

City of Salem Planning Board
Approved Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 3, 2018

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, May 3, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Annex, 98 Washington Street, Large Public Hearing Room, First Floor, Salem, Massachusetts.

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

I. ROLL CALL

Those present were: Chair Ben Anderson, Carole Hamilton, Helen Sides, Bill Griset, DJ Napolitano, Vice Chair Matt Venio (arrived late at 7:13PM), Kirt Rieder (7)

Absent: Dale Yale, Noah Koretz (2)

Also in attendance: Ashley Green, Staff Planner, and Stacy Kilb, Recorder

II. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Location: 11-13 Dodge St., 217-219 Washington St., and 231-251 Washington St. (Map 34, Lots 404, 405 and 406)

Applicant: DODGE AREA, LLC

Description: A continuation of a public hearing for all persons interested in the amendment to the approved Site Plan Review, Planned Unit Development Special Permit, Flood Hazard Overlay District Special Permit, and Stormwater Management Permit for the property located at 11-13 Dodge St., 217-219 Washington St., and 231-251 Washington St. (Map 34, Lots 0404, 0405, and 0406). The applicant proposes changes to the proposed buildings, landscaping, hardscape, parking, utilities, and lighting, primarily in order to incorporate changes requested by other City boards and departments and to make the project economically feasible by reducing the maximum number of stories from six to five and constructing the project all at once rather than in phases. As amended, the applicant proposes to construct an approximately 146,000 square foot mix-use development with 52 residential units, commercial space including a 113 unit hotel, a parking structure with 212 parking spaces, associated landscaping and pedestrian and transportation improvements.

Present for the Applicant are:

Ken McClure, RLA, Senior Project Manager, The DeNunzio Group

Mr. McClure notes that he is seeking Board input before drafting a finalized design for the green roof, to be presented at the May 17 meeting.

A slide show of the green roof study is presented:

- Project overview: view of garage roof from above
- Solar orientation
- Shadow study; may be difficult to grow plants year round
- Options:
 - Full green roof
 - Perimeter green roof
 - Island green roof (most feasible, selected option). Leading edge of green roof usually gets wind beaten, so island helps with that

- Potential Island massing; location of columns highlighted where other installations could be placed
- Option selected vs. original design; previous had a total of 5500 square feet; new design encompasses 8,000 square feet. Recover Green Roofs noted that larger, connected green spaces do better on green roofs so the new one is a more beneficial design
- Solar orientation with regards to current design; looking for something (undetermined as yet) to connect and make crushed stone areas more interesting
- Material selected: Stone material, plant material:
 - Sedum cuttings (mix of color, could be in pattern or just random)
 - vegetation layer
 - drainage
 - protection layer
 - root barrier if waterproofing is not root-resistant
- Perspective: What is actually installed not be boulders as illustrated but are there as “placeholders” to show anticipated repeating elements. Saw toothed edge design will provide interest

Chair Anderson thanks Mr. McClure for his presentation and asks about the boulders. What will actually be installed is still to be determined, but it will be some sort of repeating element, either artistic sculptures that relate to each other, or possibly “glow rocks” to provide lighting for night interest; Mr. McClure is also seeking Board input on this. Kirt Rieder commends the Applicant on presentation, as it has repaired the more woeful aspects of previous presentations very effectively. He clarifies for the public that sedums are small plants, 2-3” tall, and “carpet like.” He did not realize crushed stone was there, and feels it is an opportunity though they are probably limited by SRI. He feels that a few larger installations (represented by the boulders) would be better than many smaller ones, and it would be obvious if they were artificial. He asks about the surface of the roof; it was originally proposed as flat with a few waffles, however while the new design will have some waffles to capture water, the architectural discussion with Recover Green Roofs is ongoing. It will have no real slope, only 2-3%. Kirt Rieder opines that the Applicant has hit a “sweet spot” with this design. Helen Sides agrees, doesn’t but would prefer to see the sedums in a more “organic” shape, possibly with rounded edges. Kirt Rieder notes that sedums come in trays, so that look would be pixilated, so this design is easier, and more efficient. Chair Anderson and Helen Sides agree that the Applicant could offset some stone to make it less rectilinear, however Kirt points out that joined trays have the best chance of survival.

