

<b>Board or Committee:</b>	<b>Design Review Board – Regular Meeting</b>
<b>Date and Time:</b>	<b>Wednesday, November 16, 2022, at 6:30 pm</b>
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	<b>Remote Participation via Zoom</b>
<b>DRB Members Present:</b>	<b>Chair Paul Durand, Glenn Kennedy, Catherine Miller, Marc Perras, Sarah Tarbet</b>
<b>DRB Members Absent:</b>	<b>David Jaquith, J. Michael Sullivan</b>
<b>Others Present:</b>	<b>Kate Newhall-Smith</b>
<b>Recorder:</b>	<b>Colleen Brewster</b>

Chair Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:30PM. Roll call was taken.

### **Signs in the Urban Renewal Area**

---

There are no sign applications to review.

### **Projects in the Urban Renewal Area**

---

1. **252 Bridge Street and 32-34 Federal Street:** Final Design Review – The Exchange Salem – Part 1: Redevelopment of 252 Bridge Street, the ‘Crescent Lot’ into a six-story mixed use building with approximately 7,325 square feet of commercial space, up to 120 residential units that will be offered at varying levels of affordability, creation of public spaces, and site improvements, *continued from 10/26/22.*

Ramie Schneider (WinnDevelopment), Steve Prestejohn (Cube3), and Michael Blier (Landscape Architect at Landworks Studio) were present to discuss the project.

Schneider stated that the color samples have been on display at the City Hall Annex for review. She noted that changes have been made that they feel address the concerns from the previous DRB meeting, such as creating four color pattern studies for DRB consideration and adjusting the landscape plan at the plaza on Bridge Street. They met with the Conservation Commission (CC) on October 27, 2022, November 15, 2022, and on November 17, 2022, they will go before the Planning Board (PB).

Prestejohn stated that the comments received on October 26, 2022, DRB meeting related to a successful “intermediate scale” along Bridge Street and a more successful light grey façade. The result of the color study was that the two-tones is preferred over a single color, preferably with a less randomized arrangement. More information was needed on the landscape plan regarding the interactions between the Bridge Street sidewalk and plaza/building, the exploration of including trees along Bridge Street, and the reduction of ragweed in the proposed flower mix.

#### **Bridge Street Landscape and Design**

Blier noted the desire to create strong urban connections and to foster connections between the Downtown, North Salem, and train station, and between Bridge Street and the MBTA drive by creating public minded civic spaces for people to be in and pass through. Recent changes include the curb line along Bridge Street by providing additional planting, which also better defines the pull-over zone. They’ve extended the green island

area to the sidewalk and added trees to prevent people from pulling over and parking further up the ramp. The sidewalk was increased from 5'-0" wide at its narrowest points to 6'-4" wide with integration of light pole stanchions. Where the plaza meets the sidewalk, they added a third connection closer to the pull-over zone which also provided more logical tree planting space and cadence into the plaza.

### Lower Plaza

They were previously asked to ensure that the granite stone monoliths would not interfere with the flow of traffic, so both the monoliths and trees have shifted to foster clear travel lanes and frame the proposed crosswalks. The sight lines were shifted slightly to ensure vehicular views were not being concealed. The team met with New England Roadside Plants and the roadside matrix was adjusted to include a more colorful and resilient planting palette without ragweed. He reiterated that three more oak trees are proposed along the street edge. They created several grass slope section drawings to better understand the grade changes between the rising sidewalk, the plaza, and the building.

