

**City of Salem Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, May 19, 2016**

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, May 19, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Annex, 120 Washington Street, Room 313, Salem, Massachusetts.

Chair Ben Anderson opened the meeting at 7:02 pm.

**I. ROLL CALL**

*Those present were:* Chair Ben Anderson, Helen Sides, Kirt Rieder, Noah Koretz, Bill Griset, Dale Yale, Carole Hamilton, Vice Chair Matt Venno and Tony Mataragas (arriving late)

*Absent:* None

*Also present:* Amanda Chiancola, Staff Planner, and Stacy Kilb, Planning Board Recording Clerk.

**II. REGULAR AGENDA**

- A. Location:** 81 HIGHLAND AVENUE; 108 JEFFERSON AVENUE; OLD ROAD; 1 DOVE AVENUE; 79 HIGHLAND AVENUE; 55 HIGHLAND AVENUE; AND 57 HIGHLAND AVENUE (Map 24, Lots 1, 2, 88, 19, 216, 218 220; and Map 14, Lot 129)

**Applicant:** NORTH SHORE MEDICAL CENTER, INC.

**Description:** A public hearing for a Site Plan Review, in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review; and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance with Salem Code of Ordinances Chapter 37. Specifically, the applicant proposes to construct a new Emergency Department/Inpatient Beds building, a new front Lobby expansion, renovation resulting in an addition of 119,735 square feet and repurposing of 119,734 square feet of interior space, internal driveway and parking modifications, landscape and hardscape improvements and utility infrastructure modifications to their existing campus.

Mr. Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St., Attorney, presents an introduction for the campus expansion plan, and describes their progress thus far. They have appeared before the Conservation Commission and will be appearing before the Zoning Board of Appeals, as any projects at the Hospital are required to present there. Mr. Correnti also mentions a proposed land swap with the City of Salem due to the logistics of the internal driveway.

Mr. Bob Norton, 138 Bridge St., Manchester, is the CEO of the Hospital. He outlines the reasons the expansion is necessary. There is a growing need in the population served, and consolidation of Union Hospital of Lynn has also prompted the need for expansion. Salem will thus be the main location, a hub for inpatient care for the area.

Mary Jo Gagon, Senior VP for hospital operations presents details of the North Shore Medical Center Expansion Project. Ms. Gagnon introduces Shelly Bisegna, Director of Project Management, as well as the rest of the team.

The need for expansion due to the proximity of Lynn and closure of Spaulding is detailed in a PowerPoint presentation. A new building will be added; that part will include the Emergency Room. It will also include an Observation Unit and two new inpatient floors. The Spaulding building will contain part of the new Emergency Department; Pediatric, Geriatric and Adult Psychiatry units will also be there.

Additional components are also outlined. These include a new front lobby, renovation of the old emergency department, a new MRI, and reconfiguration of the driveway. A bird's eye view of the current site is shown. The proposed access road is pointed out; this is where the land swap with the City will come into play (a small corner of a park near Bertram Field will be cut off). A schematic of the proposed project is shown.

Ms. Gagnon describes the reasoning for why Mechanical is on Level two. Site circulation for ambulances is described. Emergency Dept. (ED) visitors may also use that road though it is not intended as a main way in. A schematic of the ED layout is provided. The Davenport entrance is shown, and contrasted with the proposed entrance. How patients would access the various areas is described.

Additional slides and descriptions include:

Existing Davenport 4 (The “Wind tunnel”) Experience

Front Lobby Plan Diagram

Site Circulation – Visitors

Proposed Davenport 4 Entrance Experience

Angela Watson describes the design elements and materials via the following slides:

Proposed Davenport 4 Entrance Experience

New Front Lobby Elevations

View Coming up Dove Ave

View from Central Utility Plant

ED Building Texture

New ED/Beds Building Elevations

Full Civil Engineering and Traffic presentations are forthcoming; the City will also put in place peer reviews of those. Attorney Correnti concludes the overview. Helen Sides approves of a larger entrance on Jefferson Ave., but would also like to see the parking area there updated.

