

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board, Special Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, May 27, 2020 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	Remote Participation via Zoom
DRB Members Present:	Chair Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Catherine Miller, Marc Perras, Helen Sides
DRB Members Absent:	J. Michael Sullivan
Others Present:	Kate Newhall-Smith
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

Chair Paul Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:00PM. Roll call was taken.

Signs

1. 30 Church Street (Hive & Forge): Request to withdraw without prejudice

Jaquith: Motion to approve request to withdraw without prejudice.

Seconded by: Sides.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, and Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

2. 73 Lafayette Street (North Shore Bank Signage): Discussion and vote on signage.
Revised plans not submitted.

Newhall-Smith stated that the applicant received approval for the main signs by the DRB and Building Inspector, they were asked to return for the ATM sign and other window signage, and the blue & white mid-band signage that they wanted to blend better, but they haven't returned her phone call. Chair Durand suggested they be withdrawn without prejudice.

Miller: Motion to withdrawal the applicant without prejudice.

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, and Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

3. 193 Washington Street: East Boston Savings Bank (Continued from April 22, 2020)

Mike Brewster of Barlow Signs was present to discuss the project.

Brewster stated that after a discussion with their client they reduced the size of the two-sided signage by 14-inches in height and 36-inches in length, to allow more space around the sign. They changed the proposed lighting to halo which allowed them to use black lettering for contrast. The logo will be face-lit halo lighting to highlight the definition of the compass. They felt this was the best solution for the Board recommendations.

Sides asked if the Board was okay with turning three horizontal panels into one large panel. Chair Durand replied that at the last meeting the Board became comfortable with

this change. The Board agreed that the proposed is easier to read and a pleasant addition to the building.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to approve the proposed signage as submitted.

Seconded by: Sides.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, and Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

4. 72 Flint Street (Halstead Salem Station Apartments Sign): Discussion and vote on signage (Continued from April 22, 2020)

Attorney Michael Spillane representing the owner, Tom Mazza owner, and Bronwyn Hershberg were present to discuss the project.

Spillane stated that they used the Boards feedback and revised the sign by reducing the size, lowering the 'H', extended the length, condensed the text, and shortened the length of the brick base. Hershberg stated that the sign location is still on the right side of the drive aisle when exiting the property, the Halstead 'H' is now fully on the main body of the sign, the lettering was spaced out to make it easier to read, they shortened the brick base from 132-inches to 114-inches and the height was also reduced. The sign and I beam will be entirely aluminum with a baked enamel finish for durability. They surveyed other mutli-family monument signage in Salem, but many are street front with signage on the building, so there were few that compared. The proposed sign creates a great sense of entry. Spillane added that the Board previously suggested going to the ZBA for a sign size variance, but the proposed sign is within the NRCC district allowable square footage at 29.75 square feet where the maximum is 32.5 square feet. A sign size variance is no longer required.

Miller stated that the sign looks to be cramped within its designated space and a 6-foot-high x 9-foot-long sign will obstruct the view of drivers leaving the site. She suggested placing it at the other side of the concrete walkway and moving it two feet away from the sidewalk on Flint Street and foundation plantings can be placed along the front edge. It would be more appropriate and create a safer intersection.

Sides stated that although it meets the ZBA requirements it's still too large, placed too close to pedestrians and could be under 5-feet-high. It's extremely visible and the buildings speak for themselves.

Jaquith stated that the lettering still isn't right. The 'S' is curved and should protrude to the left of the 'H' in Halstead, the reverse is happening on the right side with the 'N' in station protruding past the 'D' in Halstead. The spacing at the word 'APARTMENTS' also isn't quite right but the use of similar lettering is an improvement. He agreed with Sides that the sign is too large and with Miller that the sign should be on the opposite side of the walkway to see around it.

Miller added that placing the sign beyond the walkway and 2 feet away from the sidewalk would also make it safer the pedestrians and driving that need to make a left onto Flint Street since driver can drive down the hill at a high rate of speed.