### Bridge Street Architecture

Prestejohn stated that the building has four key viewpoints, and they want to ensure the Bridge Street façade responds to the far edges of the building. The goal was to use the design tactic on the east elevation that faces Washington Street and expand its presence along the Bridge Street façade. They played with the widths and proportions to ensure that nothing feels static, and a diverse grouping of planes where the individual units become identifiable and provide additional intermediate scale and dynamic shadow lines that were requested. Regarding the color schemes, Mr. Kennedy previously proposed a compelling thought to consider a more horizontal color patterning, which would emphasize the curvature along the North River façade, and the design team felt would be stronger than mixed patterning. After the alternate color study, they heard the importance of two-tone color, regardless of the direction the façade goes in. The lightest color was eliminated, and the two deeper color options were studied. They feel there is potential for the red tones given the panel height with less repetition but with the same configuration or alignment of striping at each floor level. He presented the 3D views of the three alternate color studies and noted that the planes in the façade would be no deeper than 18-inches and the changes in width would highlight the relationship between the two warm fields that incorporates the light grey massing at the base. The result has movement and is more dynamic at the middle tier and terminates along the western North Street façade. The dark red color scheme with the dark grey above and light grey below makes the building feel dark which they deliberately tried not to do.

Miller stated that the changes to the landscape plan were thoughtful and asked if the existing metal guardrail at the slip ramp would be removed. Prestejohn replied yes. Miller noted that the plaza connections would be mostly level with some slopes. Prestejohn noted that at the eastern most connection the ground slopes up.

Perras asked if there had always been a reveal between the sidewalk and the building and if it would get closer to the retaining wall. Prestejohn replied no, the spacing is consistent. Perras asked how that detail reads at the end of the building. Prestejohn replied that a cap condition would be required, which has been discussed but not detailed.

There will be an additional guardrail section to fill the gap. Perras noted his preference that the condition read as a reveal that is recessed, thought the use of a vertical panel before the end of the building. Miller suggested the bridge railing extend to block the opening. Prestejohn replied that there was an existing concrete pier that the guardrail ties into and their guardrail could tie into the opposite side of that pier.

Perras noted his surprise that his preference was not for the random color scheme, it was for the striped configuration, especially on the river facing façade. The two-tone red rendering is not something he can advocate for due to its darkness, although he preferred it in elevation and in person. He suggested making the patterns slightly different along Bridge Street which is more rectangular and regimented than the curved North River façade. He noted his preference for using a different pattern on each floor that still aligns with the windows.

Miller agreed with Perras, noted that the striping contextually resembles brick which is good and not a literal rebuilding of the courthouse across Bridge Street. She noted her preference that the rows are all the same height at an intermediate scale, and the highest a single row should be is two rows high.

Perras noted the precedent that has been set in Salem for a mix of brick and sandstone at the PEM, but the proposed renderings are too gloomy. Kennedy added that he likes the color study rendering because it shows much less of the building, but having it mixed with the other grey color makes him dislike the darker color combination and prefer the lighter combination. He also preferred the difference in the variation in the thickness of the colors and that the color ratio has the dark as more prevalent than light. He disagreed with Perras' suggestion of using a different color variation on the other side of the building and preferred that they simplify the design by making them the same. Perras suggested only the projected areas on the Bridge Street façade have darker coloring for some variation, because it would be difficult to incorporate too much variation due to the articulation along the facade. It has a different character and can support a different two-tone nature rather than stripes and it's worth exploring.

Tarbet stated her preference for the darker color combination and raised concerns about the shape of the columns and the soffit on the north side of the building, which are disengaged from the mass. She asked if the lighter grey was flush with the projection of the color. Prestejohn replied yes, but an eyebrow could be added across the top of the lighter grey to avoid a strange meeting of the two materials. Tarbet agreed with accentuating the material change. Prestejohn noted that one is shown in elevation but was not included in the renderings.

Miller asked if the vertical joints will be beveled. Prestejohn replied that the vertical joints would be smaller than the horizontal joints to meet manufacturer recommendations, potentially ¼" to enhance the course lines. Miller preferred more visible vertical joints which resemble stone. Chair Durand agreed that the vertical joints help break up the horizontality of such a long building and to provide texture. Perras suggested the control joints align with the window edges. The Board agreed.