Kirt Rieder agrees with the above, feeling that the arrival experience overall could be much improved, and that landscaping along the Highland Ave. side would be a wise investment. He cites Salem Harbor Station (Footprint) as a good example, and Liberty Tree Mall as a negative example.

Carole Hamilton asks about the views from Davenport; the higher floors will still have a good view. Matt Venio thanks the applicant for investing in the community and like Kirt Rieder, agrees that it is an important resource. He asks about changes in ambulance arrivals; Highland Ave. and Jefferson Ave. will now both have entrances. He also asks about parking; the new building is going into a grassy area, but while there is a net loss of 88 spaces, ways to mitigate that will be explored; also the closure of Spaulding has impacted parking. Employee parking will also be reviewed. Chair Ben Anderson asks about changes in traffic patterns on Highland Ave. and Jefferson Ave.; there will be much more on the latter. He also indicates the importance of wayfinding during construction. Kirt Rieder also comments that wayfinding will be equally important after construction is completed, and wishes them to discuss parking utilization today vs. in the future.

Chair Anderson wonders how the closure of the hospital in Lynn will impact traffic here in Salem. Mr. Norton says that there will still be an emergency room presence in Lynn. Ms. Gagnon also describes other logistical factors that will affect traffic.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment.

William Legault describes previous efforts to renovate Bertram Field/Shaugnessy and the fact that it was difficult to deal with the Shaugnessy crew. Also, the applicant must be aware of the visual effect the facilities will have on nearby residents. He asks that they make campus attractive along all streets it faces.

Polly Wilbert of 7 Cedar St. is concerned about building infill and fire suppression.

Councilor at Large and Planning Board liaison Gerry Ryan thanks the hospital staff for their investment. He wonders about the land swap and Attorney Correnti confirms that it will require an act of the Legislature, as the Park Department, rather than the school, now has control of Bertram Field.

Tricia O'Brien, Executive Director of Parks, Recreation, and Community Services, states that this is on the agenda for New Business to be discussed on Tues. May 24.

Nina Cohen of 22 Chestnut St. agrees with Mr. Rieder; additionally she would like to see easily accessible bike paths and walkways as well as a path system and seating areas for employees who wish to go outside on breaks.

Noah Koretz was advised by state ethics commission to submit a 23(b)(3) disclosure as he now works for Mass Development, the conduit bond issuer financing for Partners, North Shore Medical's parent company. He has nothing to do with that process, and filed the notice with the Mayor's office and signed an affidavit stating he can perform his duties without conflict.

Helen sides made a motion to continue to the June 2, 2016 meeting, was seconded by Kirt Rieder, and the motion passed 8-0 with all in favor. (Tony Mataragas not yet present.)

**B. Location: 401 BRIDGE STREET (Map 25, Lot 74) and 44 Boston Street (Map 15, Lot 305)**

**Applicant: HIGH ROCK BRIDGE STREET, LLC**

**Description:** A continuance of a public hearing for amendments to the approved Site Plan Review, Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit and Special Permits associated with the North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review, Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District. The applicant requests the following Special Permit associated with the North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District (NRCC) Sections 8.4.5 and 8.4.13 North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District). Specifically, the applicant requests a Special Permit per Sec. 4.0 of the NRCC to allow a multi-story arrangement of a multi-family residential use. The applicant requests amendments to the following approved Special Permits of the NRCC: A Special Permit per Sec. 8.4.12 Retail Use of the NRCC to allow ground level retail use to be amended from the original decision to exceed the 3,000 gross square feet for one retailer. A Special Permit per Sec. 6.0 to be amended from the original decision to allow an eating and drinking place on the premises to reflect the new plan. The applicant proposes to construct two separate buildings including the Community Life Center, a two-story building, and a five-story mixed-use residential/retail on the corner of Boston and Bridge Street with an associated revised parking and landscape layout.

Mr. Joe Correnti, 63 Federal St., Attorney, presents for the applicant. Mr. Correnti feels that the few remaining issues from the last meeting have been resolved. Peer Review is complete and those requests will come up as conditions on the decision. No further presentation is being made; nor are there further

amendments to the plans. A draft decision had been requested at the last meeting but any questions the Board has will be answered.

