

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board – Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, April 24, 2024 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	Remote Participation via Zoom
DRB Members Present:	Chair Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Leeann Leftwich, Catherine Miller, Elizabeth Murray,
DRB Members Absent:	Marc Perras, Sarah Tarbet
Others Present:	Kate Newhall-Smith
Recorder:	Beth Forrestal

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

Signs in the Urban Renewal Area

There are no signs to review.

Projects in the Urban Renewal Area – Outdoor Dining

1. **76 Lafayette Street:** Outdoor Dining – Review proposed outdoor dining for Couch Dog.

Adam Shoemaker was present to discuss the project. Proposed to use two on street parking spots behind jersey barriers, string lights and a rope barrier between Couch Dog and the sidewalk. Proposing four (4) 4-tops with one (1) longer ADA table. Five inch (5") stepdown from sidewalk.

Durand asks why the ADA ramp is not parallel to the sidewalk. Shoemaker says that it is at an angle to allow for turning. Murray says that the turning radius is supposed to be five feet (5') and this is only three feet (3'). Miller says that it doesn't need handrails as it is a curb ramp. Shoemaker says that they presented it to the Disability Commission, and they were satisfied with this set up. Miller asks if they are doing partition. Shoemaker says they will have stanchions and ropes along the edge of the sidewalk but haven't selected the materials yet. Miller says this should be reviewed by the board and volunteers to visit to review the materials. The rest of the board agrees. Miller iterates to not attached lights to the street trees; she will review the lighting plan as well.

Public Comment

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Miller: Motion to approve as presented with the products for stanchions/chain and lighting through Newhall-Smith. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, and Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

2. **232 Essex Street:** Outdoor Dining – Review proposed outdoor dining for Fountain Place

Tom Moore, the owner, was present to discuss the project. Met with Disability Commission which provided conditional acceptance with an additional accessible table and they will be on opposite ends. Kickboards requested as well. Katie Neiman from DPS will supply if they are available.

Miller asks if there will be umbrellas and what the rule is on umbrellas. Newhall-Smith says no text or logos on umbrellas.

Jaquith asks what the defining edge is, Mr. Moore says planters with chains, same as what is currently in front of the restaurant.

VOTE: Jacquith Motion to approve as presented. Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Jacquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, and Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

3. 120 Washington Street: Outdoor Dining – Review proposed outdoor dining for O'Neill's

William Anderson was present to discuss the project. The plan similar to the previous year. Thirty-two feet (32') long out into the street. Not in bike lane. Spoke with Disability Commission. Will remove some of the umbrellas. Will need jersey barriers this year for customer protection. Guinness umbrellas will be switched for non-logo umbrellas – black or hunter green is acceptable. Board would like the lattice work painted black. Miller asks if adding jersey barriers will bite into more parking spaces. Anderson does not believe so, there is a little space in one of the spots. It may not be 100% level if they shift it and a third parking space may be needed. Miller thinks that the street is fairly consistent and it should be okay.

New lattice work in black and paint pressure treated wood black.

Public Comment

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Miller: Motion to approve as presented with black or hunter green umbrellas, no text. Pressure treated frames painted black and will put in black painted wood lattice. Seconded by: Jacquith.

Roll Call: Jacquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, and Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

4. 133 Washington Street: Outdoor Dining – Review of proposed outdoor dining for Boston Burger Company

Kizito Paganini, Director of Operations for Boston Burger Company. Have met with the ADA and have procured a florist to bring back the planters they have previously had. Additional shrubs and flowers will be added around the existing tree. Perimeter of patio will be surround by stanchions and planters. The Applicant shares the style of planters they would like to use for DRB approval. Swapped out an ADA table per Disability

Commission suggestion. DRB prefers waist height planters. Miller asks what happens on the side that faces Derby Square? Paganini will use removable stanchions for patrons in wheelchairs. Stanchions are poles with chains and are easily moved. Umbrellas will be red. Miller asks how much space between the table and the building. Between back door and tables is ten (10) feet. Walkway is closer to four (4) feet. Miller asks that they do not have plastic storage along the building. Paganini agrees.

Public Comment

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Jaquith: Motion to approve as presented with added comments and taller planters. Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, and Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

Projects in the Urban Renewal Area

1. **9 Crombie Street:** Small Project Review - Façade changes to single family home, including restoring the existing masonry, adding a second door, and installing new windows

Dan Ricciarelli, Seger Architects, and Robert Rogers, the owner, were present to discuss the project.