Mazza stated that the difficulty with placing the sign on the opposite side of the walkway is the requirement of the public parking spaces for the residents. Part of the requirement was to create a landscape buffer between the concrete walkway and the public parking for the Flintsteed neighbors. Chair Durand replied that the angling of the sign in the planting plan alleviates some of the blocking of traffic views. Hershberg noted that the angled sign isn't visible to drivers coming down Flint Street. Mazza added that this is why they selected this location over others. Chair Durand stated that it does have an impact on visibility which is a real problem. The Board agreed.

Perras suggested the plantings be rearranged to place the sign on the opposite side of the walkway. Mazza replied that there were size limitations and other concerns discussed at the time of Site Plan approval but they will review the sign locations internally, including moving it to the opposite side of the driveway, and return to the Board for review. The Board was open to placing the sign on the other side of the driveway entrance where more visibility is created. Miller suggested they include all planting and site features on the plan when they return. Sides suggested the applicant review the Elliot Landing sign at the Cummings Center in Beverly which is low, elegant but still visible. This site is near an intersection and will be highly visible, so such a large sign isn't necessary. Spillane replied that they may only reduce the base features because they want to keep the wording. Mazza added that reducing the size of the is a difficult proposition.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

David XXX. With the entrance to the City parking lot and the parking lot they've donated to the residents on Flint Street, them having sign is important to their entranceway.

Carol Carr, 7 River Street. Impressed with the comments by the Board and agreed with Sides that the building speaks for itself, and it looks very exciting. They shouldn't put so much emphasis on wanting a large sign since people will be able to find it.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Miller: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting June 24, 2020.

Seconded by: Sides.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, and Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. **15 Crombie Street** – Replacement of rotting columns on rear porch of 3-unit residential structure. Revised plans not submitted.

Durand suggested the application be removed from the agenda after being continued for so long.

Sides: Motion to withdrawal the application without prejudice.
Seconded by: Jaquith.
Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, and Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

2. 14 New Derby Street: Review of proposed façade modifications (Continued from April 22, 2020)

Marc Moschella of Goldberg Properties and Peter Pitman of Pitman & Wardley Architects were present to discuss the project.

Moschella stated that the three main comments from the Board at the previous meeting were 1) adjust the position of the entry to the right of the double-door, it was centered but is now. 2) There was a request to add and position the rear windows in line with the existing sills, and they've made that adjustment around the building. 3) A rendering using bronze and black windows were compared and the comment was made that there were a lot of brown tones within the building. The existing second floor windows are bronze, and the existing storefronts are anodized aluminum, but he, Goldberg Properties and Pitman prefer black windows that would pop and give the building a more dynamic feel. Miller, Perras, and Chair Durand agreed with using black windows. Perras agreed with shifting the new storefront entrance to one side to match the barbershop storefront.

Chair Durand opened public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Miller: Motion to approve as presented with black windows.
Seconded by: Jaquith.
Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, and Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

3. 30 Federal Street: Development Project Review – construction of a mixed-use addition with retail space, four residential units, and six parking spaces (Continued from April 22, 2020)

Dan Ricciarelli and Sanir Lutfija of Seger Architects and Mike Becker Owner were present to discuss the project.

Ricciarelli stated that this is a mixed-use building with retail at the base on the existing portion and the addition. The existing building is office space, and the upper level of the addition will be four residential units. The condominium association board has decided to not keep the walkway leading to Washington Street when they proposed to continue to the Northern end of the addition. New trees will be added at the proposed patio on the intersection of Washington & Federal Streets to activate that corner. Bill Uhaus an architect and abutter sent a letter to them about several matters. Along Washington Street there is a recess in the façade that will become the residential unit entrance and contains the elevator core and stair. To the left of that entrance is the retail entrance and parking for three vehicles under the proposed addition and one vehicle outside the building but still on their property. The two remaining spaces will be off site.

Ricciarelli stated that their previous scheme has double gables but there was more interest in the sketch they presented at the end and they've spent time developing it based on the Board's feedback. The base of the elevations is being opened up even into the existing building. The existing building will be painted to match the color scheme of the new addition. The dormer now has a flat roof with flying cornices and a wood panel façade to accentuate the verticality of the entrance and the upper penthouse band. There will be inset panels at each of the windows to introduce the colors into the lower levels. The ridge and cornice line of the new addition will match the existing building. The brick base will wrap around the building and continue along the addition at Washington Street, creating a plinth. The windows are awning style black dual glaze and storefront at the vertical lobby core.

