

<b>Board or Committee:</b>	<b>Design Review Board – Regular Meeting</b>
<b>Date and Time:</b>	<b>Wednesday, October 25, 2023 at 6:00 pm</b>
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	<b>Remote Participation via Zoom</b>
<b>DRB Members Present:</b>	<b>Chair Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Catherine Miller, Marc Perras, J. Michael Sullivan, Sarah Tarbet</b>
<b>DRB Members Absent:</b>	<b>None</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 6:00PM. Roll call was taken.

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

---

There are no sign applications to review.

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

---

- 1. 23 Summer Street:** Modification of Approved Design – Request to remove slate roof and replace it with GAF Slateline fiberglass/asphalt shingle and request to change from Hardie siding to LP Smart Siding, *continued from 6/28/23*.

Mike Becker was present to discuss the project.

Becker stated that the LP Smart Siding had a long lead time, so they opted to use the originally approved Hardi siding and trim, half of which has been installed. They reframed the roof with LVL's to support the slate on the building, much of the slate was spalling and cracked, but they salvaged enough to patch the remaining three sides. They also framed the two new skylights on the east and added some additional loft square footage. Becker requested to replace the east roof with Slateline shingles which is largely obscured by the addition. Chair Durand agreed that that roof was minimally visible.

David Jaquith joined the meeting.

Perras requested a photo further down Norman Street of the east roof and noted that the alternative would be to install slate roof; however, asphalt is less costly, the roof will be less visible, and with less of a chance of leaking at the skylights. Kennedy noted making a site visit of his own where the roof was mostly visible when coming down Summer Street, almost no visibility from Essex Street, and limited visibility from Norman Street means that the contrast between materials would be mostly obscured. He noted that the current slate roof looks out of place with the new shingles on the addition and there is no way to keep the continuity. He is concerned that the Board wants to save the slate for the sake of it rather than for design purposes. He suggested that they are trying to save the wrong thing for the right reason when he would rather keep the design continuity of the other details and proposed that the entire roof be changed to the asphalt shingle.

Chair Durand agreed that the east roof was minimally visible. Perras noted that the DRB is charged with making the addition look different and not match the existing. Kennedy replied that they are not doing any favors by trying to save the existing roof when the new roof looks better.

Perras asked if there was enough slate to blend three of the four sides. Becker replied that the east roof could be obscured to conceal the faded areas of slate, but there is currently buckling roof sheathing and missing shingles.

Becker presented a photo from the southeast corner showing the minimally visible east side roof. Perras was convinced that the east side should have asphalt shingles, but the other three sides of the slate roof should be repaired. Becker noted that the reframed roof can support a slate roof and Lou Sirianni provided a source to replace the roof caps to conceal the dissimilar material. Miller asked if the original details be replaced in kind. Becker replied yes, noting a fifth ridge that leaks and can be repaired using a cricket behind the chimney, if he is allowed to install one.

Public Comment:

Newhall-Smith noted that HSI resubmitted their previous letter with no changes.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Kennedy noted that his point of view was related to aesthetics.

Becker asked if a cricket could be added behind the west chimney. Chair Durand, Kennedy and Miller supported adding a cricket.

Sullivan noted that HSI wanted all the roofs to be slate, as they were before, but he was in favor of adding a cricket.

**VOTE:** Miller: Motion to approve slate roofing on three sides, asphalt shingles on the east side, ridge detail to match the traditional metal capping, and the addition of a cricket behind the west side chimney. Seconded by: Sullivan.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy – no on slate and yes on cricket, Miller, Perras, Sullivan, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 6-0.

Newhall-Smith noted that the application will be reviewed by the SRA on November 8, 2023.

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

---

- 1. 16 Franklin Street:** North River Canal Corridor – Design review of amended elevations.

Attorney Joe Correnti, Bob Griffin, Marc Tranos (Owner), and Mark Yanowitz were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Correnti stated that the former Ferris Junkyard, now called Bay View Station, was approved 5 years ago. They've continued with local and state permits, and all permits have been obtained. The old garage and office were demolished, the site is being flattened, the construction fence is up, and they retained the architectural firm LYF to improve and modernize the proposed design.

Yanowitz noted that there has been no change in the footprint of the four buildings, only minor adjustments, including raised planters at the building entries. The unit count, general massing, and building height are also unchanged. The revised elevations included color differences, and several code issues were addressed resulting in interior changes and change in window configurations with casement and awnings style for variation.

The Planning Board (PB) Site Plan decision included a desire to improve the design, include townhomes, and more variation. The townhomes facing Franklin Street are identical and provide more transparency at the second-floor deck, and by using a combination of horizontal and vertical siding, board and batten clad, and horizontal lap siding in alternating colors to provide elevation interest. They lowered the scale of the deck from the side and roof slop above the master bedroom. The large cornice was undefined, so they eliminated odd floating items, made the façade less boxy, alternated the colors to break up the massing, and incorporated metal siding with a wood grain appearance to provide some warmth. They are seeking DRB comments on the amended design, which they believe further enhances the site.

