

City of Salem Planning Board
Approved Meeting Minutes
Thursday, January 18, 2018

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, January 18, 2018 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, Kirt Rieder, Helen Sides, Carole Hamilton, Dale Yale, Matt Venio (6)

Absent: Bill Grisct, Noah Koretz (2)

Also in attendance: Amanda Chiancola, Staff Planner, and Stacy Kilb, Recorder

II. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. Location:** 16, 18 and 20R Franklin Street (Map 26, Lots 400, 401 and 402)
Applicant: JUNIPER POINT INVESTMENT CO LLC
Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application for a 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; 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 to replace the existing junk yard with a residential development consisting of forty-three (43) units in five (5) buildings with parking under each building, in addition to an independent garage and some surface parking resulting in 69 parking spaces. The project also includes landscaping throughout, and public access along the riverfront with walking paths.

The Applicant requests to continue to the next Planning Board meeting.

A motion to continue to the February 1, 2018 meeting is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Dale Yale, and passes 5-1 with Carole Hamilton opposed.

- B. Location:** 65 Washington Street Salem, MA (Map 35, Lot 600)
Applicant: 65 WASHINGTON STREET, LLC
Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of 65 Washington Street, LLC for the property located at 65 Washington Street Salem, MA (Map 35, Lot 600) for a Planned Unit Development Special Permit, and a Site Plan Review in accordance with the Salem Zoning Ordinance sections 7.3 Planned Unit Development and 9.5 Site Plan Review. Specifically, the applicant proposes to raze the former Salem District Court building, and construct on the existing foundation a new mixed-use building consisting of sixty-one (61) residential units, two levels of enclosed parking, and commercial/restaurant space on the ground floor. General infrastructure updates to drainage, sewer and landscaping are also proposed.

Attorney Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St. represents the applicant, outlining tonight's presentations. Massing of the building and how it fits in with the downtown will be addressed. The shadow studies will

also be presented. Jeff Hirsch is present and Steve Tise will join later. Engineering and traffic have been previously discussed; the City's peer reviewers were present then and their comments and how those were addressed will be reviewed at the next meeting. This is an SRA project; schematic design approval has been obtained from the DRB but that Board must still provide final approval along with the SRA in a parallel process.

Jeff Hirsch of Urban Spaces presents the Massing and Shadow Studies presentation

- Site Plan 2 – Overhead view
- View along Washington St. (rendering)
- Movie rendering of building and how it fits into downtown area
- Site and Relational Massing Studies, Tise Design Associates
 - Site Sections: this will be a “background building,” fitting into the general context of Salem, not a “signature building”
 - Still renderings of movie
- Shadow Studies
 - Standard method is to do this is to show shadows at spring and fall equinoxes, and summer and winter solstices at 8AM, 12PM, and 4PM. Views at each of these dates and times are shown. For most of the year, spring, summer and fall, shadows do not affect residential neighbors, but do affect some commercial areas. This changes in the winter, though most of downtown Salem is in shadow in the morning. December 21 at 12PM has the maximum amount of shadows on the neighbors across the street; on that date at 4MP there are lots of shadows, though the largest is created by the Church across the street.
 - Difference in shadows from current building is minimal

The Board finds these studies helpful, and Kirt Rieder especially appreciates the 3D flythrough. However, eye level shots would have been even more helpful as that is how pedestrians will experience the building, though he would not pressure them to present that.

The Chair opens to public comment.

Pam Broderick of 28 Federal St. also appreciates the presentation and asks if Mr. Hirsch can forward it to neighbors. She asks if it would still be possible to put solar panels on some of the neighboring buildings. Mr. Hirsch will send her the presentation.

Bill Uhaus of 28Federal St. would also like to see pedestrian-level renderings and feels that the massing of the building is still an issue. He would like to know how many days of the year the shadows affect their condos and is also concerned about how they will affect neighbor's ability to put solar panels on their roof. He cites the property of Bob Lutz. who owns the commercial building with the solar panels, and that they did lose 5-10% efficiency (possibly) due to a building without any overhang.

