

**City of Salem Massachusetts  
Public Meeting Minutes**

<b>Board or Committee:</b>	<b>Design Review Board, Regular Meeting</b>
<b>Date and Time:</b>	<b>Wednesday, October 26, 2016 at 6:00 pm</b>
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	<b>120 Washington Street, Third Floor Conference Room</b>
<b>Members Present:</b>	<b>Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Helen Sides, J. Michael Sullivan</b>
<b>Members Absent:</b>	<b>Ernest DeMaio, Christopher Dynia, Glenn Kennedy</b>
<b>Others Present:</b>	<b>Andrew Shapiro, Economic Development Planner</b>
<b>Recorder:</b>	<b>Colleen Anderson</b>

Paul Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:10 PM.

**Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review**

---

1. **234 Essex Street (Army Barracks):** Discussion and vote on proposed installation of window signage.

The submission under review includes; a signed application, sign dimensions, and photos showing the proposed signage. Sean Linguos of Army Barracks was present on behalf of the applicant.

Shapiro stated that the proposed low vinyl window decals will match the existing awnings mounted on the storefront in both background and font color. The signs will be placed on windows along Essex Street only. The decals will be 6.25 inches high and 41 and 44 inches wide and will replace the existing decals, which were erected without permission. Shapiro noted that the signs are compliant with both the signage code and commercial design guidelines.

Jaquith asked if the proposed colors were standard colors that match their Saugus location. Linguos replied that all 7 locations use the same colors. Durand noted that the font size/width changed due to the longer words used. Kennedy suggested using just the priority words and rearranging the words on the sign so they will fit using the same text size. Durand agrees.

Jaquith: Motion to approve the proposed signage as long as the font is kept the same.  
Seconded by: Sullivan. Passes 4-0.

2. **300-302 Essex Street:** Discussion and vote on proposed installation of new windows and doors (both front and rear elevations), and replacement of siding (rear elevation only).

Shapiro noted that the applicant has requested a continuance.

Jaquith: Motion to approve the continuance request to a future date.  
Seconded by: Kennedy. Passes 4-0.

**North River Canal Corridor Projects Under Review**

---

3. **9 South Mason Street, 3A Buffum Street Ext., and 23 Mason Street:** Discussion and vote on proposed four building, 29 unit residential development.

The submission under review includes; project overview packet with NRCC statements, and a full set of building plans; site development survey, landscape plan, floor plans, elevations, and existing and proposed perspectives. Ryan McShera, Architect, of Red Barn Architecture and Mark Tranos of Jupiter Point were present to discuss the proposed project.

McShera stated that the site includes one (1) three-story three-family structure and an existing concrete structure in the middle of the site. The site is in an area that transition from the surrounding commercial properties to the adjacent residential area further along Buffum Street. Vehicular access to the site exists and large portions of the site have been developed or paved.

McShera stated that the existing concrete building will be redeveloped to include 10 units, a mixture of townhouses and flats. The other three buildings will be townhouses with similar details. An addition will be added to the end of the existing three-family, and the second building will be new construction added on to an existing structure. A third will also be new construction but will be L-shaped. The detailing of the new facades will resemble the details of the existing residential neighborhood with; 2 ½ - 3 stories, doghouse dormers, box bay window, protruding gable ends at the front façades.

McShera stated that the existing concrete structure in the center of the site is slightly higher and the proposed design has changed since it was initially submitted to the Planning Board for review. Planning challenged them to keep this structure unique and find details of it to accentuate. A study of similar building styles was done to determine what would be best to keep. It was determined that it would be best to; maintain the overall industrial nature of the building, keep the oversized windows and grill pattern, thin the eave/parapet, and to mimic the look of the loading dock and create outdoor space for all of the first floor units. New building elements will consist of; new stair towers whose look will mimic that of the existing building, new stucco and repairs to the existing CMU, and to highlight the new third floor addition in a different material. The new third floor will become the upper levels to townhouses that begin on the second floor and the first floor will be flats.

Sullivan asked if it was important the exterior wall of the new third floor match up with the walls of the existing wall below. McShera replied that that hasn't been determined but they could be reduced to include third floor patios. Sullivan noted that the mass of that building is boxy and upper level patios would provide some relief to the mass of the structure and added that he is in favor of the look of this building over the look of the others. Tranos replied that the building, which was a former ice cream factory, was originally re-designed with third floor outdoor space but they wanted the input of the various Boards before including it. Sullivan noted that the lack of greenspace around it doesn't help to separate it from the other buildings on the site. Durand noted that lack of greenspace will help its industrial character stand-out. Kennedy noted that the color is trying to tie into the other buildings too much and the yellow could be an accent color. A difference in color will accentuate its boxiness and make it stand out. McShera noted that a metal panel is proposed for the top level which would help differentiate it from the other buildings. Kennedy noted that the grill of the third floor windows could also vary to break up the façade. Durand suggested that using a more industrial/modern glass to lighten the look of the third floor would work.

Jaquith asked how many parking spaces there would be per unit. Shapiro replied that is 1 ½ spaces because part of the parcel is industrial, which is outside of the NRCC so fewer

than 2 spaces per unit is allowed. Tranos noted that less than two is preferred because it will allow for more greenspace. Sullivan asked if there was an easement for access to the water side of the site. Tranos replied that they are trying to but it would also become a liability issue that would result in a decrease in land value. Sullivan asked if there would be parallel parking spaces next to the central building. McShera replied yes and bollards would be used to protect the building. Jaquith asked about the amount of greenspace around the central building.

Jaquith stated that there appears to be too much snow storage. The portico over the doors, dormers, and break lines could be varied to break up the very repetitive façade. Jaquith asked how much of the existing three-family will remain. McShera replied that it would be taken down to the studs but the finished product will match the proposed façade. Jaquith stated that the end units could also be varied, but not necessarily symmetrical, to also break up the repetitive façade. Sullivan asked what the new siding material will be. McShera replied hardiplank clapboards and hardiplank shingle at the dormers. Sullivan asked for more detail at the stairs leading up to the townhouse. McShera replied that they will consist of composite columns, composite stairs, traditional style handrails, and latticework below the stairs. Sullivan stated his concern for vehicles approaching those stairs, although there is some buffer with the walkways, but also with the parallel parking next to the central industrial building. McShera replied that bollards will be placed around the central building and there is also a 2 foot planting bed between the walkways and the townhouses. Sullivan asked if areas for bikes storage. McShera replied that the Planning Board mentioned it but it hasn't been included yet. Durand suggested moving some of the parking to the greenspace areas to get them away from the central building. Tranos replied that it has been considered.

Jaquith asked if the transformer would be relocated away from the entrance. Tranos replied it is the proposed location but it could be relocated. Shapiro asked if a landscape plan would be developed. McShera replied Kurt Reader from the Planning Board has made suggestions and they will continue to develop it. Shapiro noted that The DRB could leave it for the Planning Board to review. Shapiro asked about site lighting. McShera replied that lighting has been included on the civil drawings to include; post lights, wall sconces, and recessed lighting under the portico entries, but no other building lighting will be proposed. McShera replied that it cut sheets on lighting can be provided. Shapiro stated that signage would also need to be reviewed by the DRB at a future meeting.

Jaquith: Motion to continue the discussion until the next regularly scheduled meeting on November 15, 2016.

Seconded by: Sullivan. Passes 4-0.

## **Old/New Business**

---

Approval of the minutes from the September 28, 2016 regular meeting.

Durand: Motion to approve.

Seconded by: Jaquith, Passes 4-0.

## ***Adjournment***

Durand: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 4-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 7:00 PM

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