Chair Ben Anderson comments on the project in general, outlining the progress, input and comments made by numerous entities. He feels it has been thoroughly reviewed, and commends the petitioner on his responsiveness. He feels project is far improved, in a process that was lengthy but effective. He feels that the project adheres to the following criteria from the NRCC master plan vision statement:

- Creates an Urban Village and Gateway to downtown
- Improves sidewalks and the pedestrian environment
- Includes a landmark building
- Attracts uses that will serve the local markets and complementary to existing businesses
- Places new buildings close to the street
- Supports improvements to existing properties
- Provides shared-use parking

He believes the project meets Section 8.4.1:

- Creates appropriate development while preserving our historic neighborhood character;
- Addresses transportation issues for existing and new developments;
- Enhances the public realm in keeping with our unique neighborhood character.

This project encourages the best use for the North River Canal Corridor physically, economically, environmentally, and socially while promoting the best interests of the residents of the city.

He believes the adverse effects of the proposed use will not outweigh its beneficial impacts to the City or the neighborhood.

- The project is a benefit to the city because Community needs which are served by the proposal;
- Traffic flow and safety, including parking and loading;
- Adequacy of utilities and other public services;
- Neighborhood character;
- Impacts on the natural environment including view; and
- Potential economic and fiscal impact, including impact on City services, tax base, and employment.

Having reviewed the criteria for site plan review he believes the project meets the following:

- Adequacy of parking facilities and number of parking spaces proposed for each development;
- Adequacy of loading facilities;
- Adequacy of traffic circulation system;
- Adequacy of access points and routes to and from the land parcel to adjoining streets and ways;
- Adequacy of type and amount of external lighting to be provided on the parcel;
- Adequacy of type, quality and quantity of landscaping to promote an aesthetically pleasing environment and to properly screen the development from adjacent land uses;
- Adequacy of type, quality and quantity of vegetative screening to protect adjacent and nearby land parcels from structures not aesthetically pleasing or wholly compatible with such parcels;

- Adequacy of the methods of disposal of sewage, refuse and other waste;
- Adequacy of the method of surface drainage across and from the site;
- Adequacy of the method of water distribution to and from the parcel and its structures;
- Adequacy of pedestrian circulation systems to and from parking areas and structures;
- Adequacy of protection or enhancement of natural areas;
- Compatibility of the architecture of structures with architecture of surrounding or nearby buildings.

Having considered all the above he feels this proposal is a benefit to the City and he plans on supporting it.

(Tony Mataragas arrives at 8:01PM)

Chair Anderson opens to public comment.

Joyce Wallace of 172 Federal St. asks about ram pile driving and protection for abutters. The applicant states that the foundation has not yet been designed but vibration monitoring will occur if needed.

Ken Wallace of 172 Federal St. asks if existing houses will be videoed if damaged, and also comments that there is a retaining wall that should be monitored.

John Russel of 16 Memorial Drive feels there is a need for this project to go through. Seniors deserve better than the current Center, and need is growing every year. Programs and staff exist but need a better space.

Elaine Milo of 181 Marlborough Rd, City Council and Liaison for the Council on Aging (COA), thanks the Board for their service. She echoes the comments of the Chair and supports the project, as it has evolved and needs to move forward. She also agrees with Mr. Russel.

Kay Walsh of 5 West Terrace outlines her background and reads a letter of support outlining the need for this project to go through. She had studied the need for a new Senior Center and submitted a proposal for one as far back as 1989-93. It is long overdue.

Two letters of public comment were received from Linda Coffill and Meg Twohey, et. al. and have been entered into the public record. A recommendation from the Design Review Board has also been received.

Jerry Ryan, Councillor at Large of 4 Nichols St. had originally voted against this particular site, but is now fully in support of this project as it is much improved over the original plans. He cites the need for this project going back as far as 1976 and asks about the time frame for completion.

Atty Correnti states that additional permitting is required as Conservation Commission approval is needed. There is a Zoning Board appeal, plus state permits must be completed but work on site prep etc. can continue as the processes go on. Tonight's approval is a huge step toward moving forward with the above items.