Perras asked if the manufacturer provided any information on the curvature of the panel material. Prestejohn replied that the Hardie representative isn't aware of many buildings that have applied this paneling in this manner and the Hardie representative noted that the feedback from installers in the field was a minimum radius for a horizontally installed panel is 6-feet and tighter than expected, and the minimum radius proposed is 10-feet-8-inches. They would be installed on 1-inch furring strips spaced between 12 and 16-inches on center starting at the center of the panel working outward to bend the panel as they go, and the panels are in 8-foot lengths. The precedent photos provided by the representative were in such isolated areas as soffits and podium fasciae with approximate 20-foot radii rather than a curved façade so they were not incorporated into the presentation. Kennedy noted seeing a building in Germantown, Pennsylvania with a similar design.

Chair Durand asked if a mock-up would be provided. Schneider replied yes and suggested it become a condition. Chair Durand agreed.

Perras asked if they would be attached with face fasteners the same color as the panel. Prestejohn replied yes.

Newhall-Smith requested additional information on the red accent panels at the ends of the building that the Board liked. Prestejohn replied that the panels would come primed, and field painted with Sherwin Williams paint, and they are placed where the ends of the building will face outward and only on the lowest level of the west elevation because of the proximity of the material terminating above. Kennedy believed the single red accent panel on the west end takes things too far with so many other changes to the building design. Prestejohn agreed that if felt left over. Chair Durand noted that the panels were one of his favorite details and agreed that the lone panel is now singled out and suggest the color be toned down to a dark brown. Perras suggested painting the panel light grey even though it indicates plinth. Kennedy agreed.

Perras noted that the west elevation shows a gap between the building and the retaining wall. Prestejohn replied that a short knee wall would be placed off the face of that elevation at that location.

Public Comment:

Newhall-Smith stated that she received the following letter prior to the meeting.

1. Historic Salem, Inc. dated on November 16, 2022

Emily Udy, HSI. Generally pleased with the progression of the design, particularly the warm color and detailing. Their letter includes some comments, and they are curious about the dark grey color and the rendering not being accurate to the material board sample color. The elevation at the dark grey reads flat and she asked if it would be the same material as the 8'x1' panels to make it seem more horizontal and if some small articulation could be added to make the dark grey read less flat.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Prestejohn stated that the color sample will be the color used and lighting from the sun and reflectivity in the renderings makes them appear lighter and the sample in sunlight may appear lighter as well. All panel sizes would be 8-feet-long except for at windows. Kennedy believed the dark grey will not appear as dark as in the sample, colors in the 70-75% range tend to look darker, but the color may be in the 60-65% where the color will lighten. Chair Durand noted that the color can be determined in the mock-up. Perras believed the lack of articulation in the gray zone was intentional, so the warmer articulated areas are hanging off a monolithic grey element and he would not articulate it more than it has been. Prestejohn agreed and noted that they don't want the design to have too much going on.

Newhall-Smith requested confirmation of the board's decisions related to the color options and the striped pattern, which accent panels would be red vs. light grey, the columns along the north façade that were wrapped in the warm material, and the soffits. Chair Durand suggested the columns color be solid vs. stripped. Kennedy preferred the continuous striped pattern since the columns were stepped back and not flush with the façade above. Chair Durand noted that a rendering would be necessary if a solid column color were preferred. Perras requested the goal of this meeting. Newhall-Smith replied that as Final Design, a recommendation to the SRA is required for the final design elements. Chair Durand replied that the final colors could be determined in the mock-up during the Construction Document review and requested a 75% Construction Document review vs. 100% when there is still time to make final adjustments.

Newhall-Smith noted that she shared a draft mock-up statement for the Board to consider.

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to approve as presented: landscape plan, minor design changes to the architecture strategy including the lighter panel color with subtle stripes, to remove or change the red panel color, to investigate the west end condition where the building meets the retaining wall, and to consider solid color exterior columns along the north façade vs. the subtle stripes. Seconded by: Tarbet.

Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Tarbet, and Chair Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

2. **231 Essex Street:** Small Project Review – Remove six windows, replace three with new windows and restore and reinstall three at Rockafella's, continued from 10/26/22.

Juliana Silva was present to discuss the project.

Silva stated that the new window measurements now match the original windows and will be manufactured by Trimline. Newhall-Smith noted that the masonry opening dimension is 58-inches-wide and the muntins are 1-inch-wide. She noticed on the 2 over 2 windows, the frame width is 48-inches-wide but the original window is 51-inches-wide. Silva noted that the manufacturer doesn't customize windows larger than 48-inches-wide, and wood trim would be used to infill the space around the jamb, to match

the temporary windows, with 3-1/2-inches of trim on each side. Miller noted that the extra 3-inches of trim needed to fill the opening will not match the old windows. Silva noted that the mullions will be aligned and only 1-1/2-inches of additional trim on each side, which is a minimal difference. Chair Durand noted that the 3-inch discrepancy is a lot, and it will be visible. Miller believed the temporary windows did not have trim surrounding them, but the glass size is close to the existing windows. Silva believed the 1-1/2-inch difference would not be noticeable on the second floor.

Perras asked how situations where an owner was unable to find an exact match were handled. Newhall-Smith didn't recall that happening previously, but it may have occurred within an historic district, however, the DRB is allowed to deviate from exact matches.

Miller asked how the architects on the board felt about the proposed window manufacturer. Chair Durand and Perras replied that the window is okay. Perras believed the difference will not be noticeable and if the owner has exhausted their efforts and an exact replica is not available, he has no issue with proceeding with the selected window. Kennedy believed that although it wasn't ideal only a few people would notice the difference. Chair Durand praised the proposed consistency on the second floor.

Miller asked if matching the muntin size was favorable to the Board. Perras noted that matching the 1-inch muntin with was a greater concern to him because the difference would be noticeable. Chair Durand agreed. Silva noted that despite their efforts to match the original windows dimension they could not.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to approve as presented. Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Tabet, and Chair Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

Silva asked if windows could be ordered. Newhall-Smith replied that the application must also be approved by the SRA and windows ordered before their review would be done at your own risk.

3. **301 Essex Street:** Schematic Design Review – Erect a one-story addition above the existing building (known as Jerry's Army & Navy Store) with ten (10) residential units and twelve (12) onsite parking spaces located inside the building at the first-floor rear with retail space fronting on Essex Street

Michael Becker and Carissa Vitas (Owners) and Daniel Ricciarelli (Architect from Seger Architects) were present to discuss the project.

Ricciarelli presented early and current photos of the Classical Revival design with cast iron columns and cornice, brick parapet with finials, with dark brown aluminum windows installed in the 1980's. The structure always has been a 1-story building with a 16-foot-

high parapet. He presented photos of 4 and 5-story buildings in the area and noted the site's location in a B5 district which allows for a maximum height of 70-feet which is 6-story building. The existing plan is a 6,200 square-foot that occupies most of the site except for a narrow alleyway next to the Salem Inn on Summer Street, and it has a zero lot in except for a 5-foot setback at the rear.

Ricciarelli stated that most of the current site is retail, and the plan is to introduce ground floor parking at the rear of the site entranced along Summer Street with parking for 12 vehicles. A new overhead door for a double-loaded entrance is proposed to meet the parking requirements. The SRA requested more retail space and between 1,500-1,800 square-feet is now proposed and it will occupy the glazing along Summer and Essex Street. To be considered an existing building the first-floor townhomes will be introduced at the mezzanine level of the existing building, behind the parapet and the ground floor retail ceiling will be lowered. The parking meets the 1 to 1 ratio and two additional spaces have been provided off site. 10 townhomes are proposed, all with one bedroom and 1-1/2 baths. Becker noted that the floor plans have been revised since the last SRA meeting, but they will have the same general scheme. The existing roof will be removed, and the building will be inter-floored, and the first-floor level will match the parapet height. An interior atrium corridor is being introduced to provide more natural light and ventilation and each lower level of the townhome will have access to a private outdoor terrace behind the parapet.