Chair Anderson notes that this view shows how much better this is than a blank slate.

DJ Napolitano asks about the voting timeline, as he feels prepared to vote tonight, however Mr. McClure notes that in two weeks, the Applicant will have determined a shape and have a better idea of repeating elements. The Design Review Board (DRB) also has one more chance to review the project. Kirt Rieder feels that the Applicant is on target but given their request at last meeting (to touch base at this meeting, then seek approval at the next), he doesn’t want to shortchange the Applicant or the public by voting prematurely.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment.

Councilor Josh Turiel, Ward 5, of 238 Lafayette St. thanks applicant for their listening to the public and Board. He appreciates the green roof upgrade.

Judy French of 16 Foster St. would prefer a more organic shape and asks about public accessibility to the roof. As discussed at the previous meeting, options such as urban gardening are not possible as the hotel

partner feels that hotel guests and residents using the same space presents a conflict and cannot support that concept.

Bill Legault of 2 Orne St. approves of project and the roof but is disappointed that the surface parking from upper Washington St. has been eliminated. He is concerned that the public will not be able to find the parking spaces that have been provided.

Emily Udy of 8 Buffum St., speaking on behalf of Historic Salem Inc., appreciates the Applicant listening to public and Board, and wonders what other questions are outstanding. Additional green roof details will be provided at the next meeting, at which time a draft Decision will be voted upon.

Kirt Rieder asks about the 38 public parking spaces, and Mr. McClure outlines the 10 spaces on the 3rd floor and 28 on the ground floor. This was done as a mix, as the current access is from lower Dodge St. across from Starbucks. When presented to the SRA, they suggested consolidating parking, so it has been left open, but the Applicant is willing to go with either configuration depending on input from the SRA, however that Board sought DRB and PB direction.

David Friedberg of 57 Britannia Circle notes that parking spaces must be well marked so people know they are available. He is concerned that RCG retail tenants will suffer if the public parking is not made obvious.

A motion to continue the May 17, 2018 meeting is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Helen Sides, and carries 7-0.

- B. 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:** The applicant requested a continuance to the regularly scheduled meeting on THURSDAY, May 17, 2018 of a continuation of 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.

A motion to continue to the May 17, 2018 meeting is made by DJ Napolitano, seconded by Bill Grisct, and passes 6-0 with Matt Veno not yet present.

- C. 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.

Present for the Applicant:

Attorney Joseph Correnti, 63 Federal St.

Bob Griffin, Project Engineer, Griffin Engineering

Laura Rutledge, Landscape Architect

Attorney Joseph Correnti provides a review of activity. At the last meeting this Applicant attended, a significant change in the Plan was presented. The Board felt that the reconfiguration was an improvement and helpful Board and public feedback were provided. Work on those revisions has continued. Revised Plans were filed and details will be discussed tonight. Revised landscaping plans will also be presented. The main focus of those is along the Franklin St. edge. Open space along the riverfront will also be reviewed. The Applicant presented to the DRB and continued that process on architectural features; they are working to incorporate that feedback.

Bob Griffin, Project Engineer, presents a PowerPoint outlining further revisions to the project:

- Project Site, entirely within flood zone, elevations 7-10
- Existing Conditions, environmental contamination are outlined; all onsite vegetation will be replaced
- Proposed Layout Sept. 2017 (Original)
- Proposed Layout Feb. 2018 (Revised): unit count is the same but building footprints have shrunk and building orientations changed; view corridor from Franklin St. now provided
- Proposed Layout Apr. 2018:
 - Revisions include incorporation of “woonerf” concept [as suggested by Noah Koretz at a previous meeting]
 - 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit, for a total of 74 spaces, are provided; a loading area has been included for temporary parking/drop-offs of guests or packages
 - Drive corridors have been narrowed, crosswalks in a different color, speed bumps to be installed
 - Pavement materials in circular area are varied
 - Trying to emphasize pedestrian movement on the site.
 - Taller buildings are toward the back of the site; lower townhouses near the front
 - 54 outside, 20 indoor parking spaces, with 3 ADA compliant handicapped spaces
 - Treatment of asphalt and sidewalk relationship has been revised; normally there is a crown at the center of the road to shed water, however in this design, water will flow toward the center of the roadway with no defined curb between sidewalk and pavement; separation will be via bollards,

lights and signposts to create a safe environment for pedestrians and vehicles. More conventional parking is along the Furlong Park side of site.