Patricia Zato of 10 Andrea St. works on the Age Friendly Initiative. Salem wants to be certified by the WHO as an age-friendly City. She describes what they need to do to put together a plan, which be sent in by end of Oct. Thus, it is extremely important that this go through tonight.

Toni Gaspard of 180 Federal St. would like assurances from the City that abutters will be supported and their historic homes protected.

Matt Venio asks about the creation of the foundation, piling, etc. and oversight of that since details are not before this Board tonight.

Lynn Duncan suggests wording for conditions requiring that once designed, plans for the foundation and building be submitted to the City Planner, so these questions may be addressed. She suggests they be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Lynn Duncan also suggests conditioning the monitoring of the retaining wall during construction, and submission of a report to the City Planner prior to issuing a Certificate of Occupancy.

Matt Venio also comments that he has a long history with this project, as outlined by Councilor Ryan. He describes the process in detail. He views it through the North River Canal Corridor Master Plan. While there will never be a “perfect project,” in any case, this project does reflect the vision of NRCC Zoning and Master Plan, in his opinion. He is in strong support of the project.

Chair Ben Anderson reviews the Site Plan Review Draft Decision by sections and pages.

Comments/questions/highlights:

Item number 2 stricken – request to allow eating/drinking establishment withdrawn

4: Fence height - wording change

p. 2: dates updated

p.3 (b): Clarifies Commercial use along the street

p. 4 (a) Ms. Chiancola clarifies

Matt Venio asks about DEP standards and Commercial use but Carole Hamilton points out that they are higher for residential.

Carole Hamilton asks what is being requested of the ZBA. The following variances/special permits are being sought:

- Curb cut
- Building entrance
- Mechanical equipment
- Density/minimum lot area per dwelling unit
- Buffer zone parking (still under analysis)

Design Review Board: Kirt Rieder asks where it says there shall be retail vs. if it is feasible on the ground floor. The DRB review is outlined and reasoning for the retail location explained. It will be in one of two places.

Kirt Rieder asks about crosswalks, and painting of these is part of the package that includes pedestrian signal implementation and improvements. A minor change “Design and location, *including crosswalks*, are to be submitted...” is made.

Lynn Duncan states that CLC is exempt because Salem is already a member of the North Shore Transportation Management Association.

There is some discussion on a Board of Health item re noise level increases on p. 8. Attorney Correnti has made an amendment, explaining that the boilerplate language would not be of use to abutters as the way it is worded, the noise level could be taken on Bridge Street at the property line. The wording now reflects that they will instead be taken at the nearest abutting residential property line, in order to actually protect the residents.

Carole Hamilton wonders if the residents of the actual new units will be affected by the noise levels. There will be a management company to address any issues that come up, but Attorney Correnti feels that the state-of-the art equipment will not cause any problems. He points out that residents of the new building are abutters of the CLC so this would also apply to them, for noises made by that building's equipment.

City Engineer (e) Conditions have been addressed, thus this item is no longer necessary.

Atty Correnti submits an email from the Fire Marshall confirming that a meeting with the project engineer has taken place and fire apparatus can access the site. The requirement for this submission shall be stricken because it has been obtained. The letter is read into the record.

Clerk of the Works: This is a new condition relating to subdivisions/phasing/seasonal work, so not applicable to this project; the term "each season" has been removed.

Ms. Duncan suggests adding the two conditions mentioned above here:

To address questions about how many piles: Information on construction approach to be submitted to the City Planner once the foundation is designed, including number of piles and confirmation that the Applicant will monitor vibrations during construction; to be submitted prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

Regarding the retaining wall: Applicant to submit photos documenting the condition of the retaining wall from the Applicant's side of the wall to the City Planner prior to the start of construction; monitor the condition of the retaining wall during construction; and submit monitoring report to the City Planner to confirm that it is still in satisfactory condition prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Chair Anderson opens to the public.

Meg Twohey of 122 Federal St. asks about the building height and gets clarification. She is also concerned about the Activities and Use Limitation on the site, but the Board feels that the language is such that the site may be developed residentially.

Barbara Cleary of 104 Federal St. asks for clarification that the food establishment mentioned in item 11q was deleted. She also asks about the density bonus; there will be the same total number of units (53 more than allowed) but the request for the variance will be reduced by 12.

