, Perras, Sides, Sullivan were in favor. Passes 6-0.

Newhall-Smith noted her excitement with seeing new activity and tenants along the Church Street side of the mall.

Projects in the Urban Renewal Area

1. 38 Norman Street: Final Design Review – Construction of a new mixed-use building with commercial uses on the ground floor and residential uses above.

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti & Navins, Ryan Wittig and Matthew Moore of Kinvarra Capital, Philip Sima (Architect at Balance Architects)

City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

Atty. Grover stated that the Schematic Approval was in July 2021 and the project has been peer reviewed and under Planned Unit Development (PUD) special permit review process by the Planning Board (PB) since then, until they filed with the SRA for final approval in February of this year.

Sima stated that the major changes include moving the trash area from the parking area under the building to a room on the far left with recycling at the exterior since they don't believe the recycling will generate any aromas, although it will be concealed with a clapboard surround. The residential entrance has been shifted to the right to accommodate the trash area and the current curb cut will be closed and the area used for deliveries and trash pickup. A vaulted transformer will be at grade outside the trash room. The brick façade has been integrated into the residential entry along with vertical trellises that continue the verticality of the bay above. Mechanical units were added to the roof with a split system for the 20 units, as well as exhaust for the first-floor commercial space. The rooftop decks will have railings for safety.

Sima stated that the materials changes include slatted wood privacy screens painted to match the Hardi clapboard siding, more traditional light fixtures, 2 over 2 black non-vinyl windows at the residential floors, and they took queues from structures within a 1-block radius for the proposed brick color. The first-floor frosted windows along Crombie Street could be an opportunity to include local art that represents the history of the site.

Perras asked if the top floor windows engage or stop short of the cornice. Sima replied that they stop short of the wider part of the cornice, but they do engage with the shorter band. Perras asked about the roof design. Sima replied that the roof will be sloped with a drip edge and the main structure will have internal drains but not the base. Perras asked about the vertical expressions between the windows, expressed sills, and the banding above the third floor. Sima replied that they want to differentiate the bottom, middle and top by including a relief between the windows with a corbeled effort or a soldier course. The lintels and sills will be slightly recessed with a color matched concrete and the lintels will be in line with the jamb not extend beyond it. Perras noted that what's proposed is a nice expression.

Jaquith asked where the Hardi clapboard will be used. Sima replied at it will start at the residential entry and will be used at the non-street fronting sides and the rear. They would also use the smooth side not the grained.

Perras asked for the base material. Sima replied an architectural CMU manufactured by Shouldice and above it perhaps be a fiber cement panel with trim between the windows. Awnings are also proposed above the windows with gooseneck lights in between. Perras suggested using an all-stone base rather than introducing another product, like the simply detailed granite storefronts. He didn't see the need for the cornice above the commercial space. Sima noted that the masonry base is only 42-inches high.

Perras asked if the middle portion of the rear lower roof was accessible rather than terraced. Sima replied that the building abuts two single-family houses, so they opted to not have a continuous row of roof decks along the rear. Perras questioned the additional breaks in the rear façade with a vertical stripe of brick within the grey box, rather than a cleaner solution. Jacquith agreed and suggested eliminating the brick at the penthouse and rear façade and continuing the clapboards. Sima noted that the rear red

City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

area is clapboard, not brick, and it was implemented to break up the scale of the building. Perras reiterated his preference for the same expression around the non-street facing façades. Sides and Sullivan agreed with creating a uniform façade. Sullivan asked if the trash will be in bins or at a larger capacity. Sima replied that a larger capacity dumpsters and larger totes for the recycling, both picked up by a private company that they will work with to determine the size of the containers and frequency of the pickups.

Perras commended the design updates and believed the building will do well in this location. Jaquith and Sides agreed.

Miller asked where gas and water meters will be located because she wouldn't want to see them in a prominent location, such as in place of the art panels. Sima suggested the mechanical areas in the basement and noted that they haven't engaged the utility companies to that extent. He suggested within the recycling area so where they aren't visible from the public way as an alternate location. The Board agreed that the location of the gas, water and electric meters needs to be determined. Sima suggested a condition that the meters cannot be visible from a public way. Sides doubted that the utility companies would comply with the conditions of a Board vote. Miller noted that the connection location will be a contributing factor if they are desired on one side of the building, when the connection is on the other side. Sima reiterated that the vaulted transformer will be outside the trash room, so the meter is likely to be near it.

Newhall-Smith asked when this detail is typically determined. Sima replied that the transformer location happens early in the design process, the location of the meters is schematic until the engineers are on board and determined the location with the utility companies. Perras noted that utility companies take a long time to determine those locations and they may end up losing some of their recycling area to the meters, but not be visible from the street. Newhall-Smith suggested including the meter placement in the decision and if it is in a visible area, they must return to the DRB. Atty. Grover agreed that it will up to the applicant to convince the utility company and if they cannot, they will return with an alternative plan. Newhall-Smith added that this will also allow the design team to move forward with their permitting.

Sullivan requested the unit count. Sima replied 20 units in addition to the commercial space.

Miller asked for their snow storage plan. Sima replied that their traffic consultant determined that during large storms snow would be removed from the site.

Miller asked if the applicant would return with construction documents. Newhall-Smith replied not typically but if anything changes the applicant must return to the SRA and the DRB for review. Miller believed the planting plans weren't well developed despite their planting palette and suggested that artificial turf not be used as indicated on plan, and if the client felt they needed it for a pet relief area they could return to request it. Miller stated that the tree spacing of the four trees on Norman Street is good; however, considering the potential interaction of the far-left tree with the trash truck, the tree could be shifted over three feet. Miller noted the perennials and shrubs along the north are small and larger perennials or small trees should be used to break up the view down into

City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

the parking lot by neighbors. Atty. Grover stated that MDLA will be asked to enhance the landscaping plans before the applicant returns to the SRA.

