

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee: Design Review Board, Regular Meeting
Date and Time: Tuesday, December 20, 2016 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location: 120 Washington Street, Third Floor Conference Room
Members Present: Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Helen Sides, Christopher Dynia, Glenn Kennedy
Members Absent: Ernest DeMaio, J. Michael Sullivan
Others Present: Andrew Shapiro
Recorder: Colleen Anderson

Paul Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. **9-11 Dodge Street, 217-219 Washington Street and 231-251 Washington Street (Dodge Area LLC c/o RCG LLC):** Discussion and vote on 100% construction documents (final design review)

The submission under review includes; site plans showing possible locations for public art, revised perspectives, building section vignettes, and signage. David Steinberg and Andrew Zimmermann of RCG, LLC were present to discuss the 100% construction drawings and a signage concept. Kevin Burke of Burke Plus Designs was present to discuss the proposed signage.

Steinberg stated that the Board questions have been answered since the September presentation and site/street work is nearing completion. They will close on the City parcel near the end of 2016 / beginning of 2017. RCG, LLC has a purchase and sale agreement with the Hotel Group and should close on that deal in February of 2017.

Zimmermann stated that part one of the presentation will focus on the final construction plans and part two will focus on the different types of proposed signage. The previously discussed items were; 1) the flared stair between the hotel and mixed-use building, 2) alternative materials at the underside of the decks, 3) alternate location for the building directory, 4) revised lintel color on the Mill Hill Building, 5) possible public art locations, and 6) Washington Street sidewalk materials.

Zimmermann stated that three locations for public art have been narrowed down to two, A) at the Washington & Dodge Street corner and B) between the two buildings. Location B is on their land and location A is not, however; they are open to either although location A would have a bigger impact. The content of the art is unknown and a call to artists will be issued in the future. Commemorating the history of the site is also a possibility along Washington Street near the intersection of Canal Street, through engraving on the pavement or a plaque mounted in the landscape, although this is only a concept.

Zimmermann displayed the building section elevations/vignettes with additional detailing that had not been determined at the 50% review. Section 1) West Building: showed the retail facades and nichia paneling. Section 2) Building Connector at the residential Lobby:

showed a two story curtain wall, apartments at the upper level with cembrit panels and nichiha panels, proposed sunshades at the top level deck, and brushed metal window frames protruding from the façade. Section 3) the Mill Hill building: showed the granite base, storefront at the retail spaces, cembrit and nichiha paneling, a traditional brick façade, cembrit panels at the recessed top level, and a revised lintel color. There will be black framed single hung Anderson windows and black railings at the balconies. The underside and walking surface of all the decks will be Azek – Arbor Collection. The building transformer will be concealed with a permanent corten metal screen, in lieu of bollards painted yellow, that will double as signage.

Zimmermann noted that the building address will be on the face of the metal screen and in cut-out form on top of the entry canopy. A blade sign building directory listing the retail tenants and direction to the parking entrance has been relocated to above the storefront window rather than in the storefront window to make it visible to vehicle and pedestrians. The Dodge Street streetscape paving will have perpendicular banding, concrete on the City property for easy maintenance and pavers on the private property for a rainwater infiltration system.

Kennedy suggested that two public art locations be left open to either or both locations depending on the art proposed. Durand and Sides agreed. Kennedy suggested using either the Heritage or Vintage collection of Azek decking which resembles natural wood.

Jaquith suggested the use of a plaque for historic commemoration purposes as opposed to site paving. Durand and Kennedy agreed.

Durand opens public comment.

No one wishes to speak.

Durand closes public comment.

Shapiro stated that this is the last time this Board will review documents for this project, and this Board's recommendation will be given to the SRA. Proposed building and tenant signage, any substantial changes, and the hotel project, are the only items left for the DRB and SRA to review.