Dana Andrews of 155 Federal St., asks about tide gates; they are to prevent the water from the North River from coming in and will stop water from coming back onto Bridge St. and upstream areas.

Carole Hamilton made a motion to close public comment, was seconded by Dale Yale, and the motion passes with all in favor, 9-0.

Matt Veno made a motion to approve the project as listed, was seconded by Carole Hamilton, and the motion passed in a roll call vote with Ben Anderson, Matt Veno, Kirt Rieder, Noah Koretz, Carole Hamilton, Dale Yale and Helen Sides all in favor (7-0).

Bill Griset and Tony Mataragas were not eligible to vote as they missed more than one meeting in which this project was discussed.

**C. Location:** 331-335 LAFAYETTE STREET, 5-7, and 11 WEST AVENUE (Map  
32 Lots 231, 232, 233, 234)

**Applicant:** 331 LAFAYETTE STREET, LLC

**Description:** A continuance of a public hearing for a Site Plan Review in accordance with Salem Zoning Ordinance Section 9.5 to allow the construction of a three-story 24,388 square foot mixed use commercial building with retail on the first floor and offices on the upper floors. An existing two-family home on the site will remain in its current use.

Scott Grover, Attorney, represents the applicant, Robert Burr, the Developer. Open items re building materials and landscaping have had plans submitted, and additional visuals are provided now. The Peer Review Engineer is also available to present. Scott Cameron, Civil Engineer, reviews the materials.

Kirt Rieder asks about two of the materials which are both listed as the wall cap and discussion of granite vs. concrete ensues. The applicant asks for the Board's clarification and Kirt Rieder outlines what is conventional. The applicant will consider any requests for changes that the Board makes. Mr. Rieder suggests that all of the cap be granite, as it would be more appropriate. Scott Cameron checks in with the developer, who agrees to make the change.

Stantec peer reviewer Alan Cloutier describes the logistics of the parking lot and the space. Certain spaces will propose difficulties. The Board wonders if the number of spaces will be reduced if they are angled. Mr. Cameron states that this is not a perfect site, and it has its challenges. The parking must be made to work without seeking dimensional relief. It meets zoning requirements. Some slight improvements were made but most people will be using the lot every day so will be familiar with it. He describes the changes made and feels this is an optimized use of the site. Mr. Cloutier does note that any further changes would reduce the number of parking spaces.

Attorney Grover notes that ZBA would not allow a parking variance, so the building size was actually reduced in order to comply with the parking requirements. The house remaining on the property also constrained the parking for the project.

Chair Anderson thanks the petitioner and believes it will be a successful project. Attorney Grover also appreciates the Board's efforts.

Carole Hamilton asks about the proposal for a right turn only lane; it was peer reviewed previously. She believes a right hand turn there will not work, but the road will be expanded to accommodate via the granting of an easement. Mr. Cameron outlines the design process and highlights the easement. This is listed as a condition in the decision.

Chair Ben Anderson opens to public comment.

Joyce Kenney of 285 Lafayette informs the board that on Wed. 335 Lafayette St. will be going under auction, so that the developer can make a bid.

Polly Wilbert of 7 Cedar St. comments on the right turn lane. She hopes it will NOT be a right turn on red, as drivers cannot see who is coming from the left. She would like signage indicating “no turn on red.” She is also concerned about the angle of the curb cut on Lafayette, but it is 90 degrees to the street. She also wonders about someone going the wrong way to exit the parking lot. The petitioner outlines how these issues and other parking lot issues will be addressed.

Noah Koretz made a motion to close the public hearing, was seconded by Helen Sides, and the motion passed with all in favor, 9-0.

The Chair reviews the Draft Decision.

Kirt Rieder comments on Landscaping adding a point (d) with the following language:

d) The planter retaining wall capstone, as illustrated in Landscape Details, shall be a 3” thick monolithic granite slab.

Dale Yale adds what will become item 13 to be inserted before the as-built plans: Standard Clerk of the Works condition: The developer shall fund a clerk of the works for inspectional services; the applicant agrees.