Mr. Hirsch notes that Steve Tise, architect, is present. Mr. Hirsch opines that the 3-4' overhang would not affect the shadows. The shadows at the fall equinox fall on the backyard, not the roof, of Mr. Uhaus' condo building. The Chair recommends sending the flyover video to the solar provider noting that the Applicant cannot provide advice on solar panels and may not be able to answer those questions, and that the shadows do not appear to extend to the roof of the building in question.

Ms. Broderick requested the full study, not just copies of the slides, and insists that more detailed studies are usually done and it is common practice to tell the number of days per year there is impact and what percentage. Amanda Chiancola will pass the request on to the Applicant.

Kirt Rieder observes that it is at the petitioner's discretion to make those available, and it is not under the purview of this Board to make a determination based on neighbor's ability to install solar panels. Also, nearby trees are shorter than this building. He notes that the Board need not be so driven by what the adjacent structures are.

Polly Wilbert of 7 Cedar St. also feels that a pedestrian level rendering view would be more helpful. She worries the video flyover may not have given the Board enough information.

Steve Tise comments that the video was a specific request to show it a specific way; previous presentations have been from the sidewalk level and will be shown again. Additional concerns can be brought up by the Board, notes the Chair.

Kirt Rieder very much appreciated the flythrough, but notes that it was not what was requested by the Board; views from sidewalk are. He found the single point perspective sectionals counterproductive as it did not show the architecture to be complementary. A walkthrough rendering at 5.5 feet would be most helpful.

A motion to continue to the Feb. 1, 2018 meeting is made by Matt Veno, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 6-0.

- C. Location:** 60 & 64 Grove Street and 1, 3, and 5 Harmony Grove Road (Map 16, Lots 237, 236, 377, 239 and 378)
- Applicant:** LAR PROPERTIES, LLC
- Description:** A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the application of Properties, LLC for an amendment to the previously approved Site Plan Review, Planned Unit Development Special Permit and Flood Hazard District Special Permit for the property located at 60 & 64 Grove Street and 1, 3, and 5 Harmony Grove Road (Map 16, Lots 237, 236, 377, 239 and 378). Specifically, the applicant proposes to demolish the two and three-story office buildings at 60 Grove Street rather than restore them, and to construct a two-story community building approximately 1,620 sq. ft. in size with associated walkways, a patio, a reconstructed parking lot, and new landscaping.

Presenting for the Applicant is Attorney Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St. He outlines what was presented at the last meeting; proposed is a new, two-story commercial, office and community building. Feedback was obtained regarding several issues, which have now been addressed. Bob Griffin, Project Engineer, and Tanya Carrier from Khalsa Design are also present to answer questions.

Bob Griffin presents:

- 11/29/17 Partial Site Plan
- 1/3/18 Partial Site Plan (revised): Changes to walkway made, some parking spaces flipped, additional walkway has been added along with benches. Bike rack has been moved.
- Landscape Plan: same plants, shifted to accommodate changes.
- Fence Details; a 3.5' black chain link
- fence will keep people from falling into the canal

Tanya Carrier of Khalsa Design presents:

- Hunnewell Building at Arnold Arboretum was referenced for new design

- Floor Plans (revised): Walkway leads up, no hand rail required for low slope (replacing handicap ramp at main entrance)
- 11/29/17 Exterior Elevations: front and side
- 1/3/18 Exterior Elevations, front and side: second handicap ramp on side must be maintained for egress from back exit, but improvements have been made. Second ramp will be hidden by a stone wall, with the hand rail inside the wall, and shrubbery outside
- 11/29/17 Perspective View: Siding and trim materials are shown and a sample board provided

Chair Anderson asks about the roof shingles; they will be fiberglass shingle, most likely dark gray, darker than what is shown, but it has not yet been selected.