Perras asked why the project was being reviewed again. Newhall-Smith replied that they went through the NRCC review process 5+ years ago, but they are returning because they are requesting an amendment to the approval primarily for the façade changes and some landscaping changes. Atty. Correnti added that it was a determination by the City Planner that this be an amendment, so they went before the PB two weeks ago, and the project was referred to the DRB.

Jaquith stated that the older scheme is better than the new scheme because it had a mill building appearance. He was also not a fan of the ground floor shed addition. Yanowitz replied that the shed houses the fire suppression system that was previously included but was never added to the earlier renderings. Jaquith suggested adding a second floor to provide more square footage to the second floor and noted that the landscaping has improved.

Perras agreed with Jaquith, noting that some strengths of the previous renderings have been lost, the vertical details were out of scale, suggested the use of the same color but with a different texture. He noted that the old scheme has accentuated corner boards that have been lost and the futuristic expression of verticality doesn't work as well. He liked the materials better but preferred the forms and details of the older scheme, noting the design has lost the charm it once had.

Miller asked when the PB requested the list of items to be changed. Yanowitz replied that it was vague feedback and recommendations from their previous decision, including breaking up the massing at the townhouses and adding color. Miller noted that during her time on the Board, buildings with certain contextual details, such as the use of brick and clapboards at Halstead are held to a higher standard, and create the least public uproar, adding that she was not in favor of a woodgrain siding.

Tarbet agreed that the metal and wood photorealistic siding isn't a great product, a new modern aesthetic is good and is somewhere in between what was previously approved and what is now proposed. The design should be pushed but this is not it. The old scheme had a relationship of fenestration that was more digestible, despite the interior layout and this design seems to have fewer windows and the bright white makes the façade look stark. Sullivan agreed and noted that the project was controversial when reviewed with significant neighborhood involvement. The context is part of the mill area and in a residential area of Salem and he's uncomfortable which changing the aesthetic direction so significantly.

Perras asked about the plinth material at the garage level. Yanowitz replied that it was split face block with a dark stucco base, noting that the entire first floor could be split face to provide simplicity to the podium construction and infilled area vs. solid masonry only at the garage. The louvers are for ventilation, but you can see through them at night when light is behind them. Perras advocated for simplifying the expression and using one material at the base, such as brick, which is favorable, because a bottom band of masonry with a layer of stucco then siding is too layered. He suggested cladding the stairways rather than making using vertical metal with the wood-like image at the deck areas for warmth. He suggested the façade have intentional banding from a programmatic and usage standpoint, possibly with a wood soffit at the occupied zone at the building exterior. Applying a different material to the stairway confuses the intentions in both areas.

Kennedy agreed with the Board, preferred the window massing of previous version, noted that the 4<sup>th</sup> floor separation and vertical feel is too much, and suggested they are seeing more contrast from the rendering than what would exist, especially with the texture of the white vertical siding. He added that there is too much contrast between the two colors and favored the use of a natural material being added and less vertical alignment.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand agreed with most Board comments.

Atty Correnti stated that they will return to PB in November, who will want the DRB's recommendation and comments. They will want to digest the feedback received tonight and will return to the DRB in November. Newhall-Smith stated that the next DRB

meeting is November 15, 2023, and new materials will need to be filed by November 3<sup>rd</sup> although she agreed to extend that to November 9<sup>th</sup> due to the tight timeline.

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to continue to November 15, 2023. Seconded by: Jaquith.  
Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sullivan, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor.  
Passes 7-0.

## **New / Old Business**

---

1. Approval of Minutes:
  - a. September 27, 2023

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to approve the September 27, 2023, meeting minutes. Seconded by: Sullivan.

Roll Call: Jaquith abstained due to absence, Kennedy abstained due to absence, Miller, Perras, Sullivan, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0, 2 abstained.

2. Staff Updates, if any:

Newhall-Smith stated that they are seeking to update the sign manual and looking for feedback on her draft project proposal. She notes that whatever changes they make to the manual must not conflict with the sign ordinance. The Board agreed to review the proposal and offer feedback at the next regular meeting. Kennedy suggested noting potential changes to influence future sign ordinance changes. Newhall-Smith noted that the city could review those changes when it is ready to update the ordinance.

3. **Other:**

Perras thanked Newhall-Smith for looking into the removal of the temporary sign across from the PEM offices. Newhall-Smith noted that PEM staff reviewed the signage ordinance as it relates to the Bat Box and they realized that they shouldn't have done it, and they may present alternative signage to the DRB for future exhibits. She noted that the building by Goodnight Fatty's is a PEM building which has a vinyl sign and they will determine an alternative signage to highlight their current exhibits. This matter could be addressed in an updated sign manual.

Perras noted the removal of heritage trail signage by The Real Pirates.

Perras stated that the Barrio's sign is larger than anticipated. Kennedy was in favor of the sign and noted that the signage over the former Kokeshi doll is also larger than anticipated but it looks good.

Miller stated that Whimsey has installed their sign at the old Maria's ice cream shop

Kennedy stated that Texture also installed their sign.

## **Adjournment**

Perras: Motion to adjourn. Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sullivan, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 7-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 7:20PM.

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