- Townhouses have been pulled back to allow for landscaping; elevations are described
- Proposed sidewalk along Franklin St. has been widened and tree gates added
- Raised sidewalk and different materials emphasize pedestrians over vehicles; some areas are also stamped asphalt, but mostly stone or concrete pavers will be used
- Space for fire apparatus uses turf block in two areas where grass will come from pavers; large moving trucks can also be accommodated
- Snow storage is outlined
- Walkway to Chapter 91 area and townhouse access were previous separate; now one wider sidewalk runs all the way down to seaside path so it is not “us or them” mentality
- Materials for walkway: this was left as stabilized stone dust because if asphalt, it creates a less friendly, more industrial area. If a connection to the multi-use path is made later, this can change to asphalt. Benches have been added, and they are trying to tie their walkway into the Furlong Park walkway, though there will be a gap
- Fencing is described for along both sides of the property
- Re setbacks: Various setbacks are described, though none are specified in NRCC
- Grade changes: there still are reasonable accessible pathways to buildings
- Decorative bollards to separate vehicles from pedestrians are shown.
- Woonerf cross-section
- Fire Truck Path
- Proposed Layout: Overview in relation to adjacent properties (Furlong Park, Burnham Dredging)
- Limits of Site Above Flood Waters
 - Built area of site is above flood elevation, which is elevation 10; Franklin St. is elevation 7. If area floods above 10, it will be a tidal/storm surge, short duration flooding event
- Proposed water & sewer; applicant is still working on a response to Bill Ross’s (the Peer Reviewer’s) comments; potable services, water and sewer are outlined. An 8” sewer line will tie into the existing 24” sewer line. MDC traps for parking garages will be installed
- Proposed Grading & Drainage: slopes are described. Roof runoff will go to a new outfall; no infiltration proposed, as the Applicant does not have to meet peak flow requirements as the project is in a tidally influenced area. A First Defense Unit will provide some treatment
- Proposed Gas & Electric: All utilities are above flood elevation. Light fixtures shown area a lantern style for parking lots, and the Applicant can install black panels to focus light. A Photometric plan has been provided; average light is 1 lumen on the ground at drive aisles, less at lot lines and in open spaces. Bollard lights along public access pathways are outlined. Wall packs and wall sconces at doors of buildings
- Photometric Plan
- Bollard Lights
- Lantern
- Project Summary: (21) 2 BR, (27) 3 BR units proposed
- NRCC Projects Number of Units per Acre (density)

Laura Rutledge, Landscape Architect, presents the Landscape Plan.

- Landscape Plan
 - Pedestrian access has been simplified
 - Streetscape plantings of shade trees along Franklin St. and property line on West side

- Riverfront walkway has low plantings of perennials and large masses of shrub beds, all native, with foundation plantings along buildings; buildings provide pocket areas for plantings. Smaller trees are planned for interior of project in order to preserve the view to the river.
- Lawn between buildings and river can be used for passive recreation/enjoyment
- Public stone dust path
- Public Bench: granite or wood are options
- Fence
- Landscape example of walkway plantings

Carole Hamilton wonders about the change from 43 to 48 units; units and traffic were updated in February and discussed in the March meeting.

Kirt Rieder appreciates the detail and effort that have gone into explaining circulation and its change in configuration to favor pedestrians. He feels that regarding traffic calming, while the raised crosswalk and speed tables are good, he does not like stamped asphalt as it degrades too quickly. As for the concrete unit pavers, he asks that the Applicant please choose a single type to use on the raised crosswalks at the street and where crossing drives, as this would tie everything together. Granite pavers on the circle to accent it are good, and only one additional material to differentiate is necessary.