Kennedy: motion to recommend approval of the submitted 100% construction development documents, conditional upon the following:

1. The development shall be constructed in a manner that corresponds to plans reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board, dated December 1, 2016
2. All future additional or changed proposed signage for the building and tenants shall be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board and Salem Redevelopment Authority. Signage shall go through the proper permitting channels and comply with the City of Salem's sign ordinance.*
3. Any changes later made to the project deemed to be substantial in nature shall be submitted to the Design Review Board and Salem Redevelopment Authority for review and approval. Correspondence with the City of Salem's Director of Planning and Community Development shall lead to a determination of whether a proposed change is substantial.

Seconded by: Jacquith. Sides abstained. Passes 4-0.
Exterior Conceptual Signage

Zimmermann introduced Kevin Burke of Burke Plus Designs to discuss the proposed conceptual signage. The branding, locations, and sign types are they leaning towards for the exterior signage.

Burke stated that there are 3 aspects to the exterior signage package.

- 1) Main Building identification - building name and address
- 2) Wayfinding
- 3) Retail

Burke stated that there are minimal graphics for the exterior because it is a residential building that should fit into the neighborhood, however; the streetscape will be livened up where appropriate. There are 5 types of signage proposed. 1- The main building identity centralized to the pedestrian entrances to the residential building. 2- Directory signs such as the wayfinding sign at the flared stair between the two buildings and the large high sign at the Washington Street corner. 3- Retail signs along Washington Street. 4- Live/work retail signage. 5- Other public signage.

Burke noted that sign type 1 is the corten steel wall around the transformer that provides an opportunity for signage, such as laser cutting the address numbers and logo from the steel panels and reusing the cutouts above the entrance canopy. Branding signage will also be placed at the doors. Sign type 2 is on the opposite side of the building where there is an entrance to the residential parking deck and office parking possibly with its own Lobby where additional branding style signage will be used. Signage at both entrances will be different. The proposed location for the directory sign near the Washington Street corner is now above the storefront to maintain visibility for the retail space below. Its public parking aspect will be helpful for wayfinding so vehicular traffic can easily see it; it will highlight the retail tenants, and indicate the name of the building. It will be a double-sided perpendicular blade with external illumination with lighting in the top and bottom support bars to shine light onto the sign, and the tenant names will be replaceable panels. A freestanding pedestrian wayfinding sign will be placed in the garden at the bottom of the flared stair between the two buildings. Sign type 3 & 4 is the retail signage. Each retail and live/work tenant will have an address for easy fire department location as well as plate mounted blade style signage brackets with concealed bolts and light fixtures aimed at the signage. Each tenant will have guidelines to follow in terms of the design of their individual signage and the need for City approval of their proposed signage will be explained in their lease. Sign type 5 is the way finder at the rear to highlight the commercial and residential parking entrances. The commercial vehicle entrance will have a blade sign and the residential entrance a wall mounted sign.

Durand noted that sign type 1, the corten steel sign, is free standing. Shapiro noted that freestanding signs are not allowed within the Urban Renewal area, but inquired as to whether the corten screen wrapped to touch the building. Zimmermann noted that the corten steel sign does abut the wall and bench that enter into the residential Lobby. Based on that, Shapiro explained that he would not consider this to be a freestanding sign. Durand and Sides expressed approval of the sign as is. Shapiro added that directional signage is not a concern with this project because it is does not act as an advertisement. Sides asked if the corten steel sign will be lit. Zimmermann replied that it would backlit to highlight the numbering and lettering at night. Kennedy noted that this is a well-executed back-lit sign.

Burke discussed sign type 2, the panel signs attached directly to the wall from the parking area into the building. The residences will have a black sign and the office a white sign. Both will be flat aluminum signs. Burke noted that the logo design and name are not 100%

developed. Kennedy noted that the look of the “M” is a different type face, reads very light, and should be heavier on the black on white sign. Kennedy is in favor of this look and added that the three different wayfinding signs look somewhat similar, but not similar enough to read as a completed logo, although the logo has a nice look. The sign design concept needs to go further. The simplicity of the directional sign at the bottom of the flared stair works although a tab on the arrow would complete the look. Burke noted that the sans serif lettering is easier to read. Sides stated that she would prefer the “M” logo to be more different than the remaining text to make it more distinct. Kennedy agreed and noted that the spacing should allow the logo to read as two distinct words despite the enlarged “M.” Jaquith and Kennedy stated that they are in favor of the name.

Durand stated that the large directory sign near the Washington Street corner is high. Shapiro noted that this sign would require a variance, since signs cannot be higher than the top of the sills of the 2nd floor windows. The ZBA and SRA would also need to approve it. The larger building warrants a higher sign, especially since it will direct vehicular traffic toward the public parking lot. All Board members are in favor of the larger and higher sign. Burke noted that there will be no lighting within the sign but at night there will be street lighting adjacent to it.

All Board members are in favor of sign types 3 & 4, the blade signs at the retail and live/work areas. Shapiro asked if any further refinement would be happen to the signage package. Zimmermann replied that the sign package presented will be a part of the bid package and RCG will be providing the power and the brackets for them. Shapiro added that the total amount of square footage, other than the blade sign for retail signage for each tenant would need to be confirmed. Burke replied that there will be a double-sided blade sign, building mounted sign, the corner retail space will have two, on the doors the store hours and credit card stickers will be allowed. The address decal is a fire department requirement and doesn't qualify as retail signage. A packet on promoting their retail environment will be given to each tenant and signage within the store but within a certain range of the glass will be allowed. Tenant will need to present to the Board individually to get approval on their retail signage. Shapiro noted that an approval from the Board would be for a signage approach/concept only and any refinements to the plan would need to be reviewed by the Board.

Durand: Motion to recommend approval approval of the submitted signage plan for the building, which includes retail tenant placeholders, directional signage, and building signage. This recommendation is subject to the applicant seeking and receiving a variance from the City of Salem Board of Appeals for placement of the parking and tenant directory sign in the proposed location, which is higher than the City of Salem Sign ordinance allows.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 5-0.

North River Canal Corridor Projects Under Review

1. 9 South Mason Street, 3A Buffum Street Ext., and 23 Mason Street: Discussion and vote on proposed four building, 29 unit residential condominium development.

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

Shapiro introduced a letter to the Board from resident Nina Cohen regarding the proposed residential development.

McShera reviewed the Planning and DRB's comments regarding the modifications to the existing concrete building; the revised stair tower with its curtain wall and Alucobond panels, the massing and proportion of the proposed third floor addition, the eave lines, and the pitched roofs over the old loading docks which have been changed to flat roofs that are more harmonious with the overall building. The 3D rendering has been revised to show a light grey wash over the concrete with a charcoal and dark grey/black metal panel work.

McShera noted that the landscape plan has been revised to show additional vegetation and now coordinates with the civil and architectural plans. The corner of one loading dock patio was clipped to accommodate vehicular traffic and the South entry door and walkway now exit west. Trees and planting beds have also been called out on the site and the plan is now 75-80% completed. Shapiro noted that the Planning Board has a landscape architect that can conduct an in-depth review of the Site Plan. Durand stated that he is in favor of the additional greenspace on the Site Plan. Jaquith stated that there should be more greenspace in front of the buildings.

Kennedy asked if the transformer was still located at the entrance. McShera noted that it will be concealed with shrubbery and trees as the Board suggested. Kennedy asked if it was an existing transformer and if it could be moved. Tranos replied that there is an existing transformer on site, however; it has been located for service convenience and to keep it in a higher elevation because the site is in a flood zone. Jaquith noted that there should be bollards to protect it as well.

Shapiro asked if identification signage has been designed. Tranos replied that signage has not been designed or included in the submission. Shapiro noted that review and approval of signage by DRB will be a recommendation passed to the Planning Board.

Jaquith noted that the elevations and renderings still need some coordination. McShera stated that an alternate metal paneling material was suggested by the Board but they believe the Alucobond paneling is appropriate because a new material will emphasize that it is a new building. Durand replied that the new aspects seem too high-tech and not industrial.

Jaquith stated that the division wall at the third floor deck on top of the stair tower differs between the architectural plans and the renderings. Lowering the wall to a mullion line of the windows would be a better height. Durand and Kennedy agreed. McShera stated that the wall material is proposed as a horizontal cedar clapboard / rain screen system in a thin metal frame. Dynia asked if there will be railing around the third floor decks. McShera replied that the decks will be 1-2 steps down from the third floor level and the surrounding half wall is acting as the railing and the diving wall could be lower than what is shown. Jaquith added that a small landing/deeper first step, rather than exiting the door and immediately stepping down.

Shapiro noted this project has been through all other procedural reviews and that the Planning Board is waiting for the DRB's recommendation; he suggested applying conditions to the project for future revisions and/or issues and a final review of construction documents.

Concrete Building Review: Jaquith suggested that the 3rd floor dividing wall be no lower than 6'-6" and with a metal frame and the clapboard should be a natural toned wood. Sides and Durand are in favor of the design of the two new entrances. Dynia noted that the

canopies over the first floor deck project beyond the edge of the decks. Kennedy stated that the edge of the canopy should be in line with the edge of the deck at a maximum. Jaquith, Durand, Sides, and Kennedy agree.

Building 2 Review: Jaquith noted that the vertical boards need to be added to the rear elevations.

Building 3 Review: Jaquith noted that the vertical boards need to be added to the rear elevations.

Building 4 Review: Jaquith asked how the Kitchen hoods are being vented. Tranos replied the venting of hoods and microwaves hasn't been determined.

Transformer Review: Tranos stated that they can look into relocating it. Shapiro reiterated that the Planning Board must also approve the Site Plan. Tranos noted that a sign could be placed in front of it to conceal it.

Shapiro noted that Nina Cohen's letter referenes site circulation and mandating pedestrian access to the train station. The site could be redesigned to address these issues to review once it's been revised and it could be included in their recommendation to the Planning Board. Dynia noted that the site is landlocked. Shapiro added that neighboring land owners would need to agree upon river access to the park along the river. Sides added that the park does provide an alternative route to the train station. Shapiro added that the City would need to handle that matter and the City owned a parcel within the train station area. Tranos noted that he is trying to work with direct abutters to provide access.

Kennedy: motion to recommend approval of the proposed project at 9 South Mason Street, 3A Buffum Street Ext., and 23 Mason Street as modified by the applicant in plans presented at the meeting (landscape plan dated 12/20/16; floor plans dated 12/2/16).

As part of its recommendation, the DRB requests the following:

- 1.The partition walls between units on the third floor of building 1 (the concrete building) shall be lowered as much as possible so as to still provide adequate privacy, but shall be no lower than six (6) feet.
- 2.The canopies on the first floor of building 1 (the concrete building) shall project no further than the end of the decks over which they are installed.
- 3.All black and white plans/drawings shall align and match with the color renderings.
- 4.The applicant shall submit final construction plans to the Design Review Board (DRB) for its review and approval prior to obtaining a building permit.
- 5.All plans, materials and color samples shall be in accordance with those submitted to and approved by the DRB on December 20, 2016.
- 6.All future proposed signage shall be approved by the DRB prior to issuance of sign permits. The signage for the buildings and the site shall conform to the City of Salem's Sign Ordinance and NRCC zoning code.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 5-0.

Old/New Business

Approval of the minutes from the November 15, 2016 regular meeting.

Kennedy noted that changes have been made to the proposed Kokeshi signage; the storefront has increased by 8 feet since they have acquired another portion of the building which increased their square footage and frontage totals, the painted doll sign will be moved to the left of the garage door along with a vertical Kokeshi sign. The colors have also changes from blue, yellow, and white to red, white, and blue to match the interior.

Kennedy: Motion to approve the minutes as submitted.

Seconded by: Sides, Passes 5-0.

Adjournment

Sides: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Durand. Passes 5-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:00 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.