

**City of Salem Planning Board  
Approved Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, June 15, 2017**

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, June 15, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Annex, 120 Washington Street, Room 313, Salem, Massachusetts.

Chair Ben Anderson opens the meeting at 7:00 pm.

**I. ROLL CALL**

*Those present were:* Chair Ben Anderson, Vice Chair Matt Venio, Carole Hamilton, Kirt Rieder, Noah Koretz (arriving a few minutes late), and Bill Griset

*Absent:* Helen Sides, Tony Mataragas, and Dale Yale

*Also in attendance:* Amanda Chiancola, Staff Planner

Items are taken out of order to ensure there would be a quorum for the regular agenda item.

**II. OLD NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Planning Board discussion and recommendation to City Council of a proposal to amend the zoning designation of 15 Green St., 72, 76, 80 Leach St. and 2, 4, 6 Glover St. from currently zoned Business Neighborhood (B-1) to Residential Two-Family (R-2).**

Vice Chair Matt Venio says that these were once commercial properties at least those on Leach Street, but it has long since been residential and there is no compelling reason for this to not be residential.

*A motion to recommend that the City Council approve the proposal to amend the zoning designation of 15 Green St., 72, 76, 80 Leach St. and 2, 4, 6 Glover St. from currently zoned Business Neighborhood (B-1) to Residential Two-Family (R-2) is made Noah Koretz, seconded by Matt Venio, and passes 7-0.*

**B. Planning Board discussion and recommendation to City Council of a proposal to amend the City's Zoning Ordinance Chapter 7.3.6 Planned Unit Development.**

Mr. Venio asks for a narrative. Tom Daniel explains that the amendment was introduced by Councillor Famico. She brought it forward when they were looking at the district court property which refers to the subdivision regulations which are outdated. Looking for more details be put into plans, but a PUD is a special permit, the requirements of a site plan review are be required for the PUD.

*A motion to recommend that the City Council deny the proposal to amend the City's Zoning Ordinance Chapter 7.3.6 Planned Unit Development is made Carole Hamilton, seconded by Matt Venio, and passes 7-0.*

**C. Planning Board discussion and recommendation to City Council of a proposal to amend the City's Zoning Ordinance Sections: 9.5.2 Applicability, 9.5.3 Application, and 9.5.6 Review Criteria.**

**9.5.2 Applicability**

9.5.2(2) Residential structure containing one (1) or more residential dwelling units.

The board members discuss what they feel is an appropriate threshold. Noah Koretz comments that the threshold should stay at six. Kirt Rieder comments that it should be higher than 1 but should be below 6, but at the higher end. Noah Koretz suggests above 4.

Bill Griset responds that he hears it should be more than 4, at least, it sounds like the group is at 6, and that 6 makes sense to him

Chair Anderson comments that there is an expense for Site Plan Review to require that for single family is over reach (consensus from the board on that) there is enough oversight in the ordinance with dimensional requirements, if there are concerns with design criteria then he recommends another avenue to address that, e.g. design review.

Carole Hamilton says that even if we hit 4, a site plan is not going to have design criteria and if you are talking about expense, that size dwelling shouldn't be subject to it.

Matt Veno comments that the existing threshold is 6. He ponders the question, have we found there are significant projects under that size that we wish had Site Plan Review, and explains that he can't think of any that would make him vary from the existing.

Chair Anderson says that concerns such as garage totes and snow storage came up at the public hearing. But he explains those concerns can be addressed through other parts of the zoning ordinance e.g. totes not in the front or side or sidewalk etc. could be an opportunity to put that in Section 5.4, not needed in Site Plan Review. If an owner was submitting a set of documents to build a Single Family residence, are we going to request where they place their snow?

Mr. Koretz comments that snow removal for a single family is too cumbersome it is micromanagement. He explains that this whole region is in a crisis with housing, in dense transit accessible location we need to make it easier to build this is going in the wrong direction.

Chair Anderson says that the city has snow removal criteria and you can be fined.

Mr. Koretz comments that this has nothing to do with planning board. Chair Anderson says there is an opportunity to put this in the zoning ordinance if we want to put this as a suggestion. Mr. Kortez says that this is not the right place for it. Carole Hamilton says that the building inspector still has to enforce it, which is an issue for the administration, not planning, and not this board. She says it is way overreach for anything less than 6.