Discussion regarding the configuration of the access drive off of Franklin St. ensues. It is not parallel to the building any longer but is parallel to the softball field line. Originally, it was planned parallel to the building, however this left a small wedge of landscaping along the fence line, so the Applicant decided to reconfigure the area and make plantings near the building bigger. Kirt Rieder notes that there are existing trees lining ball field, that have a large root zone, and that paving nearby will stress those trees.

Twenty-nine (29) new shade trees are proposed for this project. However, the site is very large, and he feels 29 shade trees is too few. The lawn is expansive, and while he appreciates the flexibility he notes that it will likely be burnt from July-Sept., like Leslie's Retreat was for several years until the trees there matured. He feels the Applicant should invest in more smaller shade trees that will become large, and thus will add value in years 10-20. Laura Rutledge feels that the character and view preservation from buildings and lawn space are important. Kirt Rieder, in contrast, says that those views can still be had from under large shade trees, and residents can see through them.

He also wonders if the trees near the water can handle salt water inundation/infiltration. There are only 4 to provide a bit of shade; the examples of riverfront park with masses or perennial beds and native plants are appealing. He also supports stabilized crushed stone for path.

Other concerns include the street trees, whose 42" root balls will not fit in a 24" hole, and the building cannot be shifted. Also, Kirt Rieder urges the Applicant not be "overtly nostalgic" with regards to bollards and lighting but to make them more compatible with the architecture. Something powder coated, dark but not black, and less stark would be appealing. He supports the idea of granite benches, as granite is indestructible, which is good if vandalism is an issue.

Chair Ben Anderson echoes Kirt Rieder's comment regarding green space along left hand side of driveway but he likes the pathway to the river where it is. Greenery along the fence would be good. He is uncomfortable with the flush sidewalk and roadway and understands it is partially for drainage but feels more bollards may be needed for people to feel safe. He also appreciates the reconfigured roadway and pergola.

Kirt Rieder disagrees regarding the bollards, feeling they should be deleted altogether, as there will be few vehicle trips through the area. Bollards are meant to slow down traffic, but there is need to protect pedestrians. Flush curbs do not bother him. The Applicant can show some examples at the next meeting.

Matt Veno approves of the circulation plan presently proposed. He agrees with the choice of stone dust on the path and advises the Applicant not to pave it unless or until it connects to a multiuse path. He approves of the new path to river to the right of the parking lot and has no strong opinion about the wedge of vegetation along the fence but agrees with Kirt Rieder and Chair Anderson. He commends the scaling of the project, with the smaller units toward Franklin St. with the larger ones towards the back. He is concerned about adjacent sidewalks and bollards, feeling that bollards would look ugly and that he would prefer granite to provide a more traditional separation of pedestrians and traffic. However, he is open to convincing alternatives.

Helen Sides notes that too many bollards provide too much light at eye level; light must be softer at night and come from above, spreading, so she implores the applicant not to add too many bollards. Only the bollards on the path out to the river are intended to be lit, a few lit ones can be added. She likes the idea of combining the sidewalk and road. Kirt Rieder feels that this creates enhanced ambiguity between who is in charge; if the space is more defined, people stop paying attention. He also asks that the Applicant not install tree grates but choose perhaps flexi pavers to allow for a wheelchair compliant surface.

Chair Anderson asks how units will be heated and cooled, concerned about fans on the ground. Individual units will be on the roof for each dwelling, and boxes are indicated on the plan. If temperature control units change to ground based ones, the Plan would be amended.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment.

Victoria Ricadello, 5 Foster St. Concerns:

- Height of buildings (she mentions 70')
- DRB had negative reaction to design; none of their comments were taken into acct prior to today
- Congestion/density
- Out of character with Northfields neighborhood

Attorney Correnti clarifies the above misinformation. No building is proposed at 70'. The tallest is 60', which includes parking underneath, that creates an entire story.

Judy French, 16 Foster St.

Concerns:

- Number of 3 bedroom and 2-bedroom units? 21 and 27, respectively.
- DRB report was not yet received and will not be until their process is complete. She also notes that they did not like the height, but architecture is not being reviewed this evening
- Height & size out of scale for neighborhood
- Approves of stone dust path and vegetation there
- How the project fits into Salem; Chair will review notes
- Process once DRB comments are received; timing of process is uncertain

Orville Nadler, 43 Walter St. asks about the possibility of a traffic light at Franklin St. and route 114 as drivers cannot safely make left to get downtown. There are no plans for that. Attorney Correnti cites the traffic study done by Vanasse & Associates; the impact analysis statement is in the filing, and the City had Gary Hebert peer review that analysis, so all that information is available there as part of the record.