Kirt Rieder asks about what determined the geometry of the patio, specifically, why the upper perimeter is not parallel to the railroad tracks rather than at an angle. There is no reason it could not be parallel. Kirt Rieder also asks about the stone wall at the side accessible ramp, feeling that the parallel row of shrubs will hide and limit its effectiveness. He is not advocating to eliminate this, but if they keep both, they should make the wall level. Otherwise, one option would be to keep the hand rail only, while the shrubbery would make it disappear and make snow removal easier, as well as being less expensive than building a wall. Any change can be submitted to Amanda Chiancola for administrative approval.

Chair Anderson opens to public but there are no comments. He reviews the Amended Decision. Changes from the original Decision are discussed. Kirt Rieder asks how tonight's topics will be added; Amanda Chiancola recommends adding another section for site specific conditions.

Conditions:

- Recommendations regarding exterior materials shall be submitted to the Staff Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of the permit
- Deletion of the proposed stone wall on the southwest façade
- Rectify north edge of patio to be parallel to the railway
- Revised Plans showing these changes to the Plans submitted on 1/3/18 shall be submitted to the Staff Planner for review and approval prior to permit issuance.

A motion to close the public hearing is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes with all in favor, 6-0.

A motion approve the Amended Decision, with conditions as discussed, is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes 6-0.

- D. Location:** 132-134 Canal Street, 142 R. Canal Street, and 144 Canal Street (Map 33, Lots 5, 6, and 8)
- Applicant:** CANAL STREET WAREHOUSE LLC, CANAL STREET REALTY DEVELOPMENT LLC and CANAL FURNITURE LLC
- Description:** A public hearing for all persons interested in the application of Canal Street Warehouse LLC, Canal Street Realty Development LLC, and Canal Furniture LLC for the properties located at 132-134 Canal Street, 142 R. Canal Street, and 144 Canal Street (Map 33, Lots 5, 6, and 8) in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 7.3 for a Planned Unit Development, Section 9.5 for a Site Plan Review, Section 8.1 for a Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, and Section 6.7 for a Drive-Through Special Permit, and a Stormwater Management Permit in accordance with Salem Code of Ordinances Chapter 37. Specifically, the applicant proposes the redevelopment the site by razing the

buildings at 132-134 and 144 Canal Street and constructing three (3) new buildings with associated driveways, parking spaces, landscaping, utilities, and drainage systems for stormwater runoff. Construction of a new three-story, mixed-use building with approximately 7,000 square feet of retail on the first floor and 20 residential units on the upper floors is proposed at the north side of the site. Construction of a three-story building with 30 residential units and parking below; and a 2,500 square foot retail building with a drive-through is proposed at the south side of the site. The existing buildings located at 138-142 Canal Street will remain with some site improvements.

Attorney Scott Grover of 27 Congress St begins the presentation, outlining the project by Symes Associates, a multi-generational, family company that has only recently begun developing properties in Salem.

Also present are:

Landers Symes, Symes Associates
Steve Feinstein, Symes Associates
Rich Williams, Williams & Sparages
John Seger, Seger Architects
Dan Ricciarelli, Seger Architects
James Emanuel, Landscape Architect
Scott Thornton, Traffic Engineer, Vanasse Associates

The location and background of the project are described. This is in the middle of Canal St. on the right side heading south. It is flanked by Darlene's Florist on the north side. The property is comprised of the former California Olive Oil building (CA Olive Oil) next door, and includes the existing Revere Tan, Family Dollar, Honeydew Donuts, and a dental office. O'Reilly Auto is also in the middle, and on the southern end of the property is the former Jeffrey Brothers Furniture and a used car lot. The Lot encompasses three separate properties and sits on 4.5 acres total. It was only recently acquired by Symes Associates, who did not expect to move forward with development so quickly.

However, soon after they purchased the property, they were approached by the City of Salem. City officials are planning for construction of the bike path that will run behind the property. In particular, they were interested in the possibility of eliminating the rail spur that had been in active use serving the CA Olive Oil building. Previous attempts by the City to get that company to abandon the spur proved unsuccessful, but the current Applicant is receptive to accommodating a more streamlined bike path. Thus, plans were developed quickly. Four Special Permit applications are included, for Planned Unit Development (PUD), Site Plan Review (SPR), and Flood Hazard Special Permit, and they include a drive-through. The Applicant will also appear before the Conservation Commission.