The applicant is seeking to change the existing façade of the home by:

1. Repointing and restoring exterior masonry.
2. Removing masonry infill of former window on the right side of the front elevation to install matching double hung window.
3. Installing an entry door on the left side of the front elevation in the existing window location.
4. Adding a new canopy over the facade width for the covered entry. "Freedom Gray" standing seam roof with composite wood fascia and corbels.
5. Installing replacement windows to match the existing with dual glazed, SDL, double hung aluminum clad windows (Andersen or equal).
6. Painting the existing trim and Palladian transoms.
7. Retaining all gutters, downspouts, and shingles.

Durand asked if there an existing downspout. Ricciarelli said yes and stated that it clears the awning. Miller asked about the infill on the lower right and if it could be made to look more like the existing one. Ricciarelli said that a granite sill will be added. Rogers added that the entire side of the house will be repointed so the mortar will match. Jaquith doesn't like the canopy over the top, would like it only over the door. Ricciarelli said that it is the desire for the applicant. Miller said that this is a weird alley and this will make it more like a front entrance.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

VOTE: Miller: Motion to approve as presented. Seconded by: Jaquith
Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, and Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

Newhall-Smith said that this project must return to the SRA and will be added to the May 8, 2024 agenda. Asked for Ricciarelli to send rendering and light fixture image for file.

2. 252 Bridge Street: Design Drawing Review - Review of 75% design drawings for The Exchange

Ramie Schneider, Winn Development, Chris McFarland, Landworks Studio, and Steve Prestejohn, Cube 3, were present to discuss the project.

Schneider said that they have been awarded funding from the state and are working on a closing and hope to start construction soon. Schneider reviews the current status of the project.

McFarland and Prestejohn review the submitted materials.

1. Parking Level: New three-level stairway to MBTA access drive; expanded area for utilities based on conversations with National Grid.
2. Bridge Street Level: slight shift in location of three access points from Bridge Street to align with grade and with the building; addition of intermediate rail on monumental stair for code compliance; further refinement of where the building meets the existing overpass retaining wall; adjustments to curtain wall facing Bridge Street as a result of building to passive house standards.
3. Roof Plan: refinements to equipment and its layout; some areas now have safety rails for code compliance but are not visible from grade.
4. Elevations: Refined metal reveal at each level as they worked through how the panels and window heights interact; roof height adjusted for insulation, 2" increase; bike storage openings adjusted for open air requirements; flood proof walls designed to 13' rather than code required 11'; roof deck access removed, and doors were replaced with windows; eliminated the red panels that were on the west elevation facing North Street.
5. Facade Color Patterning: 7 panels per floor, color variation, panel dimensions were adjusted to reduce material waste while maintaining design intent.
6. Site Plan: Changes to shape and location of the softscape areas due to the National Grid requirements for its equipment.
7. Planting Plan: Changes made to the planting schedule.

Miller thinks that the plan with the first piece of sloped walkway needs to be a landing. Miller asks at the pinch point to the right of this, how wide is the sidewalk. Prestejohn says that it is three feet eight inches (3'8") accounting for the thickness of the curb. Miller points out that as of September 2023 ADA codes make this not big enough. Schneider says that they have a code consultant but will double check. Miller wants to see more on the utility pen fencing. Prestejohn says that this is still under review with DPW and National Grid. Miller asks for better understanding on the crosswalks and the existing rail

tracks. Schneider says that this crosswalk was a request of the Planning Board and SRA. This does not line up with the exiting path and was designed by VHB. Miller not convinced on the colors of the façade and stripes are not the solution. Murray asks what the design intent is for the stripes. Prestejohn says it is to add texture to the building. Drawings were approved by the DRB and the Planning Board. Jaquith says that to change the design now is unfair to the developer. Newhall-Smith shares a rendering from the approved plan set to clarify what was approved.

Public comment

Susan Moulton, 98 Washington Square East.

Ms. Moulton asks what the exact choice of Hardee panel, name and color is.

Mr. Jaquith says they will be able to see the mockup.

Ms. Moulton asks if the city provides the jersey barriers and if so, is there an effort to create a theme for the barriers. Newhall-Smith will investigate.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

The team asked to return when they have the details requested by the board.