Ricciarelli stated that towards the East, they want the addition to blend with the adjoining 1985 condominium. They will maintain the datum line, eaves, and ridge to create a courtyard feel so the two condominiums blend successfully. The upper level townhome was moved toward Washington Street to eliminate most of the new windows facing the neighboring condominium. A new deck and pergola has been carved into the top floor of the addition in an inverted L shape, similar to Washington Street.

Ricciarelli stated that at the first-floor level there will be a new canopy to double as a sign band that will wrap around the North elevation. Cedar screening will conceal the parking area in a similar color palette to limit the number of materials used. The colors will blend into the existing building and the heavy cornice band above the eave. The deck will be seen from the North but will have solid walls for privacy. The cladding at the elevator is cementitious panel, there will be cladding at base, fiber cement panel at the upper levels, soffit panels at garage, and Boral composite wood trim.. The shingles will have GAF Slateline asphalt shingles and the exterior lights will be sharp cut off fixtures.

Chair Durand stated that progress has been made on the plans. Sides, Jaquith, and Miller agreed. Miller added that it will complement the Brix building and the residential condominiums next door. Perras noted that the revised drawings have improved but the North elevation has an odd gable alignment. He suggested they create a flat roofed gable as well as breaking up the side panels on the North end of the deck. Chair Durand agreed. Sides noted the numerous materials that need to come together at this end of the building.

Miller stated that the planting plan showed 3 or 4 trees and they are an important part of the plan. Ricciarelli and Becker agreed.

Public Comment:

Ann Laaff, 20 Federal Street. In February the DRB instructed the developer to reflect the design of the buildings across the street, but she doesn't see evidence of that reflection. Ricciarelli replied that he felt the design was complimentary to the neighboring condominiums and the addition created more presence on Washington Street than at the rear. Becker added that they took hints from the design of the new

Brix building. Laaff noted that the proposed design takes away from historic charm of downtown Salem.

Alice Merkl, 28 Federal Street. Agreed that having the bulk of top floor moved towards Washington gives the neighbors behind them more of a residential feel.

Bill Yuhas, 28 Federal Street. Echoed Alice Merkle's comments. Adjusting the roofline changed the look, making the balcony walls solid with clapboard finish is good, and the elevations have improved. The North elevation may need some adjusting but it's coming together nicely.

Michelle McHugh, Federal Street. Asked if the Board planned to make a site visit, if the Board had reviewed the letters submitted by the abutters - including hers and commented on the inaccurately scaled drawings. Chair Durand replied that he read all the letters submitted and understands their concerns. Becker noted receiving a letter about the scale which has been corrected. Lutfija added that they adjusted the perspective in the photo overlay to be more accurate. Chair Durand replied that he knows the site. Miller replied that she made her own site visit. Sides replied that she too is familiar with the site. Newhall-Smith noted that she received 10-12 letters in the past couple of days regarding this application.

Linda Finn, Washington Street. Concerned with the scale, rendering, turning radius for vehicles in the parking lot, and snow removal. Lutfija replied that the addition ends just beyond the end of the existing parking stripes. Ricciarelli noted that they will haul the snow away. Becker added that the snow that would be on the ground at spaces 1-3 will now be on the roof of the addition.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Chair Durand asked about the two proposed parking spaces on Federal Street. Becker replied that they will seek a variance and move the parking spaces off-site.

Jaquith noted the competing double cornices on the Washington Street sides and suggested that one be slightly different. The top cornice is okay, but the intermediate cornice is missing something. Chair Durand noted that the lower cornice creates a nice platform for retail signage to be mounted above.

Perras suggested the vertical wood element at the North balcony be pushed inward to create more of a separation of the two sides to create a break in the plane. Jaquith suggested they treat it like a boxed bay.

Sides: Motion to send a recommendation to the SRA for approval, applicant to return to the DRB with Construction Documents for review.