Ricciarelli stated that the Essex Street elevation shows the 1-story addition with a glass façade that will be visible above the parapet with that will wrap around the corner to Summer Street and align with the storefront edge at grade below. The remainder of the upper Summer Street elevation will have a solid construction with punched openings correlating to the structure at grade, in keeping with the residential like the rest of Summer Street. The brick will be wrapped along a portion of the side facing Bonchon before switching to a simulated brick of a different material towards the rear where it will not be visible from the street. The existing building will be refurbished, the storefront glazing will be replaced, the parapets repaired, and the facades painted. The new overhead door along Summer Street and trim will be painted to match. The façade behind the parapet will be glazed to let in natural light and each terrace will have a setback of approximately 8-feet.

Ricciarelli noted that while the design is schematic, they met with the SRA on November 9, 2022, and they are taking clues from the existing building, window ratio and proportions, matching but not necessarily mimicking materials, to help inform the addition. The metal cornice and columns with a contemporary expression with a residential feel with deep insets to create shadow lines. The punched openings on Summer Street would be a better expression for that elevation with its residential feel.

Chair Durand asked if the units would be rental or condominiums and raised concerns with dictating curtains along the storefront glass. Becker replied that rentals and this is the last property in Salem within the 'Qualified Opportunities Zone.' Ricciarelli replied that they will have more control over that with rental units.

Chair Durand stated that he was in favor of the design and noted the letter from HSI requesting the building be taller, although the parking is limited.

Ricciarelli noted that the 6,000 square-foot full basement will be part of the retail space along with overflow for bike parking.

Tarbet asked if the inter-floor strategy was the driving force behind meeting the 1 to 1 parking ratio. Ricciarelli replied yes. Tarbet noted the transit connection and questioned whether the design revolving around parking was worth all the trouble given their inset and the creation of light well conditions, despite how well the design works because of the number of drawbacks. Kennedy agreed and noted that the design seems forced, but he doesn't see the connection to the structure below. Perras agreed with Tarbet and asked why the design team thought the revised plan was a better strategy, given the required structural adjustments with so little payoff. Becker replied that the roof would need to be restructured to incorporate the addition, so the recent changes were vastly different. Some ground floor headroom will be lost but most of that will be parking garage where high ceilings aren't necessary, zoning required a 5-foot setback along Bonchon, and the remaining setback were incorporated to create exclusive outdoor space for each unit and provide more natural light. Perras noted his intrigue on the terraced areas that are mostly glazed and his preference for only punched openings at all facades of the addition in keeping with the surrounding residential aesthetic rather than taking cues from the storefront below. He asked if every townhouse unit would have a terrace. Becker replied yes.

Ricciarelli stated that earlier SRA feedback, possibly from Christine Madore, include the suggestion to provide openings in the parapet wall, which they haven't incorporated yet, but believe it would be beneficial even with the amount of light possible with an 8-foot-deep terrace. Perras preferred the privacy of private terraces. Becker noted that the parapet would assist in blocking noise from the intersection below. Chair Durand was in favor of the concealed space that will block views of the items stored in that area.