Proposed:

The Applicant will maintain the existing buildings and uses in middle of site, and redevelop perimeters, integrating the site via a comprehensive site plan that will change circulation and provide landscaping. That approach is dictated by the tenants in middle, who have have long term leases that can't be disturbed, and are good businesses/neighbors.

The CA Olive Oil building will be demolished, and a new 3 story building will replace it that will include 7,000 square feet of retail on 1st floor with 20 residential units above. When first presented to the Planning Department and the Mayor it was a one story structure, but the Mayor asked them to add housing above since the need for housing is strong. Revere Tan will also stay in place. The former Jeffery

Bros. Factory and used car lots will be eliminated, and a new single story retail pad of 2,500 square feet will be in that location. The area behind that will include a four story building, with parking directly below three levels of residences and a total of 30 units.

The City also wanted to provide access to the bike path through this property, and also to the proposed south Salem rail station, which will be right behind it. The only access is over this private property, so a couple of access points to both have been provided for. One is off of Ocean Ave via a pocket park to the bike path (primary access). Secondary access is via a smaller pedestrian path at the northern end of the site near the former Olive Oil building, which just about joins with the crosswalk to Crosby's Market.

One accommodation the Applicant requested from the City and the MBTA is an easement, as much parking at the rear is partially on MBTA property; many cars parked there are currently encroaching on MBTA property without the benefit of an easement. The parking area must be expanded in order to accommodate the residential units above the northernmost building with 20 units. Any decision this Board makes would have to carry that condition.

The property is presently industrially zoned, which does not reflect its current use or the vision for Canal St.

Kirt Rieder asks about the as yet unmentioned small building to the rear; there is some kind of clean room activity of Light Tower. It is a fiber optic clean room, with no customers; someone goes once a month to check on it, and that is the only activity it sees. It appears decrepit from the outside, but has a state of the art interior, with lots of air conditioning. That building must remain and will not be touched.

Rich Williams outlines the layout of each proposed site. Access to the bike path is again outlined; their pedestrian walkways are also connected to this path. Trash enclosures and realignment of parking are described. The building to the north will not have access to sites to the south; all access to those will be from the front (Canal St).

Current and proposed traffic patterns are described. Access is described. The dumpster areas will also be moved and consolidated with the approval of the MBTA and City of Salem. Access from the rear of the buildings to proposed uses is described. The new 2,500 square foot retail space will be accessed from Ocean Avenue; the traffic pattern is described. Parking for the residential building at that end is also available from that entrance, but most access to that will be through the on-grade parking. All the areas mentioned are also connected with the driveway out to Canal St. Bike and pedestrian access to the bike path from Ocean Ave is also briefly outlined.

Mr. Williams outlines the Flood Hazard Zone and elevations. The buildings themselves are partially above and partially below Flood Elevations; to obtain a permit for new construction, living space cannot be below Elevation 10, so the design must pick up grading. The north building is proposed at 10.25 as is the retail at the corner. The residential building to the rear is lower than elevation 10, but is flood resistant construction with only parking on the ground level, and the first residences well above flood elevation.

Existing grades are described. They will be improved, with buildings in the flood zone being removed and replaced. Some fill will be brought in, an average of about 2' over the area of proposed buildings, to raise them to the required elevation. This is in LSCSF (Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage) so there is no requirement to mitigate for material brought into the site; the Applicant can fill without providing flood storage/compensation.

Having said that, substantial drainage improvements will be made and are described. Five infiltration areas will be fed into treatment facilities then discharged into the sandy soils. In total runoff leaving the site is being reduced by 65%. The site is almost entirely paved, and the impervious area is being reduced by 12,000 square feet and providing an extra 14,000 square feet of landscaped area. This is a redevelopment project that meets the requirements of stormwater management policy. There will be new sewer and water connections, which are described. Matt Venio asks if the Applicant can complete this part of the project before anticipated roadway improvements; this can be done.