VOTE: Miller: Motion to approve as presented. Seconded by: Jaquith

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, and Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

3. **32 Federal Street:** Schematic Design Review – Review of proposed changes to the exterior of the Superior Court House and the County Commissioners' Building

Derek Hansen, WinnDevelopment, Chris McFarland Landworks Studio, and John Segar, Segar Architects, were present to discuss the project

McFarland discusses the current state of the site. Looking to extend streetscape up to Washington Street along with an amenity courtyard and a new, more inviting entry ramp. Condenser area will be built into the slope side to be not visible. Emergency egress from both buildings out to Bridge Street. Segar joins to explain the programming. County Commissioner building will have five residential units on the first floor and five on the second with a corridor connecting through access from federal to the garden area on Bridge Street. Superior court will be office space and event space. There will be one main entrance through the courtyard as that is where the staircase and elevator are. The trash and loading area will have a basement egress and thinking of having schedule pick up for trash to avoid a dumpster. McFarland shows the proposed on street drop off area. Majority of parking is more a pedestrian way. There are four parking spaces for accessible parking. Bridge Street garden – hardscape with public art or more of a complete garden. The intent is something to be viewed from the street. A giant window box. Low level walkway lighting is predominant. Segar gives overview of the existing conditions as preserved by DCAMM.

Segar reviews the proposed program for the interior space. The county commissioner building will have residential units on the first and second floor. The superior court will

have restored office space and event space toward the back (Bridge Street) of the building. The connecting element between the two buildings will remain and serve as the primary access for both buildings. The project will maintain existing egress areas though they will not be for primary access. He confirms that trash will be retained within the building and moved outside for private pick up; they are trying to avoid an exterior dumpster.

Seeger reviews the existing facades and their elements. The existing facades will be restored to what they previously looked like. The predominant change to the buildings is the connector space. It will be removed entirely and replaced with an identical structure in terms of footprint and height. However, it will feature a full glass curtain wall. All of the restoration will comply with National Park Service standards.

Hansen shares the SRA comments to the Bridge Street Garden. The SRA pointed out the original design contemplated a more expansive Bridge Street garden area. This was with the potential with MassDOT to reformat intersection. This is not being pursued and the team is stuck to the site as it exists now. The SRA would like to have a civic oriented space with potential programming. Version two has a larger plaza area with simpler stair. It is an accessibility challenge and will allow for ramping. Miller asks for a review of the previous designs. Miller asks who is using the basement egress – 10 households, not public. The other design is a window box and not terribly functional for residents. Miller does not like the newer options and likes less paving. The rest of the board agrees. Murray asks if they have thought of turf stone instead of paving. McFarland says that it is a program issue. Miller asks about the access drive along the west side of the site. How are you preventing traffic from cutting through there. Hansen says that DCAMM would like them to not have access to this road at all.

Public Comment:

Edith Johns asked about the height of the trees and if there was consider of taller trees. Mr. McFarland responded that what they have presented are young trees that will grow into canopy trees.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Durand asks if they will restore or replace windows. Segar says that the intent is to restore and that as they are allowed to do interior storm windows, they will likely do that, at least on the residential units. Segar states that most of event spaces have a restrictions on the interior.

VOTE: Miller: Motion to approve as presented with the direction for the Bridge Street garden be the window box scheme with trees aligning the sidewalk. Seconded by Jaquith

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, a Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

Projects Outside the Urban Renewal Area

1. **75 North Street:** North River Canal Corridor – Design review of four-story, 60-unit multi-family residential building on approximately one-acre of land at the corner of North and Commercial Streets.

Chris Koeplin, Beverly Crossing, Dan Skolski, DMS Design, Joe Ficociello, Halverson Tighe & Bond were present to discuss the project. This project has been reviewed by the Planning Board and referred to the DRB. Have received relief from the ZBA as well.

Skolski says that the building will be a four-story L-shaped building with sixty (60) units. Style is fitting with what is currently on the canal and the history of Salem as an industrial hub. Extensive chamber system to allow floodwaters to flow in and out. Critical infrastructure is high in the building are raised up. Materials are explored: base of front portion in a brick like pattern on first floor; brick in area above this with recessed soft down lights; lights over openings on windows; steal canopy over vehicular entrance; dark gray Hardee siding and lighter cementitious (middle section). Back portion reflects front of property but with no brick. Bike storage and trash/recycling room in garage.

Mr. Ficociello explains the bike parking on North Street and seating elements; picnic areas as well. Lighting will be about four (4) pole tops to match existing on the canal side. Trash access will be a permeable surface. Use of landscape boulders will be carried through the site. Plantings will have to be malleable with brackish water and the team will work with the tree warden.