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, and Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

4. 65 Washington Street: Review of 100% Construction Drawings. Final Design Review

Jeff Hirsh of Urban Spaces and Steve Tise of Tise Design Associates were present to discuss the project.

Tise stated that the building has been a challenge, but the construction is now above ground. They reused the lower level which saved some money, a few changes have been made but they now have more details. The major materials are: Glen Gary Brick, precast stone band in beige, Hardiplank in various shades, and simulated wood panel Nichiha Vintagewood "Bark" with pre-formed corners at the bay windows. Greyish Beige fixed casement windows at the upper levels with interior screens and "dark bronze" storefront windows. 8-inch x 8-inch cast star pattern medallions will be inserted into the brickwork at each floor level in a weathered copper patina similar to the historic ties used to tie masonry warehouse walls together. The corrugated shutter panel PAC-CLAD will be "champagne" color. The storefront will be "dark bronze", and the cement siding in three colors but not in wood grain. The 5/8" back-lit acrylic panels will be at recessed 8" at both entry ramps with LED lighting behind. The largest change is at the two rear walls, the wall over the Pitman building and the façade along Federal Street. Both will now have same cladding system as at the bays but with added detail because they aren't allowed to fenestrate a party wall.

Tise stated that the shutters have their own pattern, with a precast lintel above, the window assembly, the opaque aluminum shutter panel in a prefinished champagne color. The projecting cornice with tapered brackets remain, timber decking with joints every 8-inches, intumescent paint, and dimmable LED up-lighting surrounding the cornice. The granite base at the ground floor will be darker, the larger columns are stone and the slender ones are covered in steel plates with bolt heads painted darker than the stone. Hirsh added that the glazing and patterning of the 6th floor windows has changed and the proportion of glazing to Nichiha panel has changed to match the lower window assemblies. Tise noted that they will add solar panels to the roof, a sculpture for the corner of Washington & Federal Street, and Washington Street banners still haven't been designed.

Tise stated that they will return for review and approval of the proposed signage and awning at the main entry canopy. The canopy will have a translucent flat glass roof, powder coated steel tubes, LED downlights, and a frosted glass skirt that lines up with the stone band where they may apply street numbers to the face. Landscaping will be added to the rear interior second floor terrace, the overhang at the courtyard will be deleted, the siding color will be changed at the sixth floor, and minor changes will be made to the balcony pattern. The side wall at the first-floor balcony will be changed from brick to Nichiha composite panels and the exterior finish at the garage will also be change. The brick and stone from Federal Street will be carried back about 7-feet to make pedestrians less aware of the material change. A Nichiha panel with ivy climbers will be applied to the back of Mr. Pitman's building. The garage ramp roof changed from plantings to EPDM with a beach stone ballast.

Hirsh noted the public art wall along Federal Street will be perforated metal screens over recessed tile. The artwork will be backlit, so they glow at night. Tise added that the panels will be a slightly darker color than the pre-cast panel for contrast and the same steel plate will be recessed 2-inches in between the decorative panels on Federal Street.

Perras preferred the previously proposed heavier base to the granite and asked if both the brick sample and pattern were proposed. Tise replied color only, the pattern will be running bond with a soldier course at each floor. Perras questioned the need for the shutter panels next to the windows and suggested they have a textured finish. Tise replied that textured was preferred so they didn't become blank panels, and he will specify metal furring strips to be secured to the studs for stability and treat the panels like a rainscreen.

Tise stated felt the need to break up the rhythm of the ground floor. The flower boxes and steel plate columns would be painted a subtle color, so they blend in. The base is granite with a stone band and a two-piece stone cornice above with an 8" projection and a flush bottom course. Sides agreed with Perras, liked the color change, but would prefer the ground floor flower boxes match the planters at the bays. Tise noted their preference for a scale and texture difference but the use of similar colors.

Miller requested a proposed lighting plan. Tise replied that the exterior lighting plans is required by the Planning Board and they've hired a lighting design studio to design the lighting. Everything will be controllable to determine what levels of illumination will work, and there will be no up lighting except for small fixtures as base of the banners.