Miller stated that the flowers growing on the wall in the rendering are not helping their case and shouldn't be shown. She preferred a brick façade, suggested the windows above were fighting with the windows below, and was in favor of a subtle setback with similar coloring. She was not in favor of new openings in the existing parapet and suggested a further restoration of the Essex Street façade rather than installing a new aluminum storefront. This is an opportunity to bring that façade back to life. Kennedy agreed with restoring the Essex Street façade because the two facades' design, windows, and parapet don't connect. Perras suggested the money spent on the curtain wall above be spent restoring the original storefront below and the punched openings wrap the entire building. Ricciarelli stated that the storefront below will be restored. Kennedy asked if the origin of the Essex Street addition design came from 281 Essex Street. Ricciarelli replied it came from the proportions and ratio of the storefront dimensions below. Kennedy agreed with Perras' comments. Chair Durand disagreed with Perras and added that the punched openings would be tremendously boring and would not create a great living situation. Ricciarelli suggested possibly including some pilaster expression to activate the elevation, he understands their point and it could be



studied. Kennedy suggested whether the façade should include one type of opening rather than both.

Becker requested feedback on the proposed height and massing with only one added story. Tarbet noted her preference for the previously proposed height and noted the start contrast as it relates to the context of the street, in terms of mass and how it allows the street edge to disintegrate at the corner by stepping back when the surroundings are so tall. The design is acontextual and not working. Kennedy noted his preference for a three-story building and an addition aligned with the street edge and not stepped back. As a highly used entrance into downtown Salem the design should be more substantial. Chair Durand agreed and noted that the existing building is underwhelming from all perspectives, from the original architecture to the rundown facades. Kennedy added that it feels as though it should be bigger. Miller noted that from an urban design standpoint, it is a lost opportunity if it doesn't relate to the building across the street and the design should signify the entrance into downtown Salem. Ricciarelli replied that a bigger massing is where the design started, but they have been backed into a corner due to zoning regulations and a bigger building requires a variance which is a long process that may not be granted.

Becker asked if the Board would prefer to see the front of the addition coplanar or just behind the parapet wall. Perras noted the Board's preference for the overall footprint extruded up but not the stepping back, even though he is in favor of the terraces. He preferred an internal terrace. Kennedy agreed. Chair Durand noted the hard aesthetic to step back from and to consider successful despite also being in favor of the terraces. Becker noted an earlier scheme that was sighter to the parapet on Essex Street and stepped back along Summer Street and along Bonchon, but they were concerned with the asymmetry. Kennedy suggested construction tight to the wall along Essex and Summer and stepping back terraces along the Salem Inn, but not relating to the corner across the street seems off.

Ricciarelli stated that they will increase the massing and they will consider whether the units remain townhomes or become a different scheme, and they understand the importance of the building and this corner.

Public Comment:

Newhall-Smith stated that she received the following letter prior to the meeting.

1. Historic Salem, Inc. dated on November 8, 2022, to the SRA.

Emily Udy, HSI. HSI has watched the project evolve for many months and met with the design group to provide feedback. Knowing the process this project went through with the SRA the current flood plan is an elegant solution to getting 10 townhouse units in the building, the parking layout has improved, as well as the amount of retail space in this historically commercial building. While hesitant to recap the SRA's comments, she recalled their lengthy discussion and the submission of a shorter building whose height was thoroughly discussed. Rather than continuing to hold up the project at the SRA they

referred it to the DRB to flesh out the height and massing concerns. The proposal for a taller addition related well to the existing building and a shorter building loses that connection, but the addition should complement the existing building, and perhaps the SRA should have finished addressing the height issue. They agreed that the building to be taller, so it fits within the urban scale and suggested at the SRA meeting that all ceiling heights be increased to gain height without changing the townhouse layout. They also appreciated the comments regarding moving the plane to the second floor. The strength of bring the vertical elements into the visible areas of the addition is successful and they would prefer that element remain even if the amount of glazing is reduced.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Newhall-Smith stated that the SRA appreciated the taller building but not the design. They acknowledged that the parking requirements aren't necessarily appropriate in this location and there was the idea that if the SRA found the design appropriate for the downtown that they could be in support of a variance for parking. They asked the design team to create a plan where parking wasn't a concern and that may be why the lower story building is currently proposed. She noted that the parking layout has improved, and the retail square footage has increased, but the building is shorter. She believed the SRA wasn't excited by the building design, but they felt the DRB could recommend adjustments to the design but also see more height.