Kirt Rieder made a motion to approve the project proposal as amended, was seconded by Carole Hamilton, and the motion passed unanimously in a roll call vote with Chair Ben Anderson, Helen Sides, Kirt Rieder, Noah Koretz, Bill Griset, Dale Yale, Carole Hamilton, Matt Veno, Vice Chair and Tony Mataragas in favor. (9-0)

**D. Location: 70-92 ½ BOSTON STREET (Map 15, Lot 299 & Map 16, Lot 139) Applicant: 139 GROVE STREET REALTY TRUST**

**Description:** A continuance of a Site Plan Review, Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, Special Permits associated with the North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 9.5 Site Plan Review; Section 8.1 Flood Hazard Overlay District; Section 8.4 North River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District; and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance with Salem Code of Ordinances Chapter 37. Specifically, the applicant proposes the redevelopment of the former Flynntan site consisting of removal of three structures on the property, the construction of 50 residential dwelling units within two separate buildings and a commercial retail space with parking provided on the site.

Attorney Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St. represents Lar properties. An overview has been previously provided so tonight’s presentation will feature design and landscape architecture. Civil engineering will also be reviewed. The Peer Review process is also commencing.

Rich Sparages presents a Civil Engineering overview, referencing the plan as presented at the last meeting. The location of the Boston Street entrance and its proximity to Dunkin Donuts and the intersection is discussed at length. Traffic Review will provide additional perspective.

Matt Veno has mixed feelings about the traffic circle and wonders if a second entrance/exit could be added to address some issues. Mr. Sparages states that the grade difference from Boston St. to the property prohibits them from doing that. Noah Koretz asks for clarification about the circle, asking is it necessary since emergency vehicles should be able to access the buildings from the street since they both have street frontage. Noah Koretz had previously asked if it was even necessary to get fire truck onsite if both buildings have street frontage. Chair Ben Anderson comments that the fire Dept. will want to pull up to front entrance for a variety of reasons. Mr. Sparages also notes there is retail space on the interior side.

Also there are height and grade issues. An entrance/exit further from the intersection was considered, but would leave a “dead end” where residents would have to turn around if they found all spaces filled, so the circle eliminates that logistical challenge.

Noah Koretz feels very strongly that the second, larger building should have its front oriented toward Goodhue Street and the developer’s other apartments there. He comments that an inward facing site is not conducive toward the “urban village” feel indicated in the North River Canal Corridor Master Plan.

Atty Correnti asks for clarification on Noah Koretz’s suggestions. While he notes that the setup is not ideal, Kirt Rieder feels that it is more conducive to have both buildings facing Boston St., given all of the constraints of the site.

Matt Venio comments that an urban street edge is one issue to be addressed, most fulfilled when the building has a front on the street edge, but Kirt Rieder points out that it should be noted which street the “front” faces. Additional discussion ensues.

Attorney Correnti notes that some measures have been taken re facades and it will be vetted through the Design Review Board.

Tanya Carrera, the Architect, states that design has been submitted to the DRB and will be undergoing further review. The landscaping of the entrance circle is shown and it is described. Renderings of additional views are shown.

Chair Anderson points out a discrepancy in the sidewalk, which currently ends in the middle of Goodhue St. It will be extended to the edge of the applicant’s property (beyond that they have no control).

Additionally, extensive discussion ensues regarding the possibility of having the larger building facing Goodhue St. Noah Koretz feels very strongly about this. Chair Anderson comments that the Fire Department will have to weigh in but that in his experience they access buildings from the front. Mr. Sparages notes that it is obvious where front are, people will need to drop off, pick up, etc so circle is needed for proper circulation. Tony Mataragas comments that he is OK with the circle but while it makes sense for the renter/buyer not to have dead end parking, the proposed location of the entrance may not benefit street traffic. Noah Koretz says that the front of each building for pedestrians should be on the street edge that each building abuts. The point is to redefine where the front of each building is.

Blair Hines, Landscape Architect, describes those plans. He reiterates the challenges of the elevation discrepancy between Boston St. and Goodhue St. Landscape architecture should address those streets, foster residential living, and provide mitigation to abutters. He describes how those aims will be achieved. He notes the benefits of the circle and outlines the Goodhue St. garage lot entrance. Fencing and wall options are described.