Lighting Plan: There will be LED wall packs on building and parking field lights will be post top LED. There will be no spillage over the property lines. No lighting is proposed for the rail trail; some light from this property behind the northern and southern buildings may spill onto it, but it is minimal.

James Emanuel presents landscaping plans.

Circulation around the site was extensively studied. There are various access points along Canal St., some of which connect it to the multi-use trail. Circulation is anticipated along the back edge and then up through Ocean Ave. Currently the site is a sea of asphalt with little access to Canal St. for cars. To unify the site and organize it, providing safety and cohesion, they are proposing to cut off areas where vehicles can dominate the site. Greenspace has been added between the two main remaining buildings; trees/shrubs/greenery/curbing are outlined, with landscaping to be determined. The building and fence in the upper corner with the pocket park will be shielded by evergreens. The pocket park is described in more detail. The southernmost retail building and the residential building will be buffered by trees and landscaping between them and the existing building.

The front corner of that area is described in more detail. There could be a pedestrian access point and they may work with the City to do an art installation there. Landscaping adjacent to circulation will help define it. An art installation could also potentially be located at the other pedestrian access point at the north side of the site. There is a bump out, so they cannot align to the crosswalk near the Crosby's plaza exactly, but will come close. They have tried to strike a balance between parking, pavement, circulation and green space, all of which compete.

Helen Sides asks where the proposed train station would go. The Ocean St. path would lead to the rail trail and the possible train station. Helen Sides wonders about people entering the site to be picked up, but this would happen on the other side of the tracks.

Josh Turiel, Ward 5 Councilor, describes the layout of the train station. The southbound side would be across from facility, with the northbound side farther down and offset, going past there partway into the property. The southbound side would be closer to downtown, and the primary design for car access will be on the West side.

Dan Ricciarelli of Seger Architects presents.

- The north building, mixed retail and residential, is described.
 - Elevations and fenestration
 - Materials: Hardi Plank, Hardi Panel, base massing is described, Front St. was used as a model
- south building, small retail, 2500sf, 1 story w/drive through
 - Elevations
 - Floor Plan
 - Cladding similar to north building

New residential at rear of site, parking below, entering from Ocean St.

- Elevations
- Hardi Pane, Hardi Plank, EIFS (Exterior Insulation Finishing System)
- Perspective view of massing: new and existing buildings
- Grillage at garage will shield from Canal St. and train sides

Chair Anderson asks about the landscape site plan re the grade difference from the rail elevation from the train to the back parking of the site. He asks who will resolve that, the bike trail with a retaining wall, or this project? The Applicant is working with the City and MBTA, but there is a wall proposed along that area. The Chair ask for clarification of the meaning of the dark lines around the Site on the Plan. If they represent a retaining wall, who will build it, the applicant who would then obtain a right of way from the MBTA, as they are trying to use their property for parking? He also asks if they have any flexibility with the distance from #142 to the retaining wall, which appears to be 24-30'. The Applicant feels the distance was tight so the wall was set back. Chair Anderson says he approves of the landscaping, but feels that the Applicant is missing an opportunity to landscape across the back to shade and separate the bike path and train from their property. This has been commented upon and discussed; the Landscape Architect notes that they thought about providing additional landscaping along rear, by bumping out parking, but they cannot do the whole strip in a tree canopy. Substantial landscaped areas can be provided but they can't slide the whole design toward the buildings and still use them as they are.

Landers Symes comments on the grades; the bike path will be 8-10' above their parking. Grades may be at 15 and 16 and their parking is at 9; this will be a steep embankment so planting options will be limited there. They have discussed pulling parking in to form islands; there can never be a straight line of landscaping, but they will put in pockets where possible.

Matt Veno asks, regarding numbers 142 and 140, for the Applicant to confirm that the backs of those buildings are the backs of commercial buildings, with no active use other than supporting commercial use, so the value of landscaping in the back would be only to the bike path. This would be of limited utility.