Andrew Fett, 1 Felt St.

Concerns:

- Flush curbs are abused by commuter parkers; he cites that pedestrians cannot use the dedicated sidewalk in the area due to parked cars.
- Perspectives on landscape design not shown, but can be requested and reviewed
- Notes that height measurements are to the roof eave edge of buildings, not to the peak of the roof

Beth Gerard, Ward 6 Councilor, 49 Larchmont Rd

- Asks about lighted bollards along path to river; maintaining a publicly accessible space is the Chapter 91 requirement, though lighting is not specifically mentioned. Lighting is not planned along the stone dust path itself as it is not desirable to have people there at night, and Chapter 91 requires access from dawn to dusk, not 24 hours
- Asks about flood protection; shoreline here will also be cleaned up and stabilized, vegetative stabilization with riprap at the top of the intertidal area
- Asks the Applicant to ensure that light from lanterns is directed downward, not outward, for pedestrians at night
- Also recommends more trees in the lawn area; green spaces are further outlined

Anne Sterling, 29 Orchard St.

- Concerned about the disputed strip of land; Attorney Correnti notes that this was discussed at the first meeting, and plans are being presented for Board review and approval because the Applicant believes they have the right to develop that area, and if not has wasted a lot of time and money. Ultimately if the Board needs further information, the City Solicitor can weigh in.

Emily Udy 8 Buffum St.

- Concerned that the walkway by townhouses that leads to the path by the water may be perceived as “private,” but Attorney Correnti clarifies that Chapter 91 requires identifying public access via signage or visual cues; it must be clear. The larger picture of this site and the park will be shown next presentation. Also, the developer can contribute to the path into Furlong Park if it makes sense to tie it together.

Shirley Crasco, 15 Roosevelt Rd.

Concerns:

- Parking, density
- Attorney Correnti notes that these will be sold as high-end condos, not rentals, and while in theory an owner could rent it out, there may be deed restrictions to limit that. Additionally, parking requirements are the topic of a citywide conversation, and the City is encouraging building less parking.

George O'Brien

- Density
- Parking
- Traffic
- Disputed land/Coast Guard

A motion to continue to the June 7, 2018 meeting, is made by DJ Napolitano, seconded by Bill Griset, and passes 7-0.

- D. Location:** 57 Marlborough Road/Osborne Hills
Applicant: Osborne Hills Realty Trust
Description: **The applicant requested a continuance to the regularly scheduled meeting on **THURSDAY, May 17, 2018** A five-year extension request to complete the Osborne Hills Subdivision, located at 57 Marlborough Rd.*

A motion to continue to the May 17, 2018 meeting is made by Bill Grisct, seconded by Helen Sides, and passes 6-0 with Matt Veno not yet present.

- E. Location:** 45 Traders Way and 40 First Street (Map 08, Lot 159; Map 13, Lot 0011)
Applicant: PETER LUTTS/PAVEL ESPINAL
Description: A public hearing for all persons interested in the application for the properties located at 45 Traders Way and 40 First Street (Map 08, Lot 159; Map 13, Lot 0011) in accordance with the following sections of the Salem Zoning Ordinance: Section 7.3 for a Planned Unit Development and Section 9.5 for a Site Plan Review. Specifically, the petitioner is proposing seven (7), free-standing, residential/retail mixed use buildings of varying heights throughout the 8.9 acre site. The development includes 212 dwelling units, approximately 7, 600 square feet of retail space, 318 parking spaces, bike racks, at least one parking space for a car share, landscaping, a dog park, walking paths, utility work, and drainage systems for stormwater runoff.