*Motion to recommend denial is made by Carole Hamilton seconded by Noah Koretz and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).*

#### 9.5.2(3) Salem Redevelopment Authority Development Project Reviews.

Tom Daniel explains that the "Salem Redevelopment Authority Development Project Reviews" is not defined. In addition, projects within the urban renewal area that meet the threshold for a Site Plan Review are already subject to site plan review. The Salem Redevelopment Authority is capable of reviewing smaller projects that do not meet the threshold for a Site Plan Review.

Matt Veno comments that the SRA is well equipped to handle small project reviews.

Motion to recommend denial is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Carole Hamilton and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

#### 9.5.2(4) Planned Unit Developments.

Planned Unit Developments are already subject to site plan review.

Motion to recommend denial is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Kirt Rieder and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

### **9.5.3 Application**

9.5.3(2) Location and dimensions of all parking areas, loading areas, bicycle racks or bicycle storage areas, walkways and driveways; Plans shall clearly identify pavement grade changes exceeding 5% and any vegetated slopes steeper than 1V:3H, identify all pedestrian and vehicular pavement materials

Tom Daniel comments, that as Kirt noted at the public meeting, opportunities to provide more information is useful, this could be a policy or in the ordinance. Noah Koretz noted that it makes sense to include this in the ordinance since it is information they typically ask the applicant to provide.

Motion to recommend approval is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Kirt Rieder and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

9.5.3(4) Location, function, photometric intensity, color temperature, and fixture type of external lighting

The Board noted that it makes sense to include this in the ordinance since it is information they typically ask the applicant to provide.

Motion to recommend approval is made by xxx seconded by xxx and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

9.5.3(5) Location, type, dimensions and quantities of landscaping and screening; This shall include: retaining walls, fences, utilities such as drain inlets, manholes, drainage tanks, back flow preventers

Staff suggestion that further details be identified on the site plan review application e.g. identify caliper size.

Motion to recommend approval of the amendment as edited **“Location, type, dimensions and quantities of landscaping and screening including retaining walls and fences;”** is made by Matt Veno seconded by Noah Koretz and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

9.5.3(6) Current and proposed locations and dimensions of utilities, wireless communication facilities, hydrants, security cameras, signage, gas, telephone, electrical, communications, water, drainage, sewer, HVAC-related mechanicals, transformers, switchgears, generators, storm water, intake and exhaust features including: ventilation, stacks, fans, louvers, steam, and recycling and other waste disposal locations;

Motion to recommend approval of the amendment as edited **“Current and proposed locations, dimensions, and screening of utilities including: water, storm water, sewer, drainage, drain inlets, drainage tanks, back flow preventers, manholes, hydrants, gas, electrical, telephone, wireless communication**

**facilities, HVAC-related mechanicals, transformers, switchgears, generators, intake and exhaust features including: ventilation, stacks, fans, louvers, steam, and recycling and other waste disposal locations;”** is made by Kirt Rieder seconded by Noah Koretz and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

9.5.3(7) Location and dimensions of snow storage areas

Motion to recommend approval is made by Matt Veno seconded by Noah Koretz and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

9.5.3(8) Location of all existing natural features, including ponds, brooks, streams, wetlands, street trees, and existing vegetation within 25’ of the project boundary

The appropriate extent of the plans was discussed at length. Mr. Rieder explains that projects specifically excluded improvements in the public realm associated with the project, the curb line is integral to the conversation.

Motion to recommend approval of the amendment as edited “**Location of all existing natural features, including ponds, brooks, streams, wetlands, street trees, and existing vegetation up to the curb line;** is made by Noah Koretz seconded by Kirt Rieder and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

9.5.3(9) Topography of the site, with one foot contours

Mr. Rieder says that there is no additional effort to use 1 foot contour since it is all digital. The city results in better projects if we ask for it at the beginning. But if there is support by staff to get additional information when necessary, then he would be okay with two foot contours. Chair Anderson recommends that this change be denied, for the reason that requiring that level of detail is not necessary for every site plan review, and noted that the board should ask for this further detail on a case by case basis. Amanda Chiancola explains that staff recommended denial of this change since the board has not been asking for 2 foot contour lines, but if the members feel the information is necessary, staff would support the amendment. Mr. Rieder explains that many plans are submitted with 1 foot contours.