Miller stated that she doesn't want a black background to absorb heat so a green roof would be great if it were in a light stone color. The large art panels look like art project that people will graffiti.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to approve as presented with the suggested changes to the pedestrian level façade, green roof to be light color, stone at ramp roof, and the development of a lighting plan.

Seconded by: Sides.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, and Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

5. 32 Church Street: Small project review – Addition of skylights and dormer.

Peter Pitman architect at Pitman & Wardley was present to discuss the project

Pitman stated that they want to construct a dormer over the Conference Room and rear offices now that the new Brix building will block out the light from their only two windows on the 3rd floor. The developer will construct it on the East elevation (alley) just beyond

the chimney as compensation for covering their windows, view, and airflow. They can't align the dormer with the windows below due to existing interior conditions, but the dormers will blend in with roofscape. It also cannot be placed along Church Street due to the street scape or at the rear due to a mechanical equipment and an existing truss, so the side was selected. The windows will be dark bronze with vertical mullion, the dormer will be covered in "Grey" Hardi plank to blend in with roof and it will have matching architectural shingles. They will also repair some existing bead board at the lower windows.

Jaquith stated that as an original architect of the building, he has no problems with the proposed dormer. Sides and Durand agree.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sides: Motion to approve as presented.

Seconded by: Jacquith.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

Projects Subject to the Municipal & Religious Building Reuse Ordinance

- 1. Vavel Apartments:** Advisory design review of new three-story apartment building with 20 residential units and associated site improvements.

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti & Navins and Peter Pitman Architect at Pitman & Wardley Architects were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Grover stated that this project began in 2017 with 20-units but the project was appealed and tied up the last 3-years in land court. The appellant sold the property and the new owner has no issues to appeal. They returned to the ZBA in December and no one else has filed an appeal. They met with the Planning Board twice and were referred to the DRB. This property is in an overlay district.

Pitman stated that it has an accessible route to the main building entry, a plan for snow removal, bike racks, storage space, etc. There will be a one-way traffic entrance and exit. The buildings footprint/shape is due to setbacks requirements. There will be rain screen bays at the elevator, louvered screening to conceal the setback mechanical equipment on the roof, and the façade will be a NeaCera terra cotta cladding. At the West façade there is a patio and railing at rear entry as well as the garage doors to the lower level parking. There will be a dynamic footprint and exterior with a "Charcoal" and "Red" color scheme in addition to the terra cotta color, black windows, and metal railings.

Perras noted the interesting way the charcoal and red color work together, wrap around the corners of the building, and the windows were grouped together gave the building

movement. The vertical approach is blocked and could be brought together in a more interesting way with more layering, which could be demonstrated through additional renderings. Chair Durand noted the challenging site, that they've handled the design well with quality materials.

Atty. Grover noted that the front of the site is an easement and part of original layout wasn't used. Extensive tree replanting project required, significant number of new shade trees will be provided, and some ledge will be removed to improve vehicular site lines.

Jaquith and Sides agreed with Perras on finding a better way to integrate the two colors given the facets. Pitman agreed and noted that they can group the windows to create a uniform elevation; however, the numerous corner facets have been grouped as one color to identify the wrap around corner and turrets. Sides stated that she would want to see it all together although they don't have the height to incorporate for more verticality or a bank of windows.

Miller suggested they consider break up the red façade at the base and cornice or introducing a darker color such as darker red. Pitman replied that the contrasting color available in this material would a clash but could look into breaking up the façade. The façade is dynamic, and they could increase window sizes too but there's a lot of glazing already. Miller suggested adding a horizontal element such as a lintel at the top of the first-floor windows.

Perras asked if the product was textured. Jerzy Wabno replied that the product is expensive, introducing third color requires ordering a significant quantity of material. Pitman noted that the material finish is semi-flat and additional dark grey could be added at the base.

Sides asked if the entire base could be all Charcoal Grey or just a line of that color. Pitman replied either. Chair Durand suggested a low Charcoal Grey base only to not take away from the sculptural look to the building.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Newhall-Smith reviewed the Entrance Overlay District Ordinance and had several recommendations for the Board to consider. The chain-link fence screening the trash area should be opaque, the height of perimeter fencing had a maximum height, all newly planted trees must have a 3 1/2" caliper, and the signage isn't currently under review but it's placement and design should be considered.