Present for the Applicant are:

Attorney Scott Grover, 27 Congress St.
Rich Williams, Williams & Sparages, Civil Engineer
Dan Ricciarelli, Seger Architects, Architect
Mike DeAngelo, LS
Bob Michaud, Traffic Engineer

Attorney Grover describes the approximately 9-acre site controlled by Fafard Real Estate/Development; all has been developed except for this parcel, which is a “wasteland” of homeless and broken shopping carts. The parcel is in the Industrial zone and under a Purchase and Sale Agreement from Fafard subject to permission to develop it. Meetings with stakeholders have been held, including Mayor Driscoll and Tom Daniel, senior Planner. The Applicant sought City support for a change of use from Industrial to Residential for this parcel; feedback was that residential usage was appropriate. A one stop meeting was held with police, fire, traffic, and engineering Departments to get input, so the current Plan incorporated that feedback. The Applicant has also reached out to Lisa Peterson, Ward Councilor, who facilitated neighborhood meetings.

Overview:

There are two applications, one for a Planned Unit Development (PUD), and one for Site Plan Review (SPR); the project is primarily residential with 212 apartments in 7 buildings, but there is a significant retail component of 7600 square feet in 2 buildings. 322 parking spaces combined are proposed, in covered garages and surface spaces. This is just above the 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit required by zoning. Parking near the retail buildings is shared retail/residential.

Rich Williams, Site Engineer, Williams & Sparages:

- Outlines topography; wetlands fed by parking lot runoff are described; it is part of the wetland system on the other side of First St. that is owned by City of Salem

- Utilities are described; they exist in First St. and Traders Way; all electrical utilities are underground. Light poles light Traders Way; some utilities come from an adjacent site. Drainage is described
- Surrounding areas are described
- Seven buildings proposed are described, with varying unit counts; 6 garage units provide 44 covered spaces; the remainder is uncovered parking lot.
- Site circulation is described; vehicular and pedestrian access/walkways are outlined
- Drainage is described. Runoff reduction has been achieved by designing underground infiltration units. Some ledge will be removed to construct the parking lot, but the infiltration system will be installed in a place with more soil. The Applicant will be reducing runoff by 25% in a 100 year storm. All drainage will meet Mass Stormwater Policy, and will be peer reviewed
- 5 locations are provided for trash and recycling
- Snow storage is described
- Dog park is outlined

Dan Ricciarelli, Seger Architects, presents

- Square footage of buildings; amenity spaces have been interspersed on first floor levels. Some topography allows for basements, some will be slab on grade
- Street Elevations, massing
- Prototype front/Rear Elevations: Design, materials
- Renderings
- Materials
- Balconies

Bob Michaud, MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc., presents traffic impacts:

- Existing baseline conditions, count locations. Spoke to DOT and City; signals will be upgraded to adaptive “smart” signals
- Pending construction of roundabout at Swampscott Road and First. St. This will be in place by the time this development would be built and has been taken into account
- Trip Generation Summary: While a commercial project would be allowed, mostly residential is planned with neighborhood-oriented retail; planned uses would be small office, yoga studio, coffee shop, etc. This means that retail will not be a substantial traffic generator, and traffic generation estimates are based on those usages mentioned above
 - 2025 Build Condition Weekday Morning Peak Hour Traffic Volumes: trip generation at various intersections are outlined. Changes are a small percentage and well distributed among roadways that serve the site
 - 2025 Build Condition Weekday Evening Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
- Estimates are not high enough to affect the area; enhanced DOT signals and roundabout will improve traffic in the area
- Improvements related to Traders Way: single driveway provides access to commercial buildings that flank it and to other units
 - Applicant will provide a left turn dedicated lane to turn in, improve other striping
- Cyclist and Pedestrian accommodations: sidewalk improvements, connections through site are proposed
 - Amenity space for dog park will be provided
 - Bicycle racks are proposed
 - Transportation Demand Management Initiatives are being planned; those who lease will be given maps/schedules and advised to use public transit

- Zipcar parking locations will be provided. Options are driving trip rates down such as Uber etc.
- Electric car parking will be provided
- Parking: 322 spaces provided, including shared space for visitors and commercial. Supply during early AM hours is anticipated at 277, while in the middle of the day Commercial areas will be used more, so the types of commercial uses mentioned above will be well accommodated with the parking supply provided, due to complementary peaks for residential and commercial demands