Chair Anderson asks for clarification of other dark lines around the site. Mr. Williams outlines. One represents the edge of parking along Canal St, one is a retaining wall, and the one on the left from the retail drive through is a retaining wall. The existing fence between the north building and flower shop will remain. The line between the north building and the others will be a small retaining wall with a guard; that retaining wall exists today, that area is already built up.

Kirt Rieder approves of the integration of residences adjacent to the rail trail in this project, but was disappointed by the wholesale removal of all the trees during the transformation north of this project. None of the trees were particularly desirable species, but the base installed on the bike trail will not be conducive to any plantings. He states that this will effectively be a dead zone, and cites it as a cautionary tale of what not to do along this end of the rail trail. It is important that if we expect pedestrians and citizens to use it, it must be a positive environment, and would not be expensive to improve.

He also does not see the dramatic reduction in pavement claimed by the Engineer, and would like to see the increase in pervious and decrease in impervious area mapped out at the next presentation. He feels that the "pocket park" does not serve any functional purpose. While he appreciates the pedestrian circulation with pathways from Canal St. and along Ocean, the 1,000 linear feet of streetscape is "undercooked," especially along Ocean. It would be beneficial to install meaningful strips of soil that can sustain large shade trees, which are much more desirable than small ornamentals. Especially with the loss of all the trees along the rail trail, even though they were all volunteers, there is an obligation to plant meaningful shade trees here. In the past, this Board has discussed requiring a certain number of trees per parking space, and there is a disparity here. While he understands the need to get a truck behind the building, he still feels there is room to create more plant-able area for pedestrians.

Kirt Rieder also comments that the sidewalk on Ocean could be parallel, but there is a pole there. The Applicant said that the majority of the site is lit by wall packs and LED on poles. He is concerned that architecture is of a certain character but the poles are a 19th century style, so should be replaced by something that will complement the architecture and be contemporary.

Snow storage must be examined. The landscape plan was not yet well developed, but that is good, in that that it was not too detailed, too early. While he understands the City's desire for art installations, but the spaces are 5' and 15' wide so he would rather see street trees instead of cramming in an art installation. The focus on any trees should be to plant large shade trees that can handle urban conditions along major street corridors. Residents on the upper stories will need the volume and mass of shade trees to mitigate the effects of pavement.

Chair Anderson asks about the drive through on the south side of the north building; the Applicant confirms this. The Chair approves of clapboards on the smaller south building, and is not a fan of EIFS (Exterior Insulated Finishing System) and would like the Applicant to consider an alternative finishing system.

Helen Sides comments, that architecturally, the south building is more successful than north; she does not approve of mansard, as contemporary forms are preferable. John Seger states that additional details on materials will be provided. This will be incorporated.

Chair Anderson notes that while there is always a tradeoff of parking vs. landscaping, the retail spaces seem to lack an area for pedestrian congregation, which is desirable at the front of the stores, and would connect and activate the retail fronts. The intent of retail spaces should be described.

Kirt Rieder asks about the geometry of new buildings to street. He approves the layout, which breaks up and gives depth to the streetscape.

Matt Veno notes that there was a lack of vision for this whole property originally, which should have been a PUD or at least planned to use the whole plot, so he is very happy to see them doing this. The addition of residential is intriguing for this stretch of land, so he credits the Applicant for taking this "risk," and thinks it will work quite well. Options planned for micro units do not exist in the rest of the City. While he agrees with what was said before re improvements, he is very excited about this project and the plans presented. Re drive throughs: the entrances to both retail and residential off of Ocean are a huge plus, and the drive through proposed work because there is room for queuing, as the ordinance requires. Working with the City to make the bike path is also commendable. The only part he finds odd is the maintenance of the Revere Tan building, the only one coming right to the street edge, at an awkward angle, but it is an existing tenant with a long term lease, so cannot be eliminated though it is not ideal from a planning perspective.