Pitman stated the revision of the trash area which will now be enclosed with painted wood. They are working with the Landscape Architect and Tree Warden on the tree caliper and the Tree Warden suggested 3" caliper trees given the rocky nature of the

site. There is no plan for a monument sign on the property, they may want a natural rock with the street and possibly a logo but will return for review of signage. A compliant 48-inch-high aluminum fencing at the rear of the property is proposed at the ledge for security and fall protection.

Sides: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting.

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, and Durand approve.

Atty. Grover suggested including a condition that will allow them to go before the Planning Board. Chair Durand replied that that would require a special meeting. Newhall-Smith agreed and requested revised renderings for the Board to determine banding appropriateness. The Board agreed. The second PB meeting is June 18th

Pitman requested a Board liaison to bounce ideas off of prior to the next meeting. Perras agreed to be their liaison.

Sides: Motion to continue to a Special Meeting on June 11, 2020 at 6PM

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

2. Highland Ave, Barnes & Cedar Road Apartments

Attorney Scott Grover of Tinti & Navins representing Overlook Acers, Dan Ricciarelli and Sanir Lutfija of Seger Architects, Mike DeAngelo Landscape Architect, Scott Cameron Civil Engineer

Atty. Grover noted the series of agreements to purchase the property. This 16-acre site on the north bound side of Highland Avenue has three different street frontages, in three different districts while also being along an entrance corridor. This is a mixed-use Land Unit Development requiring public space. There will be five buildings total on site, the front is a 1-story 8,5000 SF commercial unit. It's the only building within the entrance corridor but now the entire project is now considered part of the entrance corridor. There will be 290 residential units within the four other buildings on site. Wetlands are rear of site and will have a walkway providing views of them.

Ricciarelli stated that this project has been vetted by Planning Board after nearly a year of review. 6 buildings are proposed: 1 administrative/club house, 1 retail building, and 4 housing. The site access has a signal at Highland Avenue which will be exit only, the entry on Cedar Road is currently a partially paved, and the intermediary road will provide the main access throughout the site. Garages are at the lower levels to open the site to landscaping, creating an approximate ratio of 50% in garage (68 spaces) and 50% on-site parking in front of the building. There will be a mixture of 1, 2, & 3-bedroom units and micro units. Each unit has a deck, bike storage on site and in garages, a central trash area between buildings 1 & 3 that will be professionally managed as frequently as

necessary. The retail trash will remain undetermined until the tenant is selected. There will be a 6-foot-high solid board fence to screen the trash and recycling areas.

Ricciarelli stated that Building 1 will have 76 units, a mix of 1 & 3-bedrooms and microunits. Building 2 will have 66 units and will be set back 75-feet from the neighbors and set down into the landscape with terraced walls. Building 3 is at the center of the site and will have 56 units, a mix of 1, 2, & 3-bedrooms and microunits. Building 4 will have 92 units, be set back 100-feet from property line and rear neighbors. There are approximately 300-feet between each building.

DeAngelo stated that the goal of landscape is to create a cohesive neighborhood design. The street trees will be 30-feet OC, pedestrian scale lighting, walkways throughout with bike racks and a community patio at each building. The landscape will provide public amenities within the open space connected with seating and a playground. There will be heavily landscaped areas and walking trails leading to the wetlands in the NE. There will be two 10-foot high retaining wall so building 2 is set down into the landscape. At building 4 there are 3 tiers of wall and guardrail at the top for safety. At the commercial building there will be a diverse selection of 3½ caliper trees, 18 feet tall. There are evasive plantings near the wetlands, and they are working with the Tree Warden to develop a plan for new plantings and the trees have been inventoried and marked to determine their replacement. The meandering ADA walkway will be up to 8-feet-wide with a dense planting buffer and a 600-foot-long park walking trail to the pond overlook. There is an assortment of fences that vary in height, 8-feet high, 6-foot-high vinyl screening at the trash enclosure, 42-inch-high black aluminum fences, while others aren't visible in the plantings.