Chair Ben Anderson asks about the intention of the retail use; the applicant is not certain what type of business will be there but feels, along with the Board, that it will probably not be successful. The possibility of putting the retail on Goodhue St. is discussed, though the City requested that it be on Boston St. Extensive discussion on this matter ensues.

While the applicant is including a retail component to meet an obligation, the Board feels that it should not be an afterthought. It is not meant to be an imposition, and should be well thought out to benefit the City and its residents.

Attorney Correnti states that the applicant will explore the concepts suggested; they have already explored multiple options before coming up with this one. He acknowledges that the project may be able to be improved, but much effort has gone into it. The issues have now become clear to the applicant and they will present other options. Current Zoning does not work on this site. That is the root of the issue. Right now they do not need a parking variance, and would like to maintain compliance as a variance would be difficult to obtain.

Kirt Rieder notes that entry cannot be shifted due to elevations of Boston St. and the site interior.

Helen Sides comments on the ideal setup of a certain set of townhouses in South Boston and approves of pulling this project back from an extremely busy location. She also agrees that retail there would not work. It will probably be internally used as office space.

Tony Mataragas comments that it has been mentioned that Goodhue St. should be made two-way; he wonders if that would open more options.

There is additional discussion of how to create the “urban village” feel envisioned by the NRCC, and of how to relate this to other nearby buildings. Chair Anderson comments that with upcoming development of additional housing, there is lots of potential. He suggests adding an entrance to the large building on Goodhue St., for two entrances.

Chair Anderson opens to the public but there is no public comment.

Jerry Ryan of 4 Nichols St. comments on how difficult the site is. While he understands mayor wishing the retail to be on Boston St., all other businesses are adjacent to the street whereas this one is set back. He thanks the developer for investing in Salem.

Helen Sides made a motion to continue to the June 2, 2016 meeting, was seconded by Noah Koretz, and the motion passed unanimously (9-0)

**E. Location: 162 FEDERAL STREET (Map 26 Lots 1 and 2)**

**Applicant: 162 FEDERAL STREET, LLC**

**Description:** Board discussion and vote on an application for endorsement of a plan believed not to require approval under the Subdivision Control Law (ANR), proposing to merge 12,025 square feet of Lot 2 with Lot 1.

Attorney Scott Grover represents the project. He has requested extensions of site plan review previously but does not believe it needs to be extended again. The developer of the convent into 8 residential condominiums must also acquire an adjacent parcel from the Archdiocese to accommodate access and parking. The piece in question will be exchanged for release of an easement. A simple Form A approval is hereby requested to separate lot 1 from the Archdiocese and merge it with 162 Federal St.

Carole Hamilton asks about depiction of parking for the site plan for the convent; Attorney Grover comments that parking was previously directly against the building, which lead to the agreement to acquire the site. There is now greenscaping proposed with parking farther away. The site plan was approved based on acquisition of the parcel.

Bill Griset made a motion to endorse the plan, was seconded by Dale Yale, and the motion passed unanimously (9-0).

- F. Location:** 14 and 16 ALMEDA STREET (Map 14 Lot 116 and Map 14 Lot 117)  
**Applicant:** TOWN AND COUNTRY HOMES, INC.  
**Description:** REVISION: The applicant requested a continuance to June 2, 2016 of the public hearing for a Definitive Subdivision Plan to construct a roadway to serve two existing undeveloped lots.

*Tony Mataragas made a motion to continue to the June 2, 2016 meeting, was seconded by Helen Sides, and the motion passed unanimously (9-0)*

### III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A.** May 5, 2016  
Tabled until the next meeting.

### IV. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

### V. ADJOURNMENT

*Tony Mataragas made a motion to adjourn, was seconded by Matt Veno, and the motion carried with all in favor, 9-0.*

The meeting ended at 10:48PM.

For actions where the decisions have not been fully written into these minutes, copies of the decisions have been posted separately by address or project at:

<http://www.salem.com/planning-board/webforms/planning-board-2016-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,  
Stacy Kilb, Substitute Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 06/02/2016

*Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A § 18-25 and City Ordinance § 2-2028 through § 2-2033.*