Kirt Rieder asks that parking counts be provided in the future, noting that the Applicant probably wishes to maximize parking because the approval of a PUD is based in part on ample parking, but he would prefer to see it scaled back to the proper amount. The Applicant notes that parking was examined thoroughly, not as if it were a PUD but under current zoning, and they are significantly under that threshold.

The Applicant has only provided for one parking space per apartment, and feels that this is appropriate for this location and project, though they did feel it was a bit of a risk. Carole Hamilton and Dale Yale opine that it is not a risk given the proximity of the development to the University and the train station.

Mr. Symes notes that the existing tenants have parking requirements as per their lease prior to purchase of the buildings, and they also have looked at retailers coming in, and what they would want for parking. Parking has already been limited as much as possible, and to reduce it further, residential units would have to be sacrificed.

The Applicant also still requires information on plans for the bike path, etc. Parking on MBTA property exists now and about half of it is paved and in use, with a few spaces being added due to the inclusion of residential usage.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment.

Josh Turiel, Ward 5 Councilor, comments on the history of the site since the 1990's. The roadway project will conclude this summer; he is thrilled that this will "unlock" the road and hopes this is the beginning of quality redevelopment of any type. He feels this is a good site, with a decent mix of flow and use, that will work well. He would like to see the focus in future meetings be on green space/greenery. This area did originally provide a visual buffer to those on the other side. He makes some suggestions re accommodations in the back to break up the long stretch of parked cars. He notes that the Applicant should be aware that Canal St. has just been rebuilt with new crosswalks, sidewalks, and roadway; it is narrowed going through the curve to the north, but that has historically been a place where drivers could pass others turning left at full speed; that is no longer possible, but it is currently a blind area. The Applicant should be aware of this and should work towards pedestrian safety, if possible, especially as residents of their development will be crossing the street often, to get to the plaza. He approves of the density and feels that the addition of 50 units over the entire site will not cause congestion issues.

Polly Wilburt of 7 Cedar St. is also concerned about the lack of greenery. She also urges developer to ensure that there is sufficient water available to maintain greenery if it is put in. She cites CVS. This is a quality of life issue. She would find it unfortunate if these wound up being dorms. That would exacerbate the pedestrian issues and the effect on traffic. Pedestrian safety is important, especially that now that road surface is better, people drive faster. She is also concerned about the driveway from the north building onto Canal St., which is aligned with the Crosby's driveway, as car dart in either direction could be dangerous to pedestrians trying to cross there. Her final concern is about snow storage and removal.

Councilor Dibble of Ward 7 approves of the project plans. He is concerned that the bike path will be narrow at this point, as some of what was supposed to be bike path corridor is taken over by parking. He feels that concrete across the whole strip must be softened; the Applicant should check how wide the bike path would be and see if it can be landscaped. He confirms that the south Salem train stop is off of this plan, closer to downtown. Enclosed dumpsters in their screening must include space for recycling totes. He agrees with Kirt Rieder that the trees along Canal St. must provide a decent canopy. He suggests lining trees up with the striping on parking spaces so they are less likely to be bumped by cars with large overhangs. More landscaping is needed. Also he feels there should be fewer driveways, perhaps by combining them as has been done in other parts of the City. He approves of drainage but suggests deep sump catch basins due to material coming off the road. He asks about lighting on the north pedestrian walkway.

Steve Feinstein with Symes Associates notes that the location and size of the rail trail are not being changed, but that the Applicant is taking "orphaned" land that the MBTA owned between rail trail and this site. The retaining wall will be built in part by the City as part of rail trail plan, but they must coordinate with them on rest of it. It will be built regardless of what they do as the grades cannot work out. It was pushed back and made taller to gain parking, but the rail trail location and width is consistent on either plane. Also re curb cuts on north side: next to Darlene's is a curb cut currently, and this has been eliminated in the Plan. Crosby's is further down across from Darlene's, not this site.

The Chair requests that an elevation of the entire site along Canal St. and Ocean Ave. be provided. An aerial perspective was presented and is reviewed but will be submitted for Board member packets.