Ricciarelli stated that for Building 1 the zoning bylaw calls for a 50-foot to mean rafter and less exposure at the front of the building than at the rear. The units are stacked, and each has a deck with sliders and each deck will have a roof. All mechanical units will be placed on the roof and screened so there are no units at grade and the landscaping will soften the facades. Building 2 is closest to Barnes Road and they have bifurcated the building to bring down the massing and it appears at 2 story from Barnes Road. They eliminated 1 floor making it 3 stories with parking below. Building 3 is the smallest and adjacent to wetland. Building 4 has full rear exposure toward the wetlands but a steep drop down. The bases are a heavy board with a proud water table and banding above to help break up mass. The retail building has a gabled roof with parking at the rear only, with a lot of glazing to open up the elevation. The Clubhouse also has a gabled roof with shed dormers to break up massing and the interior will have amenity space, a mail room, yoga, gym, function room, etc.

Ricciarelli stated that the proposed materials are; 2 over 1 single hung vinyl windows, GAF Slateline asphalt roof shingles, storefront and panels around inset entries with a different color and material to accentuate them. The garage doors below the residential building will be decorative, Everlast poly resin siding will be maintenance free, and

composite wood casings at main entries. The balcony decks will be Trex decking with PVC trim. Beige, tan or light grey color options are proposed with a strong base. At the retail building, the Planning Board recommended it be set back even more from Highland Avenue, so they moved it back another 14 feet away from the road.

Jaquith suggested they try to break up the large buildings. Miller noted that the playground along the Barnes Road neighbors is 20-feet above the buildings above the concrete paver terraced walls, she asked if vines were proposed to break them up. They could vary the plant material in size and type to make the walls disappear. The plant palette is fabulous, but it would be good to incorporate something to help hide the wall. She suggested the vinyl fence be changed to wood and noted that a small piece of wetland is separate and asked if the water flows Northeast into the larger pond because it could use more expression. Cameron replied that the area is a non-jurisdiction isolated wetland, but they are trying to preserve and enhance it. Most of the site has been disturbed over the years and the isolated wetland allows off site drainage to move through it. The debris along the wetlands will be cleaned up and native plants will be planted so it appears natural. They will also file with Conservation Commission. Miller asked if the smaller wetland area can connect under the road to help support the other wetland. Cameron replied that the water flow will be unrestricted and filtered before it gets to the larger wetland. There is a larger area in front of building 1 that could become a grassy play area.

Perras stated that the buildings are large and attempts were made to break up the massing. Building 2 is more successful because of the kink and Building 4 is more successful than 1 due to breaking down of the mass. Their revised renderings should explore line weight changes so the base appears heavier than the railings to show the contrast. Ricciarelli added that they can also play with how to break up the rooflines.

Jaquith and Durand agreed with all comments. Chair Durand noted that the Planning Board did have them orient these massive buildings perpendicular to the street. Miller asked if the site to the West of Building 3 become commercial space. Atty. Grover replied that they don't control that site, it would have been the cineplex but that didn't succeed, and there are currently no plans to develop that site. Cameron added that the owner of that land would need to go through the same regulatory boards they did.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

David Labbe, 18 Barnes Road. They are making good progress and listening to the community. The two access roads have no easy way to head South on Highland and suggested the state add a stoplight to create a cut through because the neighborhood will bear the brunt of a lot of traffic. Can the retaining wall area be closed off to the playground for safety? Building 2 is 12-feet taller than the neighboring homes creating a loss of privacy towards his house. More trees is good but what is the maturity of the tree being planted? Water pressure issue in the neighborhood is challenging and this will also be a strain on the water.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting.

Seconded by: Sides.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, Chair Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

Old/New Business

Minutes

Jaquith: Motion to continue the review of the February 26, 2020 minutes to the next meeting.

Seconded by: Miller.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, Chair Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

Miller: Motion to approve the April 22, 2020 minutes.

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, Chair Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

Adjournment

Sides: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Jaquith, Miller, Perras, Sides, Chair Durand in favor. Passes 5-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 10:00PM.

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