Mike D'Angelo, Landscape Architect

- Focus was to re-create tree canopy, maintain wetland
- Emphasized large shade trees, with 150 being planted; Tree types and areas are described; diversity in species on interior of site provides resiliency and interest
- Some flowering trees will be at entrances
- Understory plantings: drought and salt tolerant plants for parking areas; perennials and evergreen materials at entrances
- Row of trees on East side of property

DJ Napolitano asks re traffic, concerned that the addition of a small number of vehicles can have an exponentially detrimental effect on congestion. He notes the delays created by cars making a left onto Swampscott Road, that extend so far back they create a secondary queue of cars that can't get around them to go straight. Mr. Michaud outlines the upcoming short-term solutions such as the adaptive signal control, to be installed within the next year. While not a perfect solution, long term improvements to this corridor have been studied but are not immediately forthcoming and will probably be installed 5-6 years out. The 19 cars per hour described here means one extra trip every 3-5 minutes; there is also some normal variation. Mr. Michaud feels that this will not create major delays. The DOT understands the problems faced by this area and is funding resolutions for these larger issues. Mr. Michaud outlines commercial vs. residential traffic impacts; the former generates a lot more traffic, such as 300-600 trips per hour, which would be very difficult to accommodate.

A discussion of the character of the development ensues regarding maintaining a neighborhood feel vs. having buildings floating in a sea of parking. The massing was actually scaled back as the neighborhood had concerns, but as this is a PUD, the applicant can fashion it as they wish, and accommodate any input from the City, Planning Board, and neighborhood.

Chair Anderson comments that renderings were not in the package, so requests them. He feels there is potentially a missed opportunity with retail on the corner to connect pedestrian traffic there from Whaler's Way. An additional rendering or flyover to provide a more accurate sense of scale would be helpful; a full model will be presented at the next meeting.

Kirt Rieder has several comments:

- Any fly through animation should have some views from driver level and eye view as that is how people experience the development
- He also asks about the possibility of a rotary at First St. and Trader's way; logistically, this is not feasible, due to the space required plus the fact that the premise of a roundabout is to accommodate balanced traffic volumes, which is not the case here
- Comments that the curb cut at Trader's Way appears very large, but its dimensions are standard. The Applicant feels that those making a turn onto Trader's Way cannot accelerate like those rounding the corner by Home Depot at 40 mph, but Kirt Rieder disagrees
- Appreciates the architecture but is concerned about placement on the site. He suggests placing parking underneath the buildings in order to unlock open space but acknowledges that this may be at odds

with neighbor desires for smaller massing. He feels that 60% of the parking could be located under the buildings

- Notes that the Landscape Architect may be able to add small caliper trees between some buildings, such as between buildings 3 and 4. Additionally, the row of trees along other parking lot is undercooked
- Urges the Applicant to view the existing wetland as an asset, not a liability.
- Feels that the 125 trees proposed are a good start, but that the species list must be diversified
- Is concerned about the proximity of the dog park to the wetland, but contrary to how it appears on the Plan, they are not overlapping; trees in a dog park are good
- Attorney Scott Grover notes that for a PUD, one option is less parking than the 1.5 spaces required, but neighbors were concerned there was not enough and that residents would park on First St.

Chair Anderson opens to public comment.

Net Levitt Aurora Lane:

- Concerns:
- Traffic counts on weekends not accounted for
- Home Depot exit situation
- Wood home construction
- Trash, environmental concerns, dumpsters

Marsha Gerber 29 Bangor next to wetlands

Concerns:

- Runoff
- Noise
- Balconies should face into complex instead - noise
- Necessity of a dog park – noise
- Left turn lane addition
- Trucks not allowed on First St.; Traffic engineer says may be a restriction but delivery trucks such as UPS etc. are allowed
- Drivers running the light
- Soil may not be conducive to trees; Applicant replies that soil will be tested and amended/improved as needed
- Traffic engineer clarifies that they are formalizing, not changing lanes; pavement markings are in bad condition and upcoming changes are described

Dave Goodoff, 31 First St.

Concerns:

- Headlights
- Balconies/noise
- Traffic
- Size and layout of development
- Parking

Debbie Tucker, 35B First St.