Kirt Rider notes that regarding "orphaned land," the Applicant should err on side of less paved space with more greenery vs. moving the wall toward the bike path and maximizing parking.

Matt Veno asks about parking spaces behind the buildings; Landrey Symes notes that there is no assigned parking, but they figured out how much was needed and went from there. Most parking exists now but spaces were added because the City asked them to add as many residences as they felt comfortable. A parking table is not in Board member packages because they are not required by the PUD, but Chair Anderson requests that this be provided at a future meeting. Matt Veno notes that when development of numbers 140 and 142 was complete, it complied with parking regulations, which means it is currently very much overparked. He can't imagine that customers park in those spaces along the back today, and indeed most employees park there. Mr. Symes says he has never been there when all spaces along Canal St. are full. The Board prefer that the Applicant sacrifice parking for landscape, but the neighbors they met with felt there was not enough parking.

A motion to continue to the Feb. 1, 2018 meeting, is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 6-0.

I. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

- A. Deliberate and vote on recommendation of the amendment to the Salem Zoning Ordinance Section 1. Sub-section 3.1 Principle Uses of Section 3.0 Use Regulations by deleting: "Use of land for the primary purpose of agriculture, horticulture, floriculture, or viticulture on a parcel of more than five acres in area." And replacing it with: "Use of land for the primary purpose of agriculture, horticulture, floriculture, or viticulture on a parcel of more than two acres in area."**

Chair Anderson suggests that the Board continue this discussion as the need for more information was made clear at the joint meeting yesterday.

A motion to continue to the February 1, 2018 meeting is made by Carole Hamilton, seconded by Dale Yale, and carries 6-0.

- B. Location: 9 south Mason Street, 3A Buffum Street Extension; and 23 Mason Street (also including 23 ½ Mason Street and 23R Mason Street) (Map 26, Lots 73, 74, 79)
Applicant: JUNIPER POINT 9 SOUTH MASON STREET LLC
Description: An insignificant change request to the previously approved Site Plan Review, and Special Permits under the north River Canal Corridor Neighborhood Mixed Use District and Flood Hazard Overlay District specifically to allow a modification to footprint, and the east and west elevation of the existing two-story concrete building to accommodate the relocation of internal stairs to the exterior of the building.**

Attorney Joseph Correnti of 63 Federal St. represents the applicant. He outlines their request at the last meeting; the "ice cream factory" middle building will be reused but needed revision to the Plans as stairwells had to be extended outside the building. Bob Griffin and Ryan McSherer, architect, are present. Site impacts or lack thereof were described at the last meeting, but they did not have elevations of the stairwells; these are being presented tonight.

Mr. McSherer of Red Barn Architecture presents. He hands out drawings that compare and contrast what was approved with what is proposed. There are no material changes to aesthetics or materials; all details are similar. A change in massing and footprint has occurred. The main block of the building will remain the same but stairs will be added to each end. Cutting through slab is ill advised so stair towers will house stairs as appendages to the outside of the building, to the interior units. Mr. McSherer outlines the reasoning for the design change. Chair Anderson clarifies that these are egress stairs on either end for

upper floors to get out; he and Helen Sides appreciate the scale of the project better now. Size and proportions of the tower are improved.

Amanda Chiancola notes that the Board had recommended including a condition re trees, with funding going into a City fund because of net tree loss, and wonders if the Board still desires that condition, and if the Applicant agreed. Bob Griffin concedes that one tree was lost, but feel that since additional shrubs will be planted, they are planting more than required. He feels that to require them to fund a new tree is punitive. Kirt Rieder disagrees but does not have strong feelings on the matter.

A motion to approve the insignificant change is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Carole Hamilton, and passes 6-0.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Planning Board Meeting held on December 21, 2017

A motion to approve the minutes with minor corrections is made by Helen Sides, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 5-0 with Matt Veno abstaining.

III. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by Dale Yale, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes with all in favor, 6-0.

The meeting ends at 9:50PM.

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-2018-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Kilb, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 2/15/2018

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