Sides noted that cedar fencing is proposed around the site and is appropriate, although a cutsheet will be needed before a final approval. A cut sheet on the deck railings will also be required. Sides asked if the brick sidewalks will be repaired. Witting replied that he didn't believe the entirety of the sidewalk was brick, but he is not opposite to repairing what exists on Crombie Street. Miller noted that the concrete sidewalk along Norman Street is currently not in good condition and will also need repair.

Miller asked about the status of the triangular patch to the left of the building on Norman Street. Atty. Grover replied that it was part of 38 Norman Street but was sold to an entity related to the developer at 23 Summer Street over 1-year ago, so they no longer have any control over that parcel.

Public Comment:

Emily Udy, HSI. Asked what level of detail the materials are specified in the approval process and if they can be seen in person at the Planning Department office. Asked for clarification on where the façade design would be simplified. Perras replied that he suggested the clapboard be all one color and requested to continue to cornice detail around the roof. Wittig added that the clapboard would all be gray. Newhall-Smith replied that SRA decision will reference the plans by name and date, with a list of all materials and their colors. A materials board hasn't been requested and is not available to view at the Planning Department office. Udy added that they've worked with the design team and HSI is confident in their design decisions. Perras noted that the red mortar with red brick is a classic combination although not widely used in Salem. Kennedy agreed with Perras.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Miller asked when the cut sheets would be submitted. Atty. Grover replied that it could be conditional, and they would submit it prior to submitting for final approval to the SRA. The fence and deck railing cutsheets, updated landscape plan with additional plantings, simplification of the side and rear façades could be provided with the utility meter locations to be decided by the SRA. The traffic peer review will be before the PB on March 3rd, and he hopes a draft decision can be prepared before their March 17th meeting. They would include all the changes proposed at this meeting so all Board can review the same fence. Newhall-Smith suggested that the fence and railing details haven't been reviewed and may not be worth holding up the permitting process. She suggested a DRB member be deputized to review them and determine if it should return to the DRB. Sides suggested they be reviewed by the PB rather than returning to the DRB.

Miller: Motion to approve with the following conditions; Hardi siding shall be smooth, water, gas and electric meters shall not be visible from the Crombie, Norman, or Summer Streets, snow shall be hauled off site, sidewalks shall be repaired, cutsheets for the cedar fence and railings shall be provided, landscape plans shall be further developed to include specifics on plantings and smaller shrubs along the north property

City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

line, the North and West façades shall be consistent with the surrounding grey siding, and the North façade shall have a continuous cornice. Seconded by: Jaquith.
Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, and Sullivan in favor. Passes 6-0.

New / Old Business

1. Approval of Minutes:
 - a. December 22, 2021

Miller: Motion to approve the meeting minutes of December 22, 2021. Seconded by: Perras.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides – abstained due to absence, and Sullivan – abstained due to absence, in favor. Passes 4-0, 2 abstained.

2. Staff Updates, if any:

Newhall-Smith stated that the state of Massachusetts signed a bill to extend some of the COVID-19 aspects, including the ability to meet remotely. The options remain to either use a hybrid option or remain remote until July 2022.

Perras noted the negative was not being able to see materials and Emily Udy's point was a valid one. Kennedy agreed. Miller and Sullivan suggested asking for the materials. Newhall-Smith agreed to request material boards when needed. Sides suggested they be clearly labeled so that anyone can view the materials.

Miller: Motion to continue remote meetings until July 2022. Seconded by: Jaquith.
Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Jaquith, Perras, Sides, Sullivan were in favor. Passes 6-0.

3. Miller requested including a running list of projects for the Board to discuss until the matter(s) have been resolved. Newhall-Smith has her own list that she references at the end of meetings when new information is available.
 - a. **25 Lynde Street** – No mention on plans or in minutes of the use of the smooth vs. textured siding.
 - b. **118 Washington Street** (Ginger Seafood) – Two letters were sent to the applicant on February 27, 2022, regarding the installation of frosted window but there has been no response. The next step will be to contract the Building Department and let them know the applicant has been non-responsive and the frosted glass must be addressed.
 - c. **65 Washington Street** (Brix) – Regarding the use of two different color greens, she had a phone conversation with a developer from Urban Spaces. The original color was the darker green, the planters were purchased in a lighter green and the architect likes the color contrast. If the planters were painted, it would flake overtime and powder-coating them to ensure the plant stayed in place would be an added expense and they feel it wouldn't make sense. Miller replied that the request was for a dark green and the contrast does not look good. Kennedy and Perras agreed. Newhall-Smith stated that there are bigger battles ahead and suggested that continuing to pursue the matter will not be productive. Miller suggested the Board review them on their own and decide at the March meeting. Sides asked where the planters were placed. Newhall-Smith replied that they

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

are the long trough style planters in front of the commercial space. Sides suggested applying a timeframe and painting them. The Board agreed to continue the discussion.

- d. **37 Central Street** (Eastern Bank) – Hasn't been reviewed but it will be addressed soon. Miller noted that the applicant placed the bank name on the "IN" and "OUT" driveway signage after specifically being told not to.

Adjournment

Miller: Motion to adjourn. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, and Sullivan in favor. Passes 6-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 7:15PM.

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