Concerns:

- Traffic

- First Street Driveway
- Size of project
- Contrast to character of adjacent neighborhood
- Balconies/noise
- Elderly comments should be heard
- Drainage

Cindy Anselmo, Cloister Condominium

Concerns:

- Wetlands/surface drainage
- Size/massing/height
- Chair comments that a rendering has been requested, will give a better idea of scale
- Traffic, if make access road to Trader's Way

Councilor Lisa Peterson, Ward 3 Councilor, outlines concerns brought to her by neighbors:

- Some neighbors are opposed to development at all re traffic, parking
- Paper road owned by DeMoulas; possible conversion to an access point to site/plaza
- Fewer units as mitigation
- Cloister Condo's interested in mitigation using trees for screening
- Shift entrances (both of them) over to mitigate impact of headlights of cars across street
- Environmental and wildlife impact concerns
- Strong blasting remediation contract (standard, but should be taken into account)
- Noise mediation and truck traffic routes to be written into plan
- Some concerned about being entirely rentals vs. condos, some wanted a higher % of affordable units; as is the PUD includes 10%
- Proximity of buildings to road is a concern, but don't want parking in front, more green space instead
- Balconies should point to interior
- Traffic study does not account for other proposals for Highland Corridor (general concern about study)

Linda Tattler Aurora Lane

- Traffic; cites roundabout in Lynn which is ineffective

Letters were submitted to the Board by:

Lisa Peterson

Linda Tattler

Marcia Callman

Joan Gillman

Barbara Canty

Deborah Tucker

Carole Hamilton asks if the Board can request that the Traffic Peer Review explore parking utilization in neighboring developments. Ashley Green replies that this can be added to the scope, and the review sent to Board members. Timing re obtaining peer review is discussed.

A motion to continue to the May 17, 2018 meeting is made by Helen Sides, seconded by DJ Napolitano, and passes 7-0.

III. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

- A. **Provide the Registry of Deeds an update on the Planning Board Members.**

This item is tabled until the next meeting.

- B. ***Deliberate and vote on recommendation to City Council on three (3) separate proposed Zoning Amendments listed below:**

1. **To amend the City's Zoning Ordinance Section 3.0—Table of Principal & Accessory Use Regulations amending scrivener's errors from 2009 recodification including allowing a dwelling above first floor retail, service or office in B1 zone; allowing by right clubs, indoor commercial recreation, service, plumbing/carpentry/sheet metal, restaurants, manufacturing, storage, research/development and adult daycare in I zone; allowing by special permit outdoor commercial recreation and accessory structures in I zone.**
2. **To amend the City's Zoning Ordinance Section 4.1.1—Table of Dimensional Requirements establishing 1) max. height of fences and 2) dimensional requirements for B1 zone dwellings.**
3. **To amend the City's Zoning Ordinance Section 10.0—Definitions relative to dwelling unit; rooming, boarding and lodging house; general service establishment; assisted living residence; site plan review; and zoning bd. of appeal.**

This item is tabled until the next meeting.

Bill Grisct, who will not be attending that meeting, has some comments relating to the question of errors vs. changes in zoning. He is unsure the posting was sufficient to cover the zoning changes under discussion. The Chair understands his concerns but notes that the fact that these were changes, not errors, was referenced. Helen Sides feels that the City Solicitor sufficiently addressed the issue at the last joint meeting, as it was posted under the correct guidelines; Bill Grisct would still like some clarification.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. **Regular Planning Board Meeting held on April 5, 2018**

A motion to accept the April 5, 2018 minutes a minor correction, is made by Helen Sides, seconded by DJ Napolitano, and passes 6-0 with Matt Veno not yet present.

- B. **Special Joint Planning Board and City Council Meeting held on April 9, 2018**

Minutes not yet available

- C. **Regular Planning Board Meeting held on April 19, 2018**

A motion to accept the April 19, 2018 minutes is made by Carole Hamilton, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 6-0 with Matt Veno not yet present.

Matt Veno arrives at 7:13PM.

V. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn is made by DJ Napolitano, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 7-0.

The meeting ends at 10:45PM.

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: <https://www.salem.com/planning-board/webforms/planning-board-2018-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Kilb, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 06/07/2018

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