Motion to recommend approval is made by Noah Koretz seconded by Carole Hamilton and the motion passes unanimously (5-1).

**9.5.6 Review Criteria**

9.5.6(8) (Adequacy of the methods and storage dimensions for disposal of sewage, refuse, recycling, and other waste).

Motion to recommend denial is made by Noah Koretz seconded by Matt Veno and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

Tom Daniel explains that the remaining three discuss the complete streets policy. He talks about role of the Traffic and Parking Commission, and that they cannot “approve” but they do not have authority to approve but when going back to their powers and duties is implementation of complete streets policy. He informed the board that after reviewing the by-law and talking to Matt Smith, the Director of the Traffic and Parking, he determined that the nexus between complete streets policy and site plan review is improvements in the right of way.

9.5.6(3) Adequacy of traffic circulation system for all modes of transit, consistent with Salem's Complete Street policy

Noah Koretz recommends keeping "all modes of transit" the board concurs.

Motion to recommend approval of the amendment as edited "Adequacy of traffic circulation system for all modes of transit; is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Carole Hamilton and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

9.5.6(11) (Adequacy of pedestrian circulation...).

Motion to recommend denial is made by Matt Veno seconded by Noah Koretz and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

9.5.6(14) Subsections 3 and 4 set forth above shall be subject to review and approval of the City of Salem Parking and Traffic Commission.

Motion to recommend denial is made by Carole Hamilton seconded by Matt Veno and the motion passes unanimously (6-0).

### III. REGULAR AGENDA

#### A. Location: 120 Washington St. (Map 35, Lot 4)

**Applicant: Peabody Block Residential Conversion by RCG.**

**Description: Site Plan Review**

Andrew Zimmerman, project manager of RCG presents:

Mr. Zimmerman explains that the Health Dept weighed in provision regarding trash storage. In response, the applicant is proposing a trash compactor. Changes are clouded on the plans. He walks through the revisions:

- Enclosure for trash went from vinyl to wood stained wood, keep metal posts for security
- Accepted a condition to fund street trees
- Looking into string lights over the deck, not sure if they will keep it, need to think through attachment and get feedback from DRB.
- Wall sconces will work, string lights are add alt.
- Commit to repainting color to match as shown on the revised plans

Mr. Rieder says that the Planning Board strongly supports activating the dark corner with stringlights. He recommends at least two street trees thinks it is better for the applicant to pay into a fund. Mr. Rieder says that this applicant is doing the right thing for this project and this city.

Public comment: letter from Councillor Famico is read into the record.

Chair Anderson asks if they are planning to change the number of recycling totes

Mr. Zimmerman points to PR-1 labeled area that says recycling, it is currently grease storage but that area will move to accommodate approx. 6 more totes. So there is a net increase of 6 recycling totes and increasing trash capacity with trash.

Councilor Famico says that PEM has a dumpster with a lever that adjusts between trash and recycling depending on what is needed at any given time, she suggests this as an option. Councillor Famico asks what the current pick up is.

Mr. Zimmerman says the pick up schedule is 6 days a week.

Chair Anderson comments that the recycling totes are blocking the access to the mechanical room, he wants to ensure there will be a net increase, existing area will not be decreased.

Councillor Famico gives an example of how much recycling she creates.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes 6-0.

The board discusses the draft decision.

Chair Anderson suggests adding Condition 8.a: adequate recycling storage must be based on number of units and recycling frequency.

Mr. Rieder asks about Paving out front – Mr. Zimmerman says it will be feathered and that there will be a seamless transition of materials concrete to tile, that lip concrete carries out. The seam between the materials are the problem.

Mr. Rieder has concerns about feathering of concrete anywhere,

Mr. Zimmerman responds that it will be concrete with a seamless transition up to the building and the flat landing will also be concrete, as the tile is an issue. Mr. Rieder concurs that the tile is an issue.

A motion to approve the site plan review decision with conditions is made by Noah Koretz, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 6-0.

#### **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

##### **A. June 1, 2017 Minutes**

A motion to approve the minutes with minor amendments is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Bill Griset, and passes 5-0 Carole Hamilton abstains.

#### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion to adjourn is made by Matt Veno, seconded by Tony Mataragas, and passes 7-0.

The meeting ends at 8:09PM.

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-2017-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,  
Amanda Chiancola, AICP, Staff Planner

Approved by the Planning Board on 07/06/2017

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