

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board & Salem Redevelopment Authority, Joint Meeting Design Review Board, Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, July 26, 2017 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	120 Washington Street, Third Floor Conference Room
DRB Members Present:	Ernest DeMaio, Glenn Kennedy, Chair Paul Durand, Chris Dyna, David Jaquith, J. Michael Sullivan
DRB Members Absent:	Helen Sides
SRA Members Present:	Chair Grace Harrington, Christine Madore, Dean Rubin, Russell Vickers
SRA Members Absent:	David Guarino
Others Present:	Tom Daniel – Director of Planning and Community Development
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

SRA Chairperson Grace Harrington calls the meeting to order. Roll call was taken.

Projects Under Review

1. 32-50 Federal Street (Superior Court and County Commissioners Building):
Discussion and vote on proposed mothballing procedure

Daniel stated that when the mothballing of the Superior Court and County Commissioners Building was discussed by the SRA in 2014, the SRA requested that the DRB have an opportunity to review the plans. Given the new SRA board members, tonight's meeting was an opportunity for SRA members to review of the mothballing plan as well. Gail Rosenberg, DCAMM Project Manager, was present to discuss the project and is updating the feasibility study for the property.

Rosenberg stated that the buildings are unoccupied. A different project manager is managing the construction and the design is almost complete.

Jim Kelly-Rand, the project architect from Perry Dean Rogers provided an overview of the project. The exterior study from 2012-2013 completed by Perry Dean determined that the exterior brick was spalling, sheering, and cracking on both buildings. The exterior woodwork also showed signs of deterioration due to the weather and lack of maintenance. Study results called for exterior repointing and replacing the exterior cracked brickwork, however; the spalling bricks do not warrant replacement at this time. The mothballing will entail closing up the windows to protect the existing woodwork and keeping the site secure from break-ins and damage. The downspouts will be replaced and the storm lines will be cleaned out to the street and closed up.

David Jaquith arrived.

The proposed site enclosure will be a 6 foot high perimeter security fence set 3 feet inboard of the existing walls and curbs, with fence options of either black PVC coated chain link or a black aluminum picket fence.

Rosenberg stated that contractors will install a temporary fence and the buildings will be occupied by security personnel from 7PM-7AM; there will also be personnel that drive by the property during the day, 7 days a week.

Tom Daniel noted that work will commence in fall of 2017. DCAMM is seeking comments on the type of fence, boarding up of the windows, and tuck-pointing of brick.

DeMaio asked if the buildings were heated and if they had sprinklers. Rosenberg replied yes the buildings are heated and but that there are no sprinklers, however; there is a standpipe in the main stairwell.

Vickers asked about the source of the heating. Rosenberg replied that there is a furnace and the heating was separated from the Family and Probate Court.

DeMaio asked if the buildings had any exterior lighting to help with security and safety, and noted that the exterior brick repair mortar should match the existing mortar. Rosenberg replied that exterior lighting is unknown at this time.

Sullivan asked what the temporary window design would be. Kelly-Rand replied that a shadow line of the faux window will be painted onto the plywood.

Glenn Kennedy arrived.

Madore asked if the fence was necessary and noted that it will impact the street space and the fence should be given as much attention as the faux window design. She asked if another fence in downtown Salem is worth the visual impact. Rosenberg replied that it is a policy for DCAMM to add perimeter fencing but she will determine if it is necessary. Sullivan noted that this is an opportunity to improve the condition of the sidewalk and suggested the fourth fence type that DCAMM is proposing, although stone pylons in the first propose fence will also fit in Salem. Vickers noted that some structures without perimeter fencing have had fires in the past. Durand suggested that fence be in line with the front face of the building and not at the street edge to maintain the street scape.

Madore asked if there are existing security cameras. Rosenberg replied yes, although it is unknown if they are functional and who monitors them.

Vickers asked why there are exhaust fans in windows. Rosenberg replied that there are humidistat fans to prevent mold growth.