Perras stated that the DRB seems to agree with the SRA and despite the applicant's hesitance for seeking a variance, a lot of effort has gone into the design without a substantive design that is necessary on that corner. He requested suggestions on what to ask for along with a continuance.

Becker noted his desire for a building people are excited about and requested clarification on whether adding one story to give the building more presence and raised concerns with a one story addition being referred from the SRA to the DRB and returning to the SRA with a higher story building that didn't request. Ricciarelli noted that the Board seems to be in favor of more massing and that a variance requires a hardship, which creates risk. The SRA also had concerns with the cantilever which they eliminated but they could incorporate all the changes into one revised design. Vitas stated that the design must also make financial sense for them, as the smaller project did, while a larger building must include an elevator and additional egresses.

Miller stated the building must either fit into the urban design or be the most beautiful small building it could possibly be, and she didn't believe it was in either place yet. The smaller size may work best financially for them, but she would be interested in seeing a larger building that fits.

**VOTE:** Miller: Motion to continue to the December 21, 2022, meeting. Seconded by: Perras.

Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Tarbet, and Chair Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

4. **23 Summer Street:** Request for review of proposed changes to approved elevation plans. Proposed changes to the East elevation include the removal of two ground floor windows with the installation of a vent, the removal of a third-floor balcony and the installation of two windows, and reconfiguration of the second-floor windows; the proposed change to the South elevation is the removal of two ground floor windows

Michael Becker and Carissa Vitas (Owners) were present to discuss the project.

Newhall-Smith stated that the applicant recently revised the plans showing those elevations.

Becker stated that along Summer Street a third-floor window increased to meet egress requirements as the balcony windows were increased to match the scale. On the Norman Street elevation, the third and second floor window were increased to meet egress requirements, two first floor windows were removed because the openings would allow the light from vehicle headlines to shine onto the 27 Summer Street lot which will be developed in the future. On the east elevation, a second balcony in a third-floor unit was removed because of redundancy and it would provide a direct sightline into a bedroom at 27 Summer Street. The overall rhythm of the windows was revised for symmetry, only one vent at the parking area is required for ventilation but two were added for symmetry, and the remaining first floor windows corresponded to parking and headlights, so they were eliminated. At the north elevation, a single first-floor window was added, two second-floor windows became double windows to meet ventilation requirements, and a second-floor single window was eliminated.

Perras asked if the windows, trim, and color would be matched. Becker replied yes, but due to the additions proximity to the lot lines the structure will need to be fire rated and Hardie siding with no texture with 4-inch exposure to match the existing clapboards, seamed at the edge of the original building, and the entire building will be repainted.

Miller noted that both the north and east elevations will be less visible than the west and south. Becker noted that the edge of the addition will be 14 feet away from the proposed building at 38 Norman Street.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to approve as submitted. Seconded by: Tarbet.

Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Tarbet, and Chair Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

Newhall-Smith noted that the project will go before the SRA on December 14, 2022.

### **Projects Outside the Urban Renewal Area**

---

There are no projects outside the Urban Renewal area to review.

## **New / Old Business**

---

1. Board Elections:
  - a. Chair
  - b. Vice Chair

Due to lack of board members present the vote was continued to the next regular meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes:
  - a. October 26, 2022

Continued to the next regular meeting.

3. Staff Updates, if any:

Newhall-Smith noted Perras alerted her to that fact that the American Flatbread sign had been installed but not been permitted when they changed ownership. Perras noted that the lattice fencing placed in front of Village Tavern was also not permitted.

Miller asked if the DRB has previously reviewed the design at 301 Essex Street. Newhall-Smith replied that the SRA had been reviewing it for several months, but tonight was the first time it has been reviewed by the DRB.

## **Adjournment**

Tarbet: Motion to adjourn. Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Tarbet, and Chair Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

The meeting is adjourned at 8:45PM.

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