Murray asks about the three starkly different materials used on the façade. Would they continue the brick rather than white on the mid-section? Mr. Skolski is not opposed to that and thinks they could make it less stark. Miller asks what the material below the brick is; Skolski confirms Arriscraft, a cementitious product, manufactured stone. Murray wonders about matching the base along and suggests picking either the lighter or darker color. Skolski think they can explore this. Jaquith has three issues:

1. Windows look cheap, two over two windows preferred; addition of a 5" mullion
2. Top of white portion looks lost
3. Why is the back end a different color than the front.

Skolski says they didn't want more brick on the sight. Durand agrees with Jaquith. Durand doesn't like the Juliette balconies, too classic and feels that an alternate detail would be preferred. No flooring on Juliette balconies due to Ch. 91. Miller questions this. Miller would like more cohesion and would be happy to see the brick leave if they could have more cohesion. Miller asks about the landscape plan – many of the trees are not on the subject property. Koeplin says that it way a collaborative effort, thought it hasn't been approved by neighbors. Miller thinks this should be removed from the plan. Miller asks about the commercial space. Miller would like to see more about this next time. There are no restrooms in the commercial space which is limiting. Jaquith finds the North Street entrance difficult. Chapter 91 doesn't let them cross over public accommodation for access. Newhall-Smith asks if the traffic study looked at getting onto North Street. Skolski says yes and it takes into account other developments in the area. There will be a "no left turn" sign.

Public Comment

Edith Johns, Massing of building and elevation of the west needs to be studied. The views don't tell the full story. There are 120 residents and there will be on one (1) elevator. Mr. Skolski says that an eighty to one hundred (80-100) unit building is where you see two (2) elevators. One (1) is typical for this building size. Concerned about the retail space. This is an NRCC requirement and this is barely on the verge of meeting this requirements

Durand asks about mechanical screening and the electric units on the roof. Skolksi says there is a parapet wall so screening should not be needed but will develop this more. And washer dryer venting. Ventless has helped. Miller asks for night view on next visit. Newhall-Smith says that the mechanical screening is needed as the roof will be visible when coming over the North Street bridge.

VOTE: Jaquith: Motion to continue Seconded by Miller.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, a Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

2. 266 Canal Street: Entrance Corridor Overlay District – Review of 50% Design Drawings

Chris Koeplin, Residences on Canal Street LLP, Matt Marotta, ICON Architecture, and Joe Ficociello were present to discuss the project.

Marotta discusses the changes made with Planning Board Approval. Changes across all buildings include around windows, simplifying masonry at grade and entrances. Parapet level raised one foot. Trim added to elongate the parapet. Windows are varied now to create interest. Mixture of Hardee siding materials. There is an emphasis on the retail space as well. Building fenestration will break at certain increments to keep the buildings from being massive.

Mr. Ficociello discusses landscape changes. Pool area now has a more screened fence. Pavers for the pedestrian egress to the garage. Sidewalk access around the wetlands area. Miller asks if this will be striped. Koeplin says that they kept the boulevard feel. Miller would like the crosswalks to be materially different for pedestrian safety. Changes near the amphitheater area include the ramp doesn't reach into the space quite as much. And at the upper terrace, a rail has been incorporated. Miller asks if the steps meet the new rules with thirty inch (30") drop off. Koeplin say that they are currently compliant. Miller says that up to 30" drop must have thirty-six-inch (36") tread and she would like to see more about that. Miller asks about the fence around the pool. It is more of a panel fence and will be wood.

Public Comment

No one in the assembly wished to speak

Miller looked at the materials and find the contrast high with the striped base.

VOTE: Jaquith: Motion to accept the 50% design drawings. Seconded by Leftwich

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, a Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

New / Old Business

1. Approval of Minutes:
 - a. March 27, 2024

Miller says that the new Witchside Tavern wall sign was to match the size of existing, but it wasn't in the motion.

VOTE: Miller: Motion to approve with comments the March 27, 2024, meeting minutes.

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, and Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

2. Sign Manual Update Project – Update on Project Status

Newhall-Smith says that a draft is done and she is working on photos. Leftwich is creating diagrams. Ken McTague of Concept Signs will review. Hopes to have it ready for review in May.

3. Staff Updates, if any:

None.

Adjournment

VOTE: Jaquith: Motion to adjourn. Seconded by: Murray.

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

The meeting is adjourned at 9:45PM.

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