Durand asked if an existing alarm system was in place. Rosenberg replied yes, it is linked to the DCAMM Central Office and reiterated that there will be security on site between 7PM and 7AM. Vickers noted that the Salem Police should be added to emergency alarms due to their proximity.

Rosenberg replied that she will determine if there is night sight lighting, she will make sure the repair mortar color to matches, and will determine if a fence is necessary.

Daniel noted that Gail Rosenberg's responses to all questions will be sent to all Board members. Regarding the separate feasibility study, he stated that when it is completed it will be presented to the SRA.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Polly Wilbert, 7 Cedar Street. Suggested that the fence be tighter to building, the City should plant more trees on the block, the Salem Police should provide their input on that street and the security risk the building poses, and foot traffic during the day and night should lower the risk of any problems.

Steve Immerman, 20 Federal Street. Noted that there are visual concerns to the City with such a long term redevelopment. Daniel noted that the revised DCAMM report is due back in September but the redevelopment could last 4 years. There may be clarifications to the legislation needed as well.

Tim Jenkins, 18 Broad Street. Asked about the current condition of roofs. Kelly-Rand replied that the County Commissioners building copper roof requires some minor repairs and there is no sign of leaking. Some EPDM being replaced at top of Superior Court building to ensure it stays dry and some missing slate pieces will be replaced. Jenkins also noted the landscaping: weeds and overgrowth will require maintenance. Vickers replied that a maintenance plan will be submitted to the SRA.

As a State project, it is not subject to SRA approval; however, the comments were welcomed. As no approval was being sought, no vote was taken.

Chair Grace Harrington: Motion to adjourn the joint meeting. Seconded by: Glenn Kennedy

Regular DRB meeting commenced.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. 10 Derby Square, Unit NB (Derby Square Architects) and 10 Derby Square, Unit S1 (Sperling Interactive): Discussion and vote on proposed installation of blade signs.

Richard Griffin of Derby Square Architects and Michael Sperling of Sperling Interactive were present to discuss their respective projects.

Griffin stated that two tenants are eligible for signage. The condo building had guidelines to follow that would require the DRB needs to approve. The original approved sign had a portrait orientation, however; both tenants now want a landscape orientation. The sign will consist of a brushed aluminum plate with etched text and an anodized aluminum backer fastened to wall with expansion bolts. The bottom of sign will be at 8 feet above grade and top will align with the buildings masonry headers.

Sullivan asked if the sign will be the same size. Griffin replied yes.

Kennedy asked if the awnings would be removed. Sperling replied yes.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to approve installation of two blade signs.
Seconded by: Kennedy. Passes 6-0.

2. 125 Washington Street (Ledger): Discussion and vote on proposed enclosure for dumpsters.

Brett Danahy of Ledger was present to discuss the proposed dumpster enclosure.

Danahy stated that the most durable fence would be black chain link with steel post and black slats. Cedar will provide for 100% screening, however; chain link would work best for their budget. Photos have been provided that show the two sides of planter remaining to provide additional support for the new fence. Ledger has switched to 100% kiln dried wood to eliminate the scent of smoke for its neighbors and all wood will be stored inside. Kennedy noted that he prefers cedar which would need to be stained and treated yearly.

Danahy noted that the rear entry sidewalk needs to be redesigned to provide proper handicapped accessibility and to make it easier to move trash bins in and out of the building, which was mentioned in the cover letter provided.

DeMaio noted that the cedar calls more attention to itself although the fence near Red's is barely visible because of its dark stain.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Daniel read a letter from Kathy Lique who would prefer a cedar fence.

Jodie Salasny of 141 Washington Street, Unit 7. Preferred a cedar fence because they have a view into from the back alley.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to approve cedar with dark stain.
Seconded by: Sullivan. Passes 6-0.

3. Mayor Jean A. Levesque Community Life Center: Discussion and vote on construction documents.

Dan Skolski, managing principal of DMS Design, LLC was present to discuss the project. Tom McGarrigle representing High Rock and Peter Terrat from DSM Design were also present.

Skolski stated that they were taking over the design process for this building and are 80% complete with the Construction Documents. New utility lines are being installed underground on Bridge Street to maintain construction equipment accessibility on site. The floor plans and elevations have been submitted and changes from the previously submitted plans are; one door was moved on the East elevation to change a stair egress, flashing detail over a covered entry, and three windows lost 6" in height on the West elevation. The footprint, massing, height, colors, materials all have not changed. The City has requested small changes to the floor plan in relation to the code review, such as moving partitions. There has been minimal settling on their side of the site and they hope to start the foundation work in August.

Sullivan asked for the cornice depth. Skolski replied approximately 3 feet.

Jaquith asked if there will be rooftop equipment. Skolski replied 5 units, 4-5 feet high, will be placed towards the center of the structure. Some 4 foot high photovoltaics will also be placed on the roof, the quantity is not yet known. Their locations have been determined but not finalized and they are installed at a low angle. Sullivan noted that they have an angle of 20 degree maximum. Jaquith noted that neighbors will have screening concerns as they have in the past. Skolski noted that an 8-10" high cornice will help conceal all rooftop equipment and the 4-5 foot high elevator penthouse.

DeMaio noted that cut sheets for all building and site lighting will need to be submitted.

Sullivan asked if the large box near the street is a transformer. Skolski replied yes, it will be placed on a pad and screened on street side.

Dynia asked if there is bicycle storage. Skolski replied no.

Chair Durand stated that revised plans showing rooftop units and screening need to be provided and asked for a proposed timeline. McGarrigle replied that the intended start date is mid-late August depending on National Grid schedule to place wiring underground. They will file for a permit within 2 weeks. Foundation permit has been submitted and they are awaiting approval and the anticipated duration of construction is approximately 9 months.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Polly Wilbert, 7 Cedar Street. Asked about the parking lot size, asked if bollard will be placed between the sidewalk and the building along Bridge Street for safety. Skolski replied that 30% of overall parking lot is meant for the CLC building and the need for bollards will be determined.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Kennedy suggested that the arborvitaes should be spaced out because their large size may overwhelm the space.

Chair Durand suggested the Board approve what they can so the design can move forward and have a special meeting to review missing items when the design is 100% complete. McGarrigle reiterated that they will submit for a permit ASAP.

Chair Durand: Motion to approve design as submitted pending review of photovoltaic equipment, rooftop equipment, and screening, elevator height, and lighting.
Seconded by: Kennedy. Passes 6-0.

4. 65 Washington Street "Salem District Court" (Diamond Sinacori, LLC and Urban Spaces, LLC): Continued discussion and vote on schematic design review for proposed development project.

Steve Tise, Architect, and Jeff Hirsch, Project Manager, of Tise Design Associates were present to discuss the proposed project.

Tise noted that the Board has previous concerns with the base of building that was overly traditional, too opaque, and out of character with remainder of building. They've looked for a different style and treatment, the storefront facades have been modified, and the planter design has been revised to lessen the visual access into the storefront. Changes to the projecting cornice were studied but it has not changed. A traffic study is being conducted.

Hirsch noted that there have been no changes to the program or unit count. The foundations will still be reused for parking. Ground floor treatment; 2 benches were added to Federal Street façade, 24" square brick piers have been placed at the entrances and corner Washington & Church Street corner, all other steel columns have been enclosed with metal. The storefront entrance facade has been extended further down Washington Street towards Federal Street and the sidewalk at the retail entrance has been widened from 5 to 13 feet. The trash area has been placed in corner at Federal and Washington Streets and the brick courses at that corner are periodically recessed. An 8" stone lintel has been added at the second floor, the upper floors have not changed except for minor detailing at the roof terrace. The proposed awning color has changed and the boxed awnings are now in a slimmer blade style. The glazing at the entrances has been made more visible.

Tise noted that in addition to the 24" brick columns the intermediate columns are galvanized and 16" deep. The planters have a 24" wide, 12" deep, and the top is at 42" above the finished floor, with iron pickets below. The parapet is a signature element that they kept and the brackets may become structural.

Durand asked if the window treatments will be legislated by condominium. Hirsch replied that they exterior panels will be uniform/standard and the interiors can be determined by occupant.

Sullivan suggests that the openings at the garage remain but that the material change. Tise replied that the recessed panels at the garage will be enclosed but they can be backlit. The fencing returns at each bench location and the condominium will be responsible for maintaining the strip of land along Federal Street.

Sullivan asked if the rear façade will receive the same cornice overhang. Tise replied no, the rear is all bathrooms and kitchens which have minimal windows.

Tise noted that the brass or bronze medallions remain in the facade between window openings at each floor.

Sullivan asked why the window layout is different on each side of the Washington Street façade. Tise replied that the corner unit towards Federal Street has a different layout which adds a third window between the bays as opposed to the 2 windows between the bays towards Church Street. The exterior corner of the living room at Federal Street will be glass.

Daniel read 6 comments/emails submitted to the DRB.

- Donna Burnam, Pickman Street. The structure is too big and doesn't conform or fit into Salem.
- Steve Caron, Cousins Street. The design is not attractive or in keeping in architecture of the surrounding buildings. The building should be evocative to the history of Salem.

- Patricia Donohue – The proposed structure doesn't reflect Salem's historic architecture, it ruins the streetscape, it will be a disservice to Salem if it moves forward, it is overpowering and out of place.
- Deborah Prentice of 16 Hardy Street. It doesn't work with the architecture in Salem, it is out of scale, looks cheap, doesn't fit with built environment and will be around for years to come. Why did Diamond Sinacori switch the design. This project was granted on the original rendering which is not what is currently proposed. If they can't do it someone else can. Please reject proposal because it doesn't work here.
- Stan Franzeen of 34 Daniels Street. The design is inconsistent with character of city, it should be less obtrusive to the surrounding buildings and church. It should be reduced in height, the flat roof should be replaced with 3 pitched roofs.
- Nina Cohen of 22 Chestnut Street. Designing a building that fosters an inviting pedestrian environment at the street level is key. Planning should underscore this goal. Schematic design for a building with parking on the ground floor must enhance the pedestrian environment on Washington St., Federal Street and Church St. One solution is to require the developer to create space on the first floor for restaurants or cafes. At a minimum, the proposed development should not be approved absent a design that includes 1,000 sf of restaurant or retail space on the building's Washington St façade. Sidewalk width is another key issue, particularly given the height of this development. Fifteen to 20 feet of sidewalk setback is required to ensure the sidewalk is wide enough to accommodate flow traffic into downtown, seated café patrons and people entering the condo building. This setback is consistent with other new developments in downtown. DRB should mandate shade and rain canopies on Washington St that are continuous and uninterrupted, and the same on Federal and Church St. sidewalks. Every new residential complex must provide bicycle racks for residents that are protected from the rain. These can be inside the first-floor garage or under a canopy.

Tise replied that the project has 3,000 SF of retail and there will be bike storage in the garage.

Kennedy note that replies to those comments should be included into their review.

Jaquith stated that he is bothered by roof overhang which draws one's eyes up, some of the letter comments submitted are zoning issues, the building should be designed for a 2017 building, and the base changes are an improvement. Dynia agrees.

Dynia noted that brick at the Federal corner seems too continuous and has no visual interest; there should be a tie-in of the metal cladding to create visual interest. Sullivan and Dynia agree that brick will make that corner extremely dark at night if not lighting is added.

Kennedy stated that the revised base coloring is an improvement as are the materials. More glazing is good as the entrance should be more contemporary to fit upper floors, the materials should be pushed further, and the material at the Washington & Church Streets corner make it feel slick and like there is more glazing. It forces your eye up.

Tise noted that the solid corner at Washington and Federal Street anchors the corner and helps make that transition into commercial.

Jaquith suggested that high windows be added at the trash area to break up the all brick facade at that corner. Kennedy suggested more of material change.

Kennedy noted that the parking needs to remain and to keep that first level layout at 2 feet above grade the parking must be raised 2 feet above sidewalk level so the base will be large. Tise added that 1-1 parking is best for marketing so that need to keep that ratio.

Tise noted that they need to move past the Schematic Design phase so the other details can be determined.

DeMaio understands purpose for the brick at the corner, wished the motif was carried around the corner, is in favor of the transparency at the base, but doesn't understand the columns between retail spaces.

Tise responded explaining the material choices and approach. Tise noted that there will be a Site Plan Review soon. There will be rooftop screening but 4 different types of units are currently being reviewed.

Sullivan is in favor with lower floor changes, encourages historic building corner treatment research, and the three sides overhang is troubling on what will be one of the tallest buildings in the neighborhood. Tise noted that eliminating the overhang brackets made it look ordinary and historic buildings have overhangs, the cornice visually increases the height, and other buildings put cornices on a floor lower or set back the roof area which is what they have somewhat achieved with so much glass at top level. An easement with the Church street abutter will be needed and he has offered to work with them. Chair Durand is in favor of the three sided overhang.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Jessica Herbert, Salem Historic Commission. The Historic Commission will meet on August 2nd to review the project and they will submit their comments to the DRB. She is concerned with the penthouse mechanicals, agrees that the window treatments should be under condominium jurisdiction, and with the placement of artwork on the corner of Washington and Federal Streets. Tise noted that those details will be determined and the corner artwork will be determined.

Tim Jenkins, 18 Broad Street. Commends the extension of and moving the retail façade to the building edge. The Federal Street corner needs some treatment and the banding helps but suggests that older details be applied. The overhang at the backside could be overdone and should be worked out. The streetscape on Federal Street seems too suburban and fencing limits access which will make it accessible and inviting. Tise replied that the Washington Street has storefronts and a repetitive look and they are looking to liven up the Federal Street wall.

Polly Wilbert, 7 Cedar Street. Relationship with building is with the brick and it doesn't fit and neither does the cornice. It doesn't look like it belongs in Salem when looking down Washington Street from MBTA station. Respect what has been here to make it feel welcoming. Consider the pedestrian and vehicle experience.

Bill Uhouse, 28 C Federal Street. Resides in the units in the building across Federal Street. This design is overwhelming for his building. Courtyards are behind their fence and its intended to soften and be sensitive to the surrounding buildings. Agrees with many of the comments submitted and believes those comments should be considered. The cornice treatment alienates this building from Salem and another treatment should be sought. Overall design should pay homage to downtown Salem and Washington Street. Is in favor of the brick mass to anchor the Federal Street corner. Would like to see a revised shadow study with the current model and how the shadow lines will affect their side of Federal

Street. Projects don't have to be completed according to what zoning says. Jaquith replied that massing is a zoning ordinance that has not been changed.

Daniel noted that the DRB will make a recommendation to the SRA. After SRA approval it will also go before the Planning Board for the PUD.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Durand suggests that they continue to review ground floor.

Kennedy: Motion to approve Schematic Design and continue Design Development material/detail to the next regularly scheduled meeting - to discuss ground floor, cornice, signage, materials, (mass and footprint will not change)

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Minutes

The minutes from the June 28, 2017 regular meeting were reviewed.

Kennedy: Motion to approve the minutes.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 4-0.

New Business

Daniel distributed the Commercial Design Guidelines given to members. As was discussed at a prior DRB meeting, the Planning Board has been considering expanding the role of the DRB to site plan review in the Entrance Corridors. Paul Durand was part of a recent discussion where the potential thresholds were discussed. The proposal is that new nonresidential construction of 10,000 square feet or more in an Entrance Corridor would require DRB review before the Planning Board took action. For new nonresidential projects 2,000-9,999 square feet, the Planning Board would decide if DRB review was needed. Residential development of 6 or more units would also be referred to the DRB. Mayor Driscoll is supportive of the change. The Commercial Design Guidelines would be used when reviewing projects in the Entrance Corridors. Staff would like to have the DRB review the Guidelines and provide comment on any gaps or areas for improvement. The expanded role of the DRB would need to be made through a change to City ordinances.

Adjournment

Kennedy: